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#### Obama has won the Iran sanctions fight for now—opposition is still working to exploit on-the-fence Dems

Greg Sargent, WaPo, 1/22/14, Another blow to the Iran sanctions bill, www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/plum-line/wp/2014/01/22/another-blow-to-the-iran-sanctions-bill/

Add two more prominent Senators to the list of lawmakers who oppose a vote on an Iran sanctions bill right now: Patty Murray and Elizabeth Warren.

Murray’s opposition — which she declared in a letter to constituents that was sent my way by a source — is significant, because she is a member of the Senate Dem leadership, which is now clearly split on how to proceed. While Chuck Schumer favors the Iran sanctions bill, Murray, Harry Reid and (reportedly) Dick Durbin now oppose it. This could make it less likely that it ever gets a vote.

From Murray’s letter: Please know that I share your concerns about the Iranian government’s nuclear program. Like you, I am troubled by Iran’s nuclear enrichment program and their desire to enrich nuclear materials above levels required for energy production. That is why I was pleased to see Iran take measurable steps toward addressing the international community’s concerns by signing the Joint Plan of Action last fall…While I still remain concerned about Iran’s nuclear program, I believe this agreement could be an important step in our efforts to reach a diplomatic solution to this complicated issue. I believe the Administration should be given time to negotiate a strong verifiable comprehensive agreement. However, if Iran does not agree to a comprehensive agreement that is acceptable, or if Iran does not abide by the terms of the interim agreement, I will work with my colleagues to swiftly enact sanctions in order to increase pressure on the Iranian regime. This hits some of the key points: The mere possibility of a long term deal is worth trying for, and sanctions can always be imposed later if the talks go awry. Meanwhile, Elizabeth Warren is circulating a letter to constituents out there that also opposes a vote. Asked about the letter, Warren spokesperson Lacey Rose emails me: “Senator Warren believes we must exhaust every effort to resolve the Iranian nuclear issue through diplomacy, and she does not support imposing additional sanctions through new legislation while diplomatic efforts to achieve a long-term agreement are ongoing.” Warren’s pull with the Democratic base, of course, is largely rooted in her emphasis on economic issues, but there has been some chatter in liberal circles inquiring about her stance on Iran. Since a mobilized left is important in preventing a vote that could derail diplomacy, her opposition can only help.

The method by which both Senators declared their positions — letters to constituents, in response to questions perhaps stoked by pressure from outside groups — says something about the caution Dems are demonstrating when it comes to the domestic politics of engagement with Iran. Those who favored a vote were far more vocal at first — as of now, 16 Dem Senators have signed on. But the continued silence of many Dem Senators signaled a broad unwillingness to join the bill, even as many were unwilling to publicly declare this to be the case, since Dems apparently see allowing negotiations to proceed, without getting a chance to vote in favor of getting tougher on Iran, as a politically difficult position to take.

If current conditions remain, a vote is starting to look less and less likely. Right now, the bill has 58 co-sponsors. On the other side, 10 Dem Senate committee chairs have signed a letter opposing a vote. Around half a dozen Dem Senators subsequently came out against it. With Murray and Warren, the number of Dems against a vote has comfortably surpassed the number who want one.

Meanwhile, announcements like the one earlier this month indicating that the deal with Iran is moving forward make a vote still less likely. With Murray now opposed, that means virtually the whole Dem leadership is a No. On the other hand, those who adamantly want a vote — insisting it would only help the White House and make success more likely, despite what the White House itself wants – will be looking for any hook they can find to reactivate pressure.

And it’s worth stressing that if this ever did come to a vote, it’s quite possible that many of the Dems still remaining silent could still vote Yes. Those Democrats would be putting themselves in a ridiculous, untenable position if they did that, but since many appear convinced that the alternative is politically worse, it remains a very real possibility.

#### Plan drains capital

Birns and Mills 13 (Larry, Director of the Council on Hemispheric Affairs, Frederick B., COHA Senior Research Fellow, 01/30, “Best Time for U.S.–Cuba Rapprochement Is Now,” http://www.coha.org/best-time-for-u-s-cuba-rapprochement-is-now/)

Despite the basic intransigence of US policy towards Cuba, in recent years, important changes have been introduced by Havana: state control over the economy has been diminished; most travel restrictions affecting both Americans and Cubans on the island have been lifted; and the “group of 75” Cuban dissidents detained in 2003 have been freed. Washington has all but ignored these positive changes by Havana, but when it comes to interacting with old foes such as those of Myanmar, North Korea, and Somalia, somehow constructive dialogue is the order of the day. One reason for this inconsistency is the continued opposition by the anti-Castro lobby to a change of course by Washington. The anti-Castro lobby and their allies in the US Congress argue that the reforms coming out of Havana are too little too late and that political repression continues unabated. They continue to see the embargo as a tool for coercing either more dramatic reforms or regime change. It is true that the reformist tendency in Cuba does not include a qualitative move from a one party system to political pluralism. Lamentably, Cuba reportedly continues to use temporary detentions and the occasional jailing of non-violent dissidents to limit the parameters of political debate and total freedom of association. The authors agree that no non-violent Cuban dissident should be intimidated, detained or jailed. But continuing to maliciously turn the screws on Havana has never provided an incentive for more democracy in any sense of the word nor has it created a political opening into which Cuba, with confidence, could enter. The easing of tensions between Washington and Havana is more likely to contribute to the evolution of a more democratic form of socialism on the island, the early stages of which we may presently be witnessing. In any case the precise form of such change inevitably should and will be decided in Cuba, not in Washington or Miami. To further moves towards rapprochement with Cuba, the U.S. State Department should remove the country from the list of state sponsors of terrorism. It is an invention to depict Havana as a state sponsor of terrorism, a charge only levied by the State Department under pressure from Hill hardliners. As researcher Kevin Edmunds, quite properly points out: “This position is highly problematic, as the United States has actively engaged in over 50 years of economic and covert destabilization in Cuba, going so far as blindly protecting wanted terrorists such as Luis Posada Carilles and Orlando Bosch, both former CIA agents accused of dozens of terrorist attacks in Cuba and the United States ” (Nov. 15, 2012, Kevin Edmonds blog). It was precisely the propensity of some anti-Castro extremists to plan terrorist attacks against Cuba that urgently motivated the infiltration of such groups by the Cuban five as well as the close monitoring of these organizations by the FBI. Another gesture of good will would be for the White House to grant clemency to the Cuban five: Gerardo Hernandez, Ramón Labañino, Fernando Gonzalez, Antonio Guerrero and René Gonzalez. They are Cuban nationals who were convicted in a Miami court in 2001 and subsequently sentenced to terms ranging from 15 years to double life, mostly on charges of conspiracy to commit espionage. Despite requests for a change of venue out of Miami, which at first was granted and later denied, the trial took place in a politically charged Miami atmosphere that arguably tainted the proceedings and compromised justice. Supporters maintain that the Cuban five had infiltrated extremist anti-Castro organizations in order to prevent terrorist attacks against Cuba and did not pose any security threat to the United States. It would be an important humanitarian gesture to let them go home. Perhaps such a gesture might facilitate reciprocity on the part of Cuban authorities when it comes to American engineer Alan Gross who is presently being detained in a Cuban jail. There would probably be a political price to pay by the Obama administration for taking steps towards reconciliation with Havana, but if Obama’s election to a second term means that there is to be a progressive dividend, surely such a dividend ought to include a change in US policy towards the island. Mirabile dictu, the Administration can build on the small steps it has already taken. Since 2009, Washington has lifted some of the restrictions on travel between the US and Cuba and now allows Cuban Americans to send remittances to relatives on the island. The Cuba Reconciliation Act (HR 214) introduced by Representative Jose Serrano (D-NY) on January 4, 2013, and sitting in a number of congressional committees, would repeal the harsh terms of the Cuban Democracy Act of 1992 and the Helms-Burton Act of 1996, both of which toughened the embargo during the special period in Cuba. The Cuba Reconciliation Act, however, is unlikely to get much traction, especially with ultra-hardliner Representative Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (R-FL), chairing the House Foreign Relations Committee, and her counterpart, Robert Menendez (D-NJ), who is about to lead the Senate Foreign Relations Body. Some of the anti-Castro Cuban American community would likely view any of the three measures advocated here as a capitulation to the Castro brothers. But as we have argued, a pro-democracy and humanist position is not in any way undermined, but might in fact be advanced by détente. An end to the embargo has been long overdue, and the judgment of history may very well be that it ought never to have been started.

#### Those defections overwhelm Obama—results in new sanctions that collapse negotiations and cause war

William Davnie, Former State Dept Officer, Chief of State at Iraq provincial office, 1/5/14, Iran sanctions bill threatens progress; pressure is on Franken, Klobuchar, http://www.startribune.com/opinion/commentaries/238660021.html

The historic Geneva deal to limit Iran’s nuclear program is scheduled to go into effect later this month. Once it does, the world will be farther away from a devastating war and a nuclear-armed Iran. As U.S. Rep. Betty McCollum, D-Minn., rightly pointed out, “this initial deal is a triumph for engagement and tough diplomacy.” However, **the U.S. Senate could reverse that progress through a vote on new sanctions as early as this week,** putting the United States and Iran on a collision course toward war.

For the first time in a decade, the Geneva deal presses pause on Iran’s nuclear program, and presses the rewind button on some of the most urgent proliferation concerns. In exchange, the United States has committed to pause the expansion of its sanctions regime, and in fact rewind it slightly with limited sanctions relief. **Imposing new sanctions now would be just as clear a violation of the Geneva agreement as it would be for Iran to expand its nuclear program.**

That’s why the Obama administration has committed to vetoing any such measures and has warned that torpedoing the talks underway could put our country on a march toward war. A recent, unclassified intelligence assessment concurred with the White House’s caution, asserting that new sanctions “would undermine the prospects for a successful comprehensive nuclear agreement with Iran.”

However, in an open rebuke of the White House, the intelligence community and the 10 Senate committee chairs who cautioned against new sanctions, Sens. Robert Menendez, D-N.J.; Chuck Schumer, D-N.Y., and Mark Kirk, R-Ill., have introduced a bill (S. 1881) to impose new oil and financial sanctions on Iran.

Supporters of this measure stress that new sanctions would take effect only if Iran violates the Geneva agreement or fails to move toward a final deal at the end of the six-month negotiation period. And some dismiss this congressional threat as toothless, given President Obama’s vow to veto any sanctions legislation. But **simply passing these sanctions would dangerously escalate tensions with Iran**. U.S. Rep. Keith Ellison, D-Minn., put it best: “**New sanctions stand to kill any hope for diplomacy.”**

Already, anti-Geneva-deal counterparts in Iran’s parliament have responded with their own provocation, introducing legislation to require Iran to enrich near weapons grade if the United States imposes new sanctions.

Like the Senate sanctions bill, the Iranian parliament’s legislation would have a delayed trigger. Like the Senate bill, the mere introduction of this reckless legislation isn’t a violation of the letter of the Geneva agreement per se. But **both bills risk** restarting the vicious cycle of confrontation **that has defined the U.S.-Iran relationship for decades.**

Without a significant public outcry, **support for this sanctions bill could potentially reach a veto-proof majority** of 67 senators and 290 representatives in the House.

Minnesota could play an important role in this showdown between supporters of using hard-nosed diplomacy to avoid military action and reduce nuclear risk, and those who would upend sensitive negotiations and make war likely. About half of the senators have staked out their positions, but neither Sen. Amy Klobuchar nor Sen. Al Franken have yet taken a public stance.

Minnesota is one of just 10 states where neither senator has taken a public position on whether or not to sign onto **sanctions** that **would sink the deal — and** risk another war in the Middle East.

While some new-sanctions proponents are banking on partisan politics to earn support from Republicans, it would still take seven of the remaining 23 undecided Democrats, along with all Republicans, to reach a veto-proof majority. All eyes will be on those 23 undecided Democrats — including Klobuchar and Franken.

#### Nuclear war

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

Strategic stability in the region is thus undermined by various factors: (1) asymmetric interests in the bargaining framework that can introduce unpredictable behavior from actors; (2) the presence of non-state actors that introduce unpredictability into relationships between the antagonists; (3) incompatible assumptions about the structure of the deterrent relationship that makes the bargaining framework strategically unstable; (4) perceptions by Israel and the United States that its window of opportunity for military action is closing, which could prompt a preventive attack; (5) the prospect that Iran’s response to pre-emptive attacks could involve unconventional weapons, which could prompt escalation by Israel and/or the United States; (6) the lack of a communications framework to build trust and cooperation among framework participants. These systemic weaknesses in the coercive bargaining framework all suggest that escalation by any the parties could happen either on purpose or as a result of miscalculation or the pressures of wartime circumstance. Given these factors, it is disturbingly easy to imagine scenarios under which a conflict could quickly escalate in which the regional antagonists would consider the use of chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons. It would be a mistake to believe the nuclear taboo can somehow magically keep nuclear weapons from being used in the context of an unstable strategic framework. Systemic asymmetries between actors in fact suggest a certain increase in the probability of war – a war in which escalation could happen quickly and from a variety of participants. Once such a war starts, events would likely develop a momentum all their own and decision-making would consequently be shaped in unpredictable ways. The international community must take this possibility seriously, and muster every tool at its disposal to prevent such an outcome, which would be an unprecedented disaster for the peoples of the region, with substantial risk for the entire world.
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#### They’re not topical—economic engagement is increasing economic contacts and interdependence in multiple-areas to influence the political behavior of a state

Resnick ‘1

Dr. Evan Resnick, Ph.D. in Political Science from Columbia University, Assistant Professor of Political Science at Yeshiva University, “Defining Engagement”, Journal of International Affairs, Spring, 54(2), Ebsco

A REFINED DEFINITION OF ENGAGEMENT

In order to establish a more effective framework for dealing with unsavory regimes, I propose that we define engagement as the attempt to influence the political behavior of a target state through the comprehensive establishment and enhancement of contacts with that state across multiple issue-areas (i.e. diplomatic, military, economic, cultural). The following is a brief list of the specific forms that such contacts might include:

DIPLOMATIC CONTACTS

Extension of diplomatic recognition; normalization of diplomatic relations

Promotion of target-state membership in international institutions and regimes

Summit meetings and other visits by the head of state and other senior government officials of sender state to target state and vice-versa

MILITARY CONTACTS

Visits of senior military officials of the sender state to the target state and vice-versa

Arms transfers

Military aid and cooperation

Military exchange and training programs

Confidence and security-building measures

Intelligence sharing

ECONOMIC CONTACTS

Trade agreements and promotion

Foreign economic and humanitarian aid in the form of loans and/or grants

CULTURAL CONTACTS

Cultural treaties

Inauguration of travel and tourism links

Sport, artistic and academic exchanges (n25)

Engagement is an iterated process in which the sender and target state develop a relationship of increasing interdependence, culminating in the endpoint of "normalized relations" characterized by a high level of interactions across multiple domains. Engagement is a quintessential exchange relationship: the target state wants the prestige and material resources that would accrue to it from increased contacts with the sender state, while the sender state seeks to modify the domestic and/or foreign policy behavior of the target state. This deductive logic could adopt a number of different forms or strategies when deployed in practice.(n26) For instance, individual contacts can be established by the sender state at either a low or a high level of conditionality.(n27) Additionally, the sender state can achieve its objectives using engagement through any one of the following causal processes: by directly modifying the behavior of the target regime; by manipulating or reinforcing the target states' domestic balance of political power between competing factions that advocate divergent policies; or by shifting preferences at the grassroots level in the hope that this will precipitate political change from below within the target state.

This definition implies that three necessary conditions must hold for engagement to constitute an effective foreign policy instrument. First, the overall magnitude of contacts between the sender and target states must initially be low. If two states are already bound by dense contacts in multiple domains (i.e., are already in a highly interdependent relationship), engagement loses its impact as an effective policy tool. Hence, one could not reasonably invoke the possibility of the US engaging Canada or Japan in order to effect a change in either country's political behavior. Second, the material or prestige needs of the target state must be significant, as engagement derives its power from the promise that it can fulfill those needs. The greater the needs of the target state, the more amenable to engagement it is likely to be. For example, North Korea's receptivity to engagement by the US dramatically increased in the wake of the demise of its chief patron, the Soviet Union, and the near-total collapse of its national economy.(n28)

Third, the target state must perceive the engager and the international order it represents as a potential source of the material or prestige resources it desires. This means that autarkic, revolutionary and unlimited regimes which eschew the norms and institutions of the prevailing order, such as Stalin's Soviet Union or Hitler's Germany, will not be seduced by the potential benefits of engagement.

This reformulated conceptualization avoids the pitfalls of prevailing scholarly conceptions of engagement. It considers the policy as a set of means rather than ends, does not delimit the types of states that can either engage or be engaged, explicitly encompasses contacts in multiple issue-areas, allows for the existence of multiple objectives in any given instance of engagement and, as will be shown below, permits the elucidation of multiple types of positive sanctions.

#### Voting issue—predictable limits—allowing one-time, non-economic plans means the topic snowballs into tons of random small affs that are impossible to prepare for
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#### Hardline against Cuba now – terror list

Kasperowicz ’13 – Pete, Staff Writer for the Hill, “State keeps Cuba on terror sponsors list”, 5/30, http://thehill.com/blogs/global-affairs/americas/302609-cuba-remains-a-state-sponsor-of-terror-despite-some-improvements

As expected, the State Department on Thursday released a report that keeps Cuba on the list of state sponsors of terrorism, even as it acknowledged that some conditions on the island were improving.

State's Country Reports on Terrorism for 2012 was widely expected to keep Cuba, Iran, Sudan and Syria on the list of countries that sponsor terrorism, despite some reports that incorrectly suggested that it might be used by Secretary of State John Kerry to shift policy on Cuba.

In the case of Cuba, State listed three primary reasons for keeping the island nation on the list. First, it noted that Cuba continued to provide a safe haven for about two dozens members of Basque Fatherland and Liberty (ETA), a group charged with terrorism in Spain.

State's report, though, seemed to give Cuba some credit for hosting peace talks between the government of Colombia and members of the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC). The report notes that Cuba offered aid to FARC members "in past years," and indicates that Havana is no longer supporting the rebel group.

A second major reason for listing Cuba was that the government "continued to harbor fugitives wanted in the United States." That language is unchanged from last year's report.

And thirdly, State said Cuba has deficiencies in the area of anti-money laundering and combating the financing of terrorism, just as it did in last year’s report. This year, however, State also noted that Cuba has become a member of the Financial Action Task Force of South America, which requires Havana to adopt anti-money laundering recommendations.

But still, this improvement and the hosting of peace talks between FARC and Colombia were not enough to remove Cuba from the list.

#### Lifting the embargo is appeasement – emboldens adversaries and turns case

Brookes ‘9 – Peter, Heritage Foundation senior fellow and a former deputy assistant secretary of defense, “KEEP THE EMBARGO, O”, April 15, <http://nypost.com/2009/04/15/keep-the-embargo-o/>

IN another outreach to roguish regimes, the Obama administration on Monday announced the easing of some restrictions on Cuba.

Team Bam hopes that a new face in the White House will heal old wounds. Fat chance.

Sure, it’s fine to allow separated families to see each other more than once every three years — even though Cubanos aren’t allowed to visit America.

And permitting gifts to Cuban relatives could ease unnecessary poverty — even though the regime will siphon off an estimated 20 percent of the money sent there.

In the end, though, it’s still Fidel Castro and his brother Raul who’ll decide whether there’ll be a thaw in ties with the United States — or not.

And in usual Castro-style, Fidel himself stood defiant in response to the White House proclamation, barely recognizing the US policy shift.

Instead, and predictably, Fidel demanded an end to el bloqueo (the blockade) — without any promises of change for the people who labor under the regime’s hard-line policies.

So much for the theory that if we’re nice to them, they’ll be nice to us.

Many are concerned that the lack of love from Havana will lead Washington to make even more unilateral concessions to create an opening with Fidel and the gang.

Of course, the big empanada is the US economic embargo against Cuba, in place since 1962, which undoubtedly is the thing Havana most wants done away with — without any concessions on Cuba’s part, of course.

Lifting the embargo won’t normalize relations, but instead legitimize — and wave the white flag to — Fidel’s 50-year fight against the Yanquis, further lionizing the dictator and encouraging the Latin American Left.

Because the economy is nationalized, trade will pour plenty of cash into the Cuban national coffers — allowing Havana to suppress dissent at home and bolster its communist agenda abroad.

The last thing we should do is to fill the pockets of a regime that’ll use those profits to keep a jackboot on the neck of the Cuban people. The political and human-rights situation in Cuba is grim enough already.

The police state controls the lives of 11 million Cubans in what has become an island prison. The people enjoy none of the basic civil liberties — no freedom of speech, press, assembly or association.

Security types monitor foreign journalists, restrict Internet access and foreign news and censor the domestic media. The regime holds more than 200 political dissidents in jails that rats won’t live in.

We also don’t need a pumped-up Cuba that could become a serious menace to US interests in Latin America, the Caribbean — or beyond. (The likes of China, Russia and Iran might also look to partner with a revitalized Cuba.)

With an influx of resources, the Cuban regime would surely team up with the rulers of nations like Venezuela, Nicaragua and Bolivia to advance socialism and anti-Americanism in the Western Hemisphere.

The embargo has stifled Havana’s ambitions ever since the Castros lost their Soviet sponsorship in the early 1990s. Anyone noticed the lack of trouble Cuba has caused internationally since then? Contrast that with the 1980s some time.

Regrettably, 110 years after independence from Spain (courtesy of Uncle Sam), Cuba still isn’t free. Instead of utopia, it has become a dystopia at the hands of the Castro brothers.

The US embargo remains a matter of principle — and an appropriate response to Cuba’s brutal repression of its people. Giving in to evil only begets more of it. Haven’t we learned that yet?

Until we see progress in loosing the Cuban people from the yoke of the communist regime, we should hold firm onto the leverage the embargo provides.

#### Appeasement kills credibility – shows other countries the US is weak

Weissberg ’10 – Robert, Professor of Political Science-Emeritus, University of Illinois-Urbana, “President Obama's Compulsive Appeasement Disorder”, 9/27, http://www.americanthinker.com/2010/08/president\_obamas\_compulsive\_ap.html

There's a simple explanation: we are no longer feared. Superpowers of yesteryear, going back to the Greeks and Romans, were feared for a reason -- they leveled a city to make an example. Today, by contrast, Uncle Sam relies on cajoling, bribery (think North Korea), entreating puny leaders of inchoate states (special envoys to the PLO's Mahmoud Abbas) and otherwise playing weak hands. We have gone from resolve to U.N. resolution. We've forgotten Machiavelli's sage advice: since love and fear can hardly exist together, if we must choose between them, it is far safer to be feared than loved.

Being feared does not require bombing Iran into the Stone Age, though that would certainly terrify North Korea and even slow down the Somali pirates. Being feared is when your enemy believes that you are willing to use overwhelming, deadly force, and this need not require nuking anybody. The trick is creating a credible, threatening persona -- convincing your enemy that while you may speak softly, you also carry a big stick and are willing to use it. Israel long ago learned this lesson, regardless of world outrage.

#### That kills US power

APSA ‘9

American Political Science Association, “U.S. Standing in the World: Causes, Consequences, and the Future”, Task Force Report, September 2009

As at the regional level, U.S. standing on the global stage appears susceptible to both vicious and virtuous cycles resulting in valleys and peaks, declines and advances. As credibility and esteem decline, the United States may be less able to lead and accomplish its policy goals. Others will be less willing to follow a U.S. lead or defer to U.S. opinions because they no longer believe the United States will get the job done, honor promises, or offer a desirable model to emulate. This, in turn, may further diminish U.S. standing. We see some evidence of this in the most recent period of diminished U.S. standing in global institutions. Logically, however, the converse ought to be true as well. As the United States is perceived to honor promises and show interest in multilateral leadership, its standing may be expected to increase, which may make expanded leadership, increased authority and cooperation possible. We suspect, however, that is harder to recover standing than to lose it.

#### American power solves nuclear war and dampens all conflict

Barnett ‘11

Thomas, American military geostrategist and Chief Analyst at Wikistrat, “The New Rules: Leadership Fatigue Puts U.S., and Globalization, at Crossroads,” http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/8099/the-new-rules-leadership-fatigue-puts-u-s-and-globalization-at-crossroads

Let me be more blunt: As the guardian of globalization, **the U.S. military has been the greatest force for peace the world has ever known**. Had America been removed from the global dynamics that governed the 20th century, the mass murder never would have ended. Indeed, it's entirely conceivable **there would** now **be no** identifiable **human civilization left**, **once nuclear weapons entered the** killing **equation**. But the world did not keep sliding down that path of perpetual war. Instead, America stepped up and changed everything by ushering in our now-**perpetual great-power peace**. We introduced the international liberal trade order known as globalization and played loyal Leviathan over its spread. What resulted was the collapse of empires, an explosion of democracy, the persistent spread of human rights, the liberation of women, the doubling of life expectancy, a roughly 10-fold increase in adjusted global GDP and a profound and persistent reduction in battle deaths from state-based conflicts. That is what American "hubris" actually delivered. Please remember that the next time some TV pundit sells you the image of "unbridled" American military power as the cause of global disorder instead of its cure. With self-deprecation bordering on self-loathing, we now imagine a post-American world that is anything but. Just watch who scatters and who steps up as the Facebook revolutions erupt across the Arab world. While we might imagine ourselves the status quo power, we remain the world's most vigorously revisionist force. As for the sheer "evil" that is our military-industrial complex, again, let's examine what the world looked like before that establishment reared its ugly head. The last great period of global structural change was the first half of the 20th century, a period that saw a death toll of about 100 million across **two world wars**. That comes to an average of 2 million deaths a year in a world of approximately 2 billion souls. Today, with far more comprehensive worldwide reporting, researchers report an average of less than 100,000 battle deaths annually in a world fast approaching 7 billion people. Though admittedly crude, these calculations suggest a 90 percent absolute drop and a 99 percent relative drop in deaths due to war. We are clearly headed for a world order characterized by multipolarity, something the American-birthed system was designed to both encourage and accommodate. But given how things turned out the last time we collectively faced such a fluid structure, we would do well to keep U.S. power, in all of its forms, deeply embedded in the geometry to come.
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#### Global movements against neoliberal hegemony are emerging now and will be effective – the plan’s consolidation of U.S.-driven economic orthodoxy collapses democracy, causes resource wars, environmental collapse, and extinction

Vandana Shiva 12, founder of the Research Foundation for Science, Technology and Ecology, Ph.D. in Philosophy from the University of Western Ontario, chairs the Commission on the Future of Food set up by the Region of Tuscany in Italy and is a member of the Scientific Committee which advises President Zapatero of Spain, March 1, 2012, “Imposed Austerity vs Chosen Simplicity: Who Will Pay For Which Adjustments?,” online: http://www.ethicalmarkets.com/2012/03/01/imposed-austerity-vs-chosen-simplicity-who-will-pay-for-which-adjustments/

The dominant economic model based on limitless growth on a limited planet is leading to an overshoot of the human use of the earth’s resources. This is leading to an ecological catastrophe. It is also leading to intense and violent resource grab of the remaining resources of the earth by the rich from the poor. The resource grab is an adjustment by the rich and powerful to a shrinking resource base – land, biodiversity, water – without adjusting the old resource intensive, limitless growth paradigm to the new reality. Its only outcome can be ecological scarcity for the poor in the short term, with deepening poverty and deprivation. In the long run it means the extinction of our species, as climate catastrophe and extinction of other species makes the planet un-inhabitable for human societies. Failure to make an ecological adjustment to planetary limits and ecological justice is a threat to human survival. The Green Economy being pushed at Rio +20 could well become the biggest resource grabs in human history with corporations appropriating the planet’s green wealth, the biodiversity, to become the green oil to make bio-fuel, energy plastics, chemicals – everything that the petrochemical era based on fossil fuels gave us. Movements worldwide have started to say “No to the Green Economy of the 1%”.

But an ecological adjustment is possible, and is happening. This ecological adjustment involves seeing ourselves as a part of the fragile ecological web, not outside and above it, immune from the ecological consequences of our actions. Ecological adjustment also implies that we see ourselves as members of the earth community, sharing the earth’s resources equitably with all species and within the human community. Ecological adjustment requires an end to resource grab, and the privatization of our land, bio diversity and seeds, water and atmosphere. Ecological adjustment is based on the recovery of the commons and the creation of Earth Democracy.

The dominant economic model based on resource monopolies and the rule of an oligarchy is not just in conflict with ecological limits of the planet. It is in conflict with the principles of democracy, and governance by the people, of the people, for the people. The adjustment from the oligarchy is to further strangle democracy and crush civil liberties and people’s freedom. Bharti Mittal’s statement that politics should not interfere with the economy reflects the mindset of the oligarchy that democracy can be done away with. This anti-democratic adjustment includes laws like homeland security in U.S., and multiple security laws in India.

The calls for a democratic adjustment from below are witnessed worldwide in the rise of non-violent protests, from the Arab spring to the American autumn of “Occupy” and the Russian winter challenging the hijack of elections and electoral democracy.

And these movements for democratic adjustment are also rising everywhere in response to the “austerity” programmes imposed by IMF, World Bank and financial institutions which created the financial crisis. The Third World had its structural Adjustment and Forced Austerity, through the 1980s and 1990s, leading to IMF riots. India’s structural adjustment of 1991 has given us the agrarian crisis with quarter million farmer suicides and food crisis pushing every 4th Indian to hunger and every 2nd Indian child to severe malnutrition; people are paying with their very lives for adjustment imposed by the World Bank/IMF. The trade liberalization reforms dismantled our food security system, based on universal PDS. It opened up the seed sector to seed MNCs. And now an attempt is being made through the Food Security Act to make our public feeding programmes a market for food MNCs. The forced austerity continues through imposition of so called reforms, such as Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) in retail, which would rob 50 million of their livelihoods in retail and millions more by changing the production system. Europe started having its forced austerity in 2010. And everywhere there are anti-austerity protests from U.K., to Italy, Greece, Spain, Ireland, Iceland, and Portugal. The banks which have created the crisis want society to adjust by destroying jobs and livelihoods, pensions and social security, public services and the commons. The people want financial systems to adjust to the limits set by nature, social justice and democracy. And the precariousness of the living conditions of the 99% has created a new class which Guy Standing calls the “Precariate”. If the Industrial Revolution gave us the industrial working class, the proletariat, globalization and the “free market” which is destroying the livelihoods of peasants in India and China through land grabs, or the chances of economic security for the young in what were the rich industrialized countries, has created a global class of the precarious. As Barbara Ehrenreich and John Ehrenreich have written in “The making of the American 99%”, this new class of the dispossessed and excluded include “middle class professional, factory workers, truck drivers, and nurses as well as the much poorer people who clean the houses, manicure the fingernails, and maintain the lawn of the affluent”.

Forced austerity based on the old paradigm allows the 1% super rich, the oligarchs, to grab the planets resources while pushing out the 99% from access to resources, livelihoods, jobs and any form of freedom, democracy and economic security. It is often said that with increasing growth, India and China are replicating the resource intensive and wasteful lifestyles of the Western countries. The reality is that while a small 3 to 4% of India is joining the mad race for consuming the earth with more and more automobiles and air conditioners, the large majority of India is being pushed into “de-consumption” – losing their entitlements to basic needs of food and water because of resource and land grab, market grab, and destruction of livelihoods. The hunger and malnutrition crisis in India is an example of the “de-consumption” forced on the poor by the rich, through the imposed austerity built into the trade liberalization and “economic reform” policies.

There is another paradigm emerging which is shared by Gandhi and the new movements of the 99%, the paradigm of voluntary simplicity of reducing one ecological foot print while increasing human well being for all. Instead of forced austerity that helps the rich become super rich, the powerful become totalitarian, chosen simplicity enables us all to adjust ecologically, to reduce over consumption of the planets resources, it allows us to adjust socially to enhance democracy and it creates a path for economic adjustment based on justice and equity.

Forced austerity makes the poor and working families pay for the excesses of limitless greed and accumulation by the super rich. Chosen simplicity stops these excesses and allow us to flower into an Earth Democracy where the rights and freedoms of all species and all people are protected and respected.

#### The alternative is to vote negative to endorse a radical break from neoliberal market society

Giroux 9/25/13

Henry, currently holds the Global TV Network Chair Professorship at McMaster University in the English and Cultural Studies Department and a Distinguished Visiting Professorship at Ryerson University, “Beyond Savage Politics and Dystopian Nightmares”

Right-wing market fundamentalists want to root out those considered defective consumers and citizens, along with allegedly unpatriotic dissidents. They also want to punish the poor and remove their children from the possibility of a quality public education. Hence, they develop schools that are dead zones of the imagination for most children and highly creative classroom environments free of the frenzy of empiricism and test-taking for the children of the rich. It gets worse. In Pennsylvania, right-wing Gov. Tom Corbett and Philadelphia Mayor Michael Nutter are intent on destroying the public school system. Instead of funding public schools, Corbett and Nutter are intent on crushing the teachers union and supporting vouchers and charter schools. They also are fond of claiming that money can’t help struggling public schools as a pretext for closing more than 23 schools “while building a $400 million state prison.”[xv] As Aaron Kase reports, “Things have gotten so bad that at least one school has asked parents to chip in $613 per student just so they can open with adequate services, which, if it becomes the norm, effectively defeats the purpose of equitable public education, and is entirely unreasonable to expect from the city’s poorer neighborhoods.”[xvi] Vouchers and under-regulated charter schools have become the unapologetic face of a vicious form of casino capitalism waging war on the imagination while imposing a range of harsh and punitive disciplinary methods on teachers and students, particularly low-income and poor white minorities.[xvii] The vast stores of knowledge and human creativity needed by young people to face a range of social, economic and political problems in the future are not simply being deferred, they are **being systematically destroyed.** When the emancipatory potential of education does emerge, it is often couched in the deadening discourse of establishing comfort zones in classrooms as a way of eliminating any pedagogy that provokes, unsettles or educates students to think critically. Critical knowledge and pedagogy are now judged as viable only to the degree that they do not make a student uncomfortable. There is more at stake here than the death of the imagination; there is also the elimination of those modes of **agency that make a democracy possible**. In the face of such cruel injustices, neoliberalism remains mute, disdaining democratic politics by claiming there are no alternatives to casino capitalism. Power in the United States has been uprooted from any respect for public value, the common good and democratic politics. This is not only visible in the fact that 1 percent of the population now owns 40 percent of the nation’s wealth or took home “more than half of the nation’s income,” it is also evident in a culture that normalizes, legitimates and thrives in a politics of humiliation, cruelty, racism and class discrimination.[xviii] Political, moral and economic foundations float free of constraints. Moral and social responsibilities are unmoored, free from any sense of responsibility or accountability in a permanent war state. Repression is now the dominant mantra for all of society. As Zygmunt Bauman and David Lyons point out, the American public has been turned into “security addicts,” ingesting mistrust, suspicion and fear as the new common sense for a security state that seems intent on causing the death of everything that matters in a democracy.[xix] The surveillance state works hard to not only monitor our phone conversations or track our Internet communication but to turn us into consumers, ratchet up the desire to be watched, and enforce new registers of social exclusion between those inside and outside the official temples of consumerism, social rights and captainship itself. Confining, excluding and vigilantism is one register of the new face of authoritarianism in the US. As America enters a historical era dominated by an authoritarian repressive state, the refugee camp as a symbol of exclusion and suffering is everywhere, visible in the material encampments for the homeless, urban ghettoes, jails, detention centers for young people, and in the tents propping up alongside highways that hold the new refugees from the suburbs who have lost their jobs, homes and dignity. The refugee camp also has become a metaphor for those who question authority, because they are increasingly rendered stateless, useless and undesirable. Critical thought is now considered dangerous, discomforting and subject to government prosecution, as is evident in the war being waged against whistleblowers in the name of national (in)security.[xx] The technologies of smart missiles hunt down those considered enemies of the United States, removing the ethical imagination from the horror of the violence it inflicts while solidifying the “victory of technology over ethics.”[xxi] Sorting out populations based on wealth, race, the ability to consume and immigration status is the new face of America. The **pathologies of inequality have come home to roost in America**.[xxii] Moreover, as suffering increases among vast swaths of the population, the corporate elite and rich use the proliferating crises to extract more wealth, profits and resources.[xxiii] Crises become the new rationale for destroying the ideologies, values and institutions that give power to the social contract. [xxiv] The ethos of rabid individualism, hyper-masculinity and a survival-of-the-fittest ethic **has created a society of throwaways** of both goods and people. The savage ethic of economic Darwinism also drives the stories we now tell about ourselves. The state of collective unconsciousness that haunts America has its deepest roots not only in the writings of Friedrich Hyek, Ayn Rand, Milton Friedman and other neoliberal philosophers but also in the increasing merging power of private-sector corporations that, as John Ralston Saul has argued, has its roots in the “anti-democratic underpinnings of Fascist Italy in particular, but also of Nazi Germany.”[xxv] Today this “corporatism [is] so strong it that it has taken the guts out of much of daily democratic life.”[xxvi] Combined with the power of the national surveillance state, it is fair to say, again quoting Saul, that “corporatism, with all of the problems attached to it, is digging itself ever deeper into our society, undermining our society.”[xxvii] Clearly, those words echoed a few years ago were not only prescient but vastly underestimated the growing authoritarianism in the United States, in particular. We now live in a society in which leadership has been usurped by models of **corporate management**, self-interest has triumphed over the ethical imagination, and a respect for others is discarded for the crude instrumental goal of accumulating capital, regardless of the social costs. Intellectuals in too many public spheres have become either dysfunctional or they have sold out. Higher education is no longer the city on the hill. Instead it has become a corporate boardroom/factory in which Bill Gates wannabes govern the university as if it were an outpost of Wall Street. Outside of the boardrooms, intellectual violence prevails aimed largely at faculty and students, who are reduced to either grant writers or consumers. To make matters worse academic knowledge is drowning in firewalls of obtuseness, creating a world of dysfunctional intellectuals, at least those who have tenure. Those who don’t have such security are tied to the harsh rhythm and rituals of contingent subaltern labor and barely make enough money to be able to pay their rent or mounting debts - never mind engage in teaching critically and creatively while writing as a sustained act of dissent. At the same time, the wider culture is sinking under a flood of consumer and celebrity idiocy. There are some who suggest that such critiques of the growing authoritarianism and repression in American society are useless and in the long run do nothing more than reinforce a crippling dystopianism. I think this line of argument is not only wrong but **complicitous** with the very problems it refuses to acknowledge. From a left suffocating in cynicism, there is the argument that people are already aware of these problems, as if neoliberal hegemony does not exist and that its success in building a consensus around its ideology as a mode of common sense is passé. At the same time, liberals detest such criticism because it calls into question the totality of American politics rather than focus on **one issue** and gestures toward a radical restructuring of American society rather than **piecemeal** and useless **reforms**. The call for such a restructuring rather than piecemeal reforms sends liberals into fits of hysteria. Of course, the right in all of its varieties views criticism as a virus that destroys everything they admire about America - a society in which democracy has been eviscerated and largely benefits the top ten percent of the population. Most importantly, the banality of evil lies less in the humdrum cruelty of everyday relations but in its normalization, the depolicitizaton of culture, and, at the present moment, in the reproduction of a neoliberal society that eradicates any vestige of public values, the ethical imagination, social responsibility, civic education and democratic social relations. The enemy is not a market economy but a market society and the breakdown of all forms of social solidarity that inform democratic politics and the cultural, political and economic institutions that make it possible. The authoritarianism that now shapes American society is not a matter of fate but one rooted in organized struggle and a vision built on the recognition that there are always alternatives to the existing order that speak to the promise of a **democracy to come**. The contradictions of neoliberalism are unraveling, but the consensus that informs it is alive and well. And it is at that level of educational intervention that the war against market authoritarianism in all of its diverse forms has to be fought first. Commonsense has become the enemy of critical thought. Hope is no longer part of the discourse of the left, only a dreary sense of despair with no vision of how to imagine a radical democracy. Manufactured ignorance has become a virtue instead of a liability in a society ruled by the financial elite. And as such we have no serious crisis of ideas. Instead, we have a crisis of power relations and structures that needs a new political language if it is to be contested at the level of both a pedagogical and political struggle. The current neoliberal drive to ruthlessly extend the never-ending task of accumulating capital is matched only by its ruthless determination to produce a notion of common sense that reinforces the idea that **there is no way to think beyond the present system**. The American public needs to break the authoritarian dysimagination machine that affirms everyone as a consumer and reduces freedom to unchecked self-interest while reproducing subjects who are willingly complicit with the plundering of the environment, resources and public goods by the financial elite. Class and racial warfare are alive and well in the United States. In fact, racism and the class warfare waged by right-wing politicians, bankers, hedge fund managers and the corporate rich are intensifying. Americans need to reject a politics in which public goods are demonized and eradicated, African-American youths become the fodder for wars abroad and the military-prison-industrial complex, the underclass disappears, public servants are disparaged, youths vanish into debt and despair, and the middle class passes into oblivion. While politics must be connected to its material moorings, it is not enough to imagine a different future than the one that now hangs over us like a suffocating sandstorm. Those intellectuals, workers, young people, artists and others committed to a radical democracy need to develop a new vocabulary about how to think about the meaning of politics, human agency and the building of a formative culture through which organized collective struggles can develop in the effort to imagine a new and more democratic future.

#### Discourse against conventional agriculture foreclose social responses to structural violence of our farm system – environmental and scientific privileging prevents addressing the root of crisis – the affirmative is a bankrupt sustainability

ALLEN 1993 **–** ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR CENTER AGROECOLOGY UC SANTA CRUZ

*FOOD FOR THE FUTURE*, PAGE 8-10

THE SCIENCE OF SUSTAINABILITY AND THE ROLE OF EPISTEMOLOGY

Located as it has been in the natural sciences, the study of sustainable agricul­ture has overlooked important social factors. As Frederick H. Buttel (this volume) discusses, sustainable **agriculture has premised its appeals and pro­gram on natural science:** the "impetus for and legitimacy of sustainability come from natural science, natural scientists, and natural science data." The **overwhelming majority of research** dollars for sustainable agriculture is spent on natural sciences and **focused on farm-level projects and production inno­vations,** while a minuscule amount is devoted to the social constraints and possibilities. This natural science approach is applied **even when** social goals are sought. As noted by Hamlin (1991:508-509), "One cannot help but be struck by the degree to which proposed social changes are sanctioned in appeals to biology, toxicology and the earth sciences, rather than notions of justice, effective government or progress."Epistcmology, the process by which people come to have knowledge of their world, **is central to solving agricultural problems** because it defines problems and the kinds of questions asked, determines which are important and how they are approached, and forms the foundation out of which solu­tions and strategies arc devised. As O'Neill (1986:91) observes, "In adopting certain categories for social inquiry we also adopt a certain view of the social world, **of its problem areas and of its fixed points, of the actions it makes available** and ways in which their results are constrained." Redclift also em­phasizes the intimate connection between knowledge and power.The knowledge system and epistemology of sustainability determines what actions will be undertaken on its behalf In traditional scientific approaches such actions will reflect the **separation of nature and society:** "It is common­place that science treats nature as external in the sense that scientific method and procedure dictates an absolute abstraction both from the social context of the events and objects under scrutiny and from the social context of the scientific activity itself (Smith, 1984:4). This has important consequences since it tends to naturalize what is social and sets tragically inaccurate limits on what is possible While agriculture's predominating natural science episte-mology is essential to preserve or reconstruct ecological conditions of produc­tion in agriculture, by itself it is insufficient. In sustainability work we must be aware of the ideological constructions and choices made within science—the "objective reality" we create subjectively.Still, sustainable agriculture researchers have broadened the agricultural science agenda considerably. They reject the view of most of the agricultural sciences (inherited from Francis Bacon) that nature is an object solely to be controlled and manipulated to serve human needs, and they locus more on integrated farm systems than do their conventional agriculture counterparts. Core sustainable agriculture premises differ from those of conventional agri­culture in their recognition of nature-mediated unintended consequences such as soil erosion and pest resistance to pesticides, which call for a different configuration of agricultural strategics. Agroecological approaches—ecologi­cal cornerstones of sustainability—include principles of diversity, adaptabil­ity, durability, and symbiosis and offer a substantial improvement on reduc­tionist approaches to dominating nature.Sustainable agriculture researchers tend to share much with their conven­tional agriculture counterparts, however, **including faith in the truth and objectivity of Western science,** the use of standard agronomic and economic categories and measures of success, and a tendency to go directly from prob- lem **description to prescription** without the intermediate step of comprehen­sive explanation or analysis. Sustainable agriculture **premises mirror those of conventional agriculture when they exclude humans and social institutions from analysis.** In their models for developing a sustainable agriculture, many programs and activities treat social relations as a constant and interaction with nature as the only manipulable variable (Allen, 1991). While some agroecologists study agricultural systems from an ecological and socioeco­nomic perspective (as discussed by Miguel Altieri, this volume), they often do this by attempting to generalize ecological principles to human systems. Many ecologists situate the human species as only one among many in the totality of nature rather recognizing humans' pivotal role in agriculture and the powerful impact of human intentionality and social institutions. Through their labor, which produces both nature and society, humans are absolutely at the center of nature (as they can know it).Overlooking the centrality of human action has led sustainability advo­cates and researchers to define problems mainly or solely in terms of nature and environment, and has resulted in a sense that sustainability problems can best be addressed through the traditional Western epistemological tools of **logical positivism, reductionism, and neoclassical economics.** These focus on the descriptive (rather than the prescriptive) and on observable "things," leading to a tendency to reify social relations in food and agriculture, that is, to treat them as if they had acquired a fixed quality and were features of an external, natural world rather than a social world. Framing sustainable agriculture in a natural science discourse that excludes social relations not only ignores social problems, but leaves unexamined the degree to which environmental problems have social causes. By its emphasis on the natural sciences and farm-level production, the sustainable agriculture movement has embraced an **epistemology that is at once too abstract and too positivistic**. it is overly abstract in that it does not give sufficient emphasis to the actions of real people producing their world. It is too positivistic in that it focuses on what is without considering what should be (much less understanding the production of what is).

## off

#### Text: The United States federal government should normalize trade relations with Cuba if and only if Cuba agrees to transition towards a democracy that enforces environmental regulations.

#### Cuba’s made recent economic reforms—unconditional lifting now destroys those which collapses democracy

Sanguinetty ‘13

(Jorge - President at Development Research Center,Director, Latin American Program in Applied Economics at American University; “Who benefits and loses if the US-Cuba embargo is lifted?”; 4/8/13;

<http://devresearchcenter.org/2013/04/08/who-benefits-and-loses-if-the-us-cuba-embargo-is-lifted-by-jorge-a-sanguinetty/>)

The answer depends on the conditions under which the embargo is lifted. I focus on the expected distribution of benefits (and costs) between the government and the Cuban population. A unilateral move by the US Government, without any quid pro quo by the Cuban government can be expected to yield significant benefits to the official establishment with benefits of an unknown magnitude to the population at large. I posit that the magnitude of the latter depends on the degree of internal liberalization of the Cuban economy. Until Raul Castro took over, the centralized command of the Cuban economy was subject to a set or constraints arguably more restrictive than the US embargo. What I have called the internal embargo consisted in the Cuban government outright prohibition for Cubans to own enterprises, freely employ workers or trade domestically and internationally. To many Cubans, probably a majority, such constraints were the main cause of the country ´s secular economic crisis.

Lifting the US embargo under such circumstances was reasonably expected to yield most of the economic and political benefits to the Cuban government and limited economic and no political benefits to the population. With the recent partial economic (not political) liberalization policies implemented by Raul Castro, we can expect that the distribution of economic benefits would be more favorable to the Cuban people. Such new economic freedoms carry a dose of informal political freedoms as Cubans are able to develop relationships among themselves that were tightly constrained until recently, like freedom of assembly, to communicate, and to make transactions and agreements without the tutelage of the government. To wit, as the private sector develops because the government is forced to reduce the inflated payrolls of its enterprises, the authorities lose control on those newly liberated workers. Nonetheless, the system might have reached a point of equilibrium under which an unconditional lifting of the US embargo might still accrue enough economic benefit to the Cuban government that it leads to a roll back of some recent reforms in order to cut loses in the political, albeit informal, arena. This will be a strong reason to oppose an unconditional lifting on the embargo for those who care about the wishes for freedom and welfare of the Cuban people. Many international observers oppose the US embargo on the basis of several debatable assumptions. One is the belief that the embargo has served the Castro government as an excuse for its economic failures, and once lifted the excuse will disappear. Another assumption is that Cubans don´t know that the embargo might have constrained their economy, but not as much as the restrictions of virtually all economic activity by the Cuban government. There are also many Cubans that believe that the US embargo is the only leverage left to pressure the Cuban government to lift internal restrictions in both the economic and the political fronts. It is doubtful that, under the current conditions, a non-negotiated lifting of the US embargo is likely to bring about democracy in Cuba.

#### Democratization through governmental guidelines solves the Cuban environment

CTP ‘4

Cuba Transition Project - at the Institute for Cuban and Cuban-American Studies at the University of Miami is an important and timely project co study and make recommendations for the reconstruction of Cuba once the post-Castro transition begins in earnest. This is being accomplished through individual original research, work-study groups, and seminars; written by Eudel Cepero – environmental scientist and research analyst with the FIU Applied Research unit; INSTITUTE FOR CUBAN AND CUBAN-AMERICAN STUDIES, “ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS FOR A CUBA IN TRANSITION”, 2004, http://ctp.iccas.miami.edu/Research\_Studies/ECepero.pdf)

The ecological costs of the Cuban totalitarian model have yet to be assessed; however, future generations will inevitably have to pay a high price to repair the damage. Among the Cuban archipelago’s most serious environmental problems are, in order of importance, soil degradation, deforestation, water pollution and contamination, deterioration of urban environments, and loss of biodiversity. The only way to avoid increasing Cuba’s heavy ecological burden is to establish basic environmental guidelines at the outset of a transition to democracy. These new guidelines should be based upon the principles of sustainable development and be part of a new economic design. During the transition to democracy, there will be three overarching stages or phases for dealing with the country’s primary ecological problems: 1) the environmental emergency phase, 2) the institutionalization phase, and 3) the sustainability stage. Each stage will include a logical sequence of actions to allow the understanding (that is, social environmental aware ness) required for the timely establishment of a new legal framework, up to-date regulations, and incentives that will lead to a sustainable development model. At the end of this paper, suggested actions to be taken during each of the three phases are listed.

## Agriculture

#### Cuba agriculture sustainable now **because of the Embargo** – plan collapses the industry

Fairweather and Asquith ’10 (Jack Fairweather- former Middle East correspondent who spent four years as the Daily Telegraph’s Baghdad and Gulf correspondent. He was an embedded reporter during the Iraq invasion, and won the British equivalent of the Pulitzer prize for his reporting on Iraq’s civil war. Most recently Jack has been the Washington Post Global’s Islamic world correspondent, where he has created Islam’s Advance, a multi-media Post webpage that’s viewed by 80,000 viewers a month. Jack is also a contributor to Harper’s Magazine, Mother Jones and the Atlantic Monthly and Christina Asquith- Christina Asquith has 12 years experience as a local beat reporter, national correspondent and foreign correspondent for The Philadelphia Inquirer, The New York Times and The Economist. She spent three years in the Middle East covering the Iraq war, and won “Educator of the Year” award by Education News for her coverage of the effects of war on the lives of school system. She also is author of two non-fiction books: “The Emergency Teacher: A Year Inside Philadelphia’s Toughest School” (Skyhorse Press, 2007) and “The Spinsters’ War: A Story of Women, Life and Death in Iraq” (Random House, 2009). Prior to joining Solutions Magazine, she was senior editor at Diverse Magazine in Washington DC; “How Can Cuba’s Sustainable Agriculture Survive the Peace?”; <http://thesolutionsjournal.com/node/554>)

For a country that responded to severe energy crisis by switching to organic, localized agriculture, the fruits of the revolution must be protected from the coming peace.¶ For those trying to imagine life without oil, Cuba has proven the solitary example of a country successfully de-industrializing.¶ Confronted with the collapse of aid from the Soviet Union and ever-tighter U.S. sanctions in the early 1990s, the Castro regime was forced to scupper its centrally-planned, fossil-fuel-driven agriculture and rediscover sustainable and green farming practices.¶ The solutions developed by a young generation of farmers and agronomists – including urban farms in vacant lots in the capital, Havana, and a network of producers across the country – now provide 80% of the country with predominantly local, organic produce and helped turn Cuba into an unintentional leader of the green movement.¶ And yet, scarcely has this revolution been achieved, but it is under threat — not from the imperial machination of America (a popular theme in Communist circles) but **from the promise of Cuba’s re-integration into the world economy**, raised by President Barack Obama at the recent Summit of the Americas.¶ The problem, say the leaders of Cuba’s green movement, is that opening up trade will flood the country with cheap oil and with it a return to an industrialized food supply. Recent subsidized oil imports from Venezuelan president Hugo Chavez have led to an increase in the use of fertilizers.¶ “Industrialized food production in Cuba means centralized planning and control. The government never wanted to give up control, and now with more oil, we may see the independence that localized, sustainable agriculture produces being undermined,” said Fernando Funes Monzote, a leading agronomist at the Indio Hatuey Experimental Station, University of Matanzas.

#### No impact to warming

Taylor 12 (James, Forbes energy and environment writer, 3/14/2012, "Shock Poll: Meteorologists Are Global Warming Skeptics", www.forbes.com/sites/jamestaylor/2012/03/14/shock-poll-meteorologists-are-global-warming-skeptics/)

A recent survey of American Meteorological Society members shows meteorologists are skeptical that humans are causing a global warming crisis. The survey confirms what many scientists have been reporting for years; the politically focused bureaucratic leadership of many science organizations is severely out of touch with the scientists themselves regarding global warming issues. According to American Meteorological Society (AMS) data, 89% of AMS meteorologists believe global warming is happening, but only a minority (30%) is very worried about global warming. This sharp contrast between the large majority of meteorologists who believe global warming is happening and the modest minority who are nevertheless very worried about it is consistent with other scientist surveys. This contrast exposes global warming alarmists who assert that 97% of the world’s scientists agree humans are causing a global warming crisis simply because these scientists believe global warming is occurring. However, as this and other scientist surveys show, believing that some warming is occurring is not the same as believing humans are causing a worrisome crisis. Other questions solidified the meteorologists’ skepticism about humans creating a global warming crisis. For example, among those meteorologists who believe global warming is happening, only a modest majority (59%) believe humans are the primary cause. More importantly, only 38% of respondents who believe global warming is occurring say it will be very harmful during the next 100 years. With substantially fewer than half of meteorologists very worried about global warming or expecting substantial harm during the next 100 years, one has to wonder why environmental activist groups are sowing the seeds of global warming panic. Does anyone really expect our economy to be powered 100 years from now by the same energy sources we use today? Why immediately, severely, and permanently punish our economy with costly global warming restrictions when technological advances and the free market will likely address any such global warming concerns much more efficiently, economically and effectively? In another line of survey questions, 53% of respondents believe there is conflict among AMS members regarding the topic of global warming. Only 33% believe there is no conflict. Another 15% were not sure. These results provide strong refutation to the assertion that “the debate is over.” Interestingly, only 26% of respondents said the conflict among AMS members is unproductive. Overall, the survey of AMS scientists paints a very different picture than the official AMS Information Statement on Climate Change. Drafted by the AMS bureaucracy, the Information Statement leaves readers with the impression that AMS meteorologists have few doubts about humans creating a global warming crisis. The Information Statement indicates quite strongly that humans are the primary driver of global temperatures and the consequences are and will continue to be quite severe. Compare the bureaucracy’s Information Statement with the survey results of the AMS scientists themselves. Scientists who have attended the Heartland Institute’s annual International Conference on Climate Change report the same disconnect throughout their various science organizations; only a minority of scientists believes humans are causing a global warming crisis, yet the non-scientist bureaucracies publish position statements that contradict what the scientists themselves believe. Few, if any, of these organizations actually poll their members before publishing a position statement. Within this context of few actual scientist surveys, the AMS survey results are very powerful.

#### No bio-d impact

Easterbrook 3(Gregg, senior fellow at the New Republic, “We're All Gonna Die!”, <http://www.wired.com/wired/archive/11.07/doomsday.html?pg=1&topic=&topic_set>=)

If we're talking about doomsday - the end of human civilization - many scenarios simply don't measure up. A single nuclear bomb ignited by terrorists, for example, would be awful beyond words, but life would go on. People and machines might converge in ways that you and I would find ghastly, but from the standpoint of the future, they would probably represent an adaptation. Environmental collapse might make parts of the globe unpleasant, but considering that the biosphere has survived ice ages, it wouldn't be the final curtain. Depression, which has become 10 times more prevalent in Western nations in the postwar era, might grow so widespread that vast numbers of people would refuse to get out of bed, a possibility that Petranek suggested in a doomsday talk at the Technology Entertainment Design conference in 2002. But Marcel Proust, as miserable as he was, wrote *Remembrance of Things Past* while lying in bed.

#### CO2 isn’t key

Watts, 25-year climate reporter, works with weather technology, weather stations, and weather data processing systems in the private sector, 7/25/’12

(Anthony, <http://wattsupwiththat.com/2012/07/25/lindzen-at-sandia-national-labs-climate-models-are-flawed/>)

ALBUQUERQUE, N.M. — Massachusetts Institute of Technology professor Richard Lindzen, a global warming skeptic, told about 70 Sandia researchers in June that too much is being made of climate change by researchers seeking government funding. He said their data and their methods did not support their claims.

“Despite concerns over the last decades with the greenhouse process, they oversimplify the effect,” he said. “Simply cranking up CO2 [carbon dioxide] (as the culprit) is not the answer” to what causes climate change.

Lindzen, the ninth speaker in Sandia’s Climate Change and National Security Speaker Series, is Alfred P. Sloan professor of meteorology in MIT’s department of earth, atmospheric and planetary sciences. He has published more than 200 scientific papers and is the lead author of Chapter 7 (“Physical Climate Processes and Feedbacks”) of the International Panel on Climate Change’s (IPCC) Third Assessment Report. He is a member of the National Academy of Sciences and a fellow of the American Geophysical Union and the American Meteorological Society.

For 30 years, climate scientists have been “locked into a simple-minded identification of climate with greenhouse-gas level. … That climate should be the function of a single parameter (like CO2) has always seemed implausible. Yet an obsessive focus on such an obvious oversimplification has likely set back progress by decades,” Lindzen said.

For major climates of the past, other factors were more important than carbon dioxide. Orbital variations have been shown to quantitatively account for the cycles of glaciations of the past 700,000 years, he said, and the elimination of the arctic inversion, when the polar caps were ice-free, “is likely to have been more important than CO2 for the warm episode during the Eocene 50 million years ago.”

There is little evidence that changes in climate are producing extreme weather events, he said. “Even the IPCC says there is little if any evidence of this. In fact, there are important physical reasons for doubting such anticipations.”

Lindzen’s views run counter to those of almost all major professional societies. For example, the American Physical Society statement of Nov. 18, 2007, read, “The evidence is incontrovertible: Global warming is occurring.” But he doesn’t feel they are necessarily right. “Why did the American Physical Society take a position?” he asked his audience. “Why did they find it compelling? They never answered.”

Speaking methodically with flashes of humor — “I always feel that when the conversation turns to weather, people are bored.” — he said a basic problem with current computer climate models that show disastrous increases in temperature is that relatively small increases in atmospheric gases lead to large changes in temperatures in the models.

But, he said, “predictions based on high (climate) sensitivity ran well ahead of observations.”

Real-world observations do not support IPCC models, he said: “We’ve already seen almost the equivalent of a doubling of CO2 (in radiative forcing) and that has produced very little warming.”

He disparaged proving the worth of models by applying their criteria to the prediction of past climatic events, saying, “The models are no more valuable than answering a test when you have the questions in advance.”

Modelers, he said, merely have used aerosols as a kind of fudge factor to make their models come out right. (Aerosols are tiny particles that reflect sunlight. They are put in the air by industrial or volcanic processes and are considered a possible cause of temperature change at Earth’s surface.)

Then there is the practical question of what can be done about temperature increases even if they are occurring, he said. “China, India, Korea are not going to go along with IPCC recommendations, so … the only countries punished will be those who go along with the recommendations.”

He discounted mainstream opinion that climate change could hurt national security, saying that “historically there is little evidence of natural disasters leading to war, but economic conditions have proven much more serious. Almost all proposed mitigation policies lead to reduced energy availability and higher energy costs. All studies of human benefit and national security perspectives show that increased energy is important.”

He showed a graph that demonstrated that more energy consumption leads to higher literacy rate, lower infant mortality and a lower number of children per woman.

Given that proposed policies are unlikely to significantly influence climate and that lower energy availability could be considered a significant threat to national security, to continue with a mitigation policy that reduces available energy “would, at the least, appear to be irresponsible,” he argued.

Responding to audience questions about rising temperatures, he said a 0.8 of a degree C change in temperature in 150 years is a small change. Questioned about five-, seven-, and 17-year averages that seem to show that Earth’s surface temperature is rising, he said temperatures are always fluctuating by tenths of a degree.

#### Aff doesn’t come close to solving

McMartin 13 (Peter, Vancouver Sun Columnist, 3/9/2013, "Global warming’s new frightening deadline", www.vancouversun.com/opinion/columnists/Global+warming+frightening+deadline/8071552/story.html)

In April 2009, the science journal Nature published a paper entitled Greenhouse-Gas Emission Targets for Limiting Global Warming to 2 C. Its subject was the end of the modern world. At the time, it attracted little notice. It was a half-dozen pages long. For laymen, its technical content was impenetrable. The purpose of the paper — researched and written by a team of European scientists headed by Malte Meinshausen, a climatologist with Germany’s Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact — was to determine just how much time mankind had left before our burning of fossil fuels would cause catastrophic global warming. The marker for what would be considered “catastrophic” warming was generally agreed to be anything above a rise of two degrees Celsius in global temperature. “More than 100 countries,” the paper noted, (the actual number was 167 countries) “have adopted a global warming limit of 2°C or below (relative to pre-industrial levels) as a guiding principle for mitigation efforts to reduce climate change risks, impacts and damages.” The problem was, no one was exactly sure how much fossil-fuel consumption had already contributed to global warming, or how much fossil fuel mankind could consume without going over the two degrees Celsius marker. Those phenomena needed to be quantified. Meinshausen’s team did just that. It constructed a rigorous model by incorporating hundreds of factors that had never been grouped together before, and then ran them through a thousand different scenarios. The team’s conclusion? Time was perilously short. It found that if we continued at present levels of fossil fuel consumption (and, in fact, consumption has been rising annually), we have somewhere between an 11- to 15-year window to prevent global temperatures from surpassing the two degree Celsius threshold in this century. And the longer we waited, the worse the odds got. To quote from a story on the Meinshausen paper by reporter Katherine Bagley of the non-profit news agency, InsideClimate News: “To have a 50-50 chance of keeping temperature rise below two degrees, humans would have to stick to a carbon budget that allowed the release of no more than 1,437 gigatons of carbon dioxide from 2000 to 2050. “To have an 80-per-cent chance of avoiding that threshold, they would have to follow a stricter budget and emit just 886 gigatons.” To put that in perspective, Meinshausen’s team calculated that the world’s nations had already produced 234 gigatons by 2006. At our present rate, the paper predicted, the world will surpass that 886-gigaton figure by 2024 — or sooner, if annual consumption rates continue to rise as they have. Since the Meinshausen paper was published, several other studies have corroborated its findings. The math in them comes to basically the same conclusion. “Yes, I use Meinshausen’s study,” wrote Prof. Mark Jaccard, environmental economist at Simon Fraser University, in an email. “But I also use about five others that basically say the same thing. The reason they all say the same thing is because the math is trivial — no independent analysts dispute it. “This is not groupthink,” Jaccard wrote. “Even when we bring in vice-presidents from oil and coal companies to be parts of the study groups, they quietly agree. When you are sitting in a meeting at Stanford (University) with top researchers — and away from your marketing department — it is pretty hard to sustain the myths that ‘business-as-usual’ is OK.” Prof. Thomas Pederson, executive director of the Pacific Institute for Climate Solutions, and former dean of science at the University of Victoria, noted in an email that “the study was conducted by one of the best teams of climate scientists in the world.” “Given continuing acceleration of emissions globally,” Pederson wrote, “we’re on or near the worst-case track that Meinshausen et al. modelled, and that puts us on a probable course for several degrees of planetary warming by the end of this century. In a word, that will be disastrous.” An even more alarming assessment comes from University of B.C. Prof. William Rees, originator of the “ecological footprint” concept. “I haven’t read this particular study,” Rees wrote, “but it sounds about right. If I recall, the United Kingdom’s Tyndall Centre (for Climate Change Research) suggests that a 90-per-cent reduction in carbon emissions from high income countries may be necessary. “In any event, various authors don’t believe we have any hope of cutting greenhouse gases sufficiently in time to avoid a two Celsius degree increase in mean global temperature since to date, no serious steps have been taken to wean the world off fossil fuels.” What would serious steps entail? According to the Meinshausen paper, up to 80 per cent of our known reserve of fossil fuels will have to stay in the ground. “The carbon budget implied by the 2 C limit,” Jaccard wrote, “means that we cannot be making new investments that expand the carbon polluting infrastructure. “This means no expansion of oilsands, no new pipelines (like Keystone and Northern Gateway) and no expansion of coal mines and coal ports. “This does not mean shutting down the oilsands. It does not mean shutting coal mines. These will continue to operate for decades. But you cannot be expanding carbon polluting production and also prevent 2 C or even 4 C temperature increase. The industry knows this, but prefers its ads telling us about the jobs and revenue from expanding the polluting infrastructure.” But the remedies needed, Rees suggested, might have to be even more draconian than that. “Even the International Energy Agency and the World Bank have recently conceded that even if present agreed-upon policies were implemented, the world is likely headed to four Celsius degrees warming by the end of the century. This would render much of the most heavily populated parts of the earth uninhabitable ...”

## Transition

#### **Doesn’t make logical sense---they have no ev that the rest of the world adopts Cuba’s model**

#### No extinction

Malcolm **Gladwell**, writer for The New Yorker and best-selling author The New Republic, July 17 and 24, 19**95**, excerpted in Epidemics: Opposing Viewpoints, 1999, p. 31-32

Every infectious agent that has ever plagued humanity has had to adapt a specific strategy but every strategy carries a corresponding cost and this makes human counterattack possible. Malaria is vicious and deadly but it relies on mosquitoes to spread from one human to the next, which means that draining swamps and putting up mosquito netting can all hut halt endemic malaria. Smallpox is extraordinarily durable remaining infectious in the environment for years, but its very durability its essential rigidity is what makes it one of the easiest microbes to create a vaccine against. AIDS is almost invariably lethal because it attacks the body at its point of great vulnerability, that is, the immune system, but the fact that it targets blood cells is what makes it so relatively uninfectious. Viruses are not superhuman. I could go on, but the point is obvious. Any microbe capable of wiping us all out would have to be everything at once: as contagious as flue, as durable as the cold, as lethal as Ebola, as stealthy as HIV and so doggedly resistant to mutation that it would stay deadly over the course of a long epidemic. But viruses are not, well, superhuman. They cannot do everything at once. It is one of the ironies of the analysis of alarmists such as Preston that they are all too willing to point out the limitations of human beings, but they neglect to point out the limitations of microscopic life forms.

#### Burn out

Joshua **Lederberg**, professor of genetics at Stanford University School of Medicine, 19**99**, Epidemic: The World of Infectious Disease, p. 13

The toll of the fourteenth-century plague, the "Black Death," was closer to one third. If the bugs' potential to develop adaptations that could kill us off were the whole story, we would not be here. However, with very rare exceptions, our microbial adversaries have a shared interest in our survival. Almost any pathogen comes to a dead end when we die; it first has to communicate itself to another host in order to survive. So historically, the really severe host- pathogen interactions have resulted in a wipeout of both host and pathogen. We humans are still here because, so far, the pathogens that have attacked us have willy-nilly had an interest in our survival. This is a very delicate balance, and it is easily disturbed, often in the wake of large-scale ecological upsets.

#### New policies and Obama reforms solve global disease spread – including zoonoses

Dr. Fischer, lead research scientist in the Department of Health Policy at George Washington University, and Dr. Katz, associate professor in the Department of Health Policy at George Washington University, February 2013

(Julie and Rebecca, “Global Health Policy in the Second Obama Term,” http://csis.org/files/publication/130214\_Morrison\_GHTransitionVolume\_Web\_FINAL.pdf)

Engaging Health Actors to Support Security Priorities. The Obama administration’s 2010 National Security Strategy committed to building disease surveillance and response capabilities at home and abroad, in order **to detect**, **prevent**, **and contain outbreaks before they affect U.S. interests**.23 In 2010, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton described the objectives for U.S. global health engagement in terms of development, diplomacy, and the need to “invest in global health to protect our nation’s security. To cite one example, the threat posed by the spread of disease in our interconnected world in which thousands of people every day step on a plane in one continent and step off in another. We need a **comprehensive, effective global system** for tracking health data, monitoring threats, and coordinating responses.”24 In 2011, an interagency working group under the National Security Staff developed the “Guidance and Principles for U.S. Government Departments and Agencies to Strengthen IHR Core Capacities Internationally.” President Obama indirectly referenced this strategy in his address to the UN General Assembly in September 2011, stating that “(t)o stop disease that spreads across borders, we must strengthen our system of public health…. And we must come together to prevent, and detect, and fight every kind of biological danger—whether it’s a pandemic like H1N1, or a terrorist threat, or a treatable disease.”25 The Obama administration followed this speech by urging other nations to join the United States in “pursuing a common vision where disease no longer threatens the security and prosperity of nations.”26 A 2011 Memorandum of Understanding with WHO affirmed “that WHO and the U.S. Government seek to establish guiding principles and a framework for collaboration on common goals in the area of global health security and in line with the principles set forth in the International Health Regulations.”27 **These priorities have** also **been increasingly reflected in the policies and programs of key health and development agencies**. HHS, which represents the United States in global health security actions undertaken with WHO, published its first Global Health Strategy in 2011. This included specific strategies “to protect and promote the health and well-being of Americans through global health action,” including working with other agencies and global partners “to enhance health security and **prevent the introduction**, **transmission and spread of infectious diseases** and other health threats within and across borders.”28 The Division of International Health Security in the office of the HHS Assistant Secretary for Preparedness and Response provides technical guidance and foreign assistance, particularly in IHR implementation, while the Office of Global Affairs coordinates HHS diplomatic and interagency policy and strategy in global health security. The Obama administration reorganized CDC’s global health functions under the new Center for Global Health, which published its own five-year global health strategy in 2012. Within CDC’s Center for Global Health, the Global Disease Detection and Emergency Response Division (GDD) plays a significant role in implementing this strategy through the **seven regional centers** it operates **with partner countries**, support for field epidemiology training programs, and technical assistance in public health surveillance, outbreak response, training, and research. In 2009, WHO designated GDD a Collaborating Center for Implementation of IHR National Surveillance and Response Capacity, recognizing GDD as a technical resource to support partner nation capacity-building.29 USAID’s global health programs generally assist partner countries in strengthening health systems and services. The USAID Emerging Pandemic Threats program launched in 2009 focuses specifically on strengthening capacities for **disease detection at the human-animal health interface**, **aiming to detect emerging infectious diseases in geographic** “**hotspots**” **before they cross into human populations**.

#### There will be no pandemic: humans adapt

Malcolm Gladwell, The New Republic, July 17 and 24, 1995, excerpted in Epidemics: Opposing Viewpoints, 1999, p. 29

In Plagues and Peoples, which appeared in 1977. William MeNeill pointed out that…while man’s efforts to “remodel” his environment are sometimes a source of new disease. They are seldom a source of serious epidemic disease. Quite the opposite. As humans and new microorganisms interact, they begin to accommodate each other. Human populations slowly build up resistance to circulating infections. What were once virulent infections, such as syphilis become attenuated. Over time, diseases of adults, such as measles and chicken pox, become limited to children, whose immune systems are still naïve.

#### Multiple alternate causalities

Jennifer Brower, science/technology policy analyst, and Peter Chalk, political scientist, Summer 2003, Rand Review, Vol. 27, No. 2, “Vectors Without Borders,” http://www.rand.org/publications/randreview/issues/summer2003/vectors.html

This year's outbreak of severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) in Beijing, Hong Kong, Taipei, and Toronto is only one of the more recent examples of the challenge posed by infectious diseases. Highly resilient varieties of age-old ailments— as well as virulent emerging pathogens—are now prevalent throughout the world. These illnesses include cholera, pneumonia, malaria, and dysentery in the former case and Legionnaires' disease, acquired immune deficiency syndrome (AIDS), Ebola, and SARS in the latter. In the United States, West Nile virus entered New York in 2000 and then spread to 44 states by 2002, and monkeypox struck the Midwest this June. In the latter half of the 20th century, almost 30 new human diseases were identified. The spread of several of them has been expedited by the growth of antibiotic and drug resistance. Globalization, modern medical practices, urbanization, climate change, sexual promiscuity, intravenous drug use, and acts of bioterrorism further increase the likelihood that people will come into contact with potentially fatal diseases.
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#### Interrogating the ideology of neoliberalism precedes policy analysis—debate is a unique opportunity to transform the current order.

**Read ‘9** (Jason, Professor of Philosophy at the University of Southern Maine, “A Genealogy of Homo-Economicus: Neoliberalism and the Production of Subjectivity,” Foucault Studies, No 6, pp. 25-36, February 2009, AM)

A critical examination of neoliberalism must address this transformation of its discursive deployment, as a new understanding of human nature and social exis-tence rather than a political program. Thus it is not enough to contrast neoliberalism as a political program, analyzing its policies in terms of success or failure. An ex-amination of neoliberalism entails a reexamination of the fundamental problematic of **ideology,** the intersection of power, concepts, modes of existence and subjectivity. **It is in confronting neoliberalism that** the seemingly abstract **debates** of the last thirty years, debates between poststructuralists such as Michel Foucault and neo-Marxists such as Antonio Negri about the nature of power and the relation between “ideolo-gies” or “discourses” and material existence, **cease to be abstract** doctrines **and be-come concrete ways of** comprehending and **transforming the present**. Foucault’s lec-tures on neoliberalism do not only extend his own critical project into new areas, they also serve to demonstrate the importance of grasping the present by examining the way in which the truth and subjectivity are produced.

### Link

#### Lifting the embargo guarantees irreparable shock waves of American development

Conell ‘9 (Christina - Research Associate at the Council on Hemispheric Affairs, “The U.S. and Cuba: Destined to be Environmental Partners,” June 12, Online: http://www.coha.org/the-us-and-cuba-an-environmental-duo/)

Many Cuba well-wishers fear if President Obama lifts the trade embargo, the invasion of raw capitalism could destroy Cuba’s relatively pristine environment. Although the Cuban government points to its environmental laws and the government agency which was established to develop a sustainable environmental policy, these measures have done little up to now to affect substantial change. In several distinct sectors, Cuba seems to remain unprepared for the lifting of the embargo and the island inevitably could face a flood of investors from the United States and elsewhere, eager to exploit the beautiful landscapes of the island, at great cost and risk. After years of relying on government subsidies and protectionism, this rapid growth could generate irreparable shock waves through the economy. Oliver Houck, a professor at Tulane University who aided the Cuban government in writing its environmental protection provisions, said “an invasion of U.S. consumerism, a U.S.-dominated future, could roll over it (Cuba) like a bulldozer,” when the embargo ends. The wider Caribbean region has experienced water contamination, mangrove destruction and sewage problems due to large quantities of tourists and inadequate plumbing. Therefore, U.S. tourism regulations need to be in place in order to protect the precious ecosystem of the island and prohibit over development. Collaboration between the U.S. and Cuba would be mutually beneficial, as the U.S. could use Cuba as a laboratory of sustainable development and U.S. tourism would stimulate Cuba’s stagnant economy, if its negative impact could be controlled. Both countries must agree upon a mutual plan for development. The Environmental Defense Fund (EDF) has conducted research in Cuba since 2000, working with Cuban partners on scientific investigations and strategies for protecting coastal and marine resources. Operating under a special license from the United States government, EDF experts are collaborating with Cuban scientists on research projects aimed at ensuring that if Cuba taps offshore oil and gas reserves, it will be done in an environmentally concious way. The US should establish more partnerships like these as President Obama has the legal authority to institute far-reaching cooperation with Cuba on joint marine environmental projects. These partnerships should be implemented as the first step in creating an elaborate alliance for environmental protection between the two countries. If the embargo is lifted, symbols of meretricious American capitalism are likely to invade the once relatively isolated island. Opinion columnist Cynthia Tucker has commented on such matters: “Mickey Mouse is sure to arrive, bringing with him the aptly predicted full frontal assault of American culture and consumer goods,” suggesting that if Obama lifts the embargo, a functioning system of environmental protection supported by both the U.S. and the Cuban public must be present for the island to be protected. It is Cuba’s lack of development that makes the island attractive to tourists and although tourism boosts the economy, it also could have detrimental effects on the environment. If the embargo is lifted, strict development restrictions need to be in place in order to prevent further environmental exploitation. Currently, without a severe shift in enforcement of environmental laws and the formation of a hard-working U.S.-Cuba partnership, the Caribbean’s most biodiverse island will continue to be damaged. The key to a new dynamic in the U.S.-Cuba relationship might be to embark on a series of strategic actions that aim to establish a bilateral relationship for sustainable development and associated activities based on mutual respect and the autonomy of each country’s sovereignty and traditions.

### Impact

#### **Prefer this impact---structural violence is invisible and exponential**

Nixon ‘11

(Rob, Rachel Carson Professor of English, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Slow Violence and the Environmentalism of the Poor, pgs. 2-3)

Three primary concerns animate this book, chief among them my conviction that we urgently need to rethink-politically, imaginatively, and theoretically-what I call "slow violence." By slow violence I mean a violence that occurs gradually and out of sight, a violence of delayed destruction that is dispersed across time and space, an attritional violence that is typically not viewed as violence at all. Violence is customarily conceived as an event or action that is immediate in time, explosive and spectacular in space, and as erupting into instant sensational visibility. We need, I believe, to engage a different kind of violence, a violence that is neither spectacular nor instantaneous, but rather incremental and accretive, its calamitous repercussions playing out across a range of temporal scales. In so doing, we also need to engage the representational, narrative, and strategic challenges posed by the relative invisibility of slow violence. Climate change, the thawing cryosphere, toxic drift, biomagnification, deforestation, the radioactive aftermaths of wars, acidifying oceans, and a host of other slowly unfolding environmental catastrophes present formidable representational obstacles that can hinder our efforts to mobilize and act decisively. The long dyings-the staggered and staggeringly discounted casualties, both human and ecological that result from war's toxic aftermaths or climate change-are underrepresented in strategic planning as well as in human memory. Had Summers advocated invading Africa with weapons of mass destruction, his proposal would have fallen under conventional definitions of violence and been perceived as a military or even an imperial invasion. Advocating invading countries with mass forms of slow-motion toxicity, however, requires rethinking our accepted assumptions of violence to include slow violence. Such a rethinking requires that we complicate conventional assumptions about violence as a highly visible act that is newsworthy because it is event focused, time bound, and body bound. We need to account for how the temporal dispersion of slow violence affects the way we perceive and respond to a variety of social afflictions-from domestic abuse to posttraumatic stress and, in particular, environmental calamities. A major challenge is representational: how to devise arresting stories, images, and symbols adequate to the pervasive but elusive violence of delayed effects. Crucially, slow violence is often not just attritional but also exponential, operating as a major threat multiplier; it can fuel long-term, proliferating conflicts in situations where the conditions for sustaining life become increasingly but gradually degraded.

## CP

#### Relations high now – US business involvement has meant a favorable opinion of the US by Latin Americans

Wilson 7-24-13 (Tim Wilson- freelance journalist for Near Shore America; “Despite Chavez and Snowden, Pro-U.S. Sentiment Grows in Latin America”; http://www.nearshoreamericas.com/chavez-snowden-latin-america-perceptions-us/)

This is a common phenomenon. The Pew Research Center, in tracking attitudes in Latin America’s two biggest economies, found that in 2012 69% of people in both Brazil and Mexico had a favorable attitude to American music, movies, and television. But when it comes to how Americans “do business”, only 43% of Mexicans and 45% of Brazilians had a favorable view. By contrast, the most recent data indicate that favorable views of the United States have experienced a significant boost: 73% for Brazilians (up from 61% in 2012), and 66% for Mexicans (up from 56% in 2012).¶ “You can see the change in U.S. favorability ratings in Mexico in our 2013 report,” Molly Rohal of the Pew Research Center tells Nearshore Americas. “We also have trend data in the Global Indicators Database.”¶ The trend is your friend¶ Specific to Latin America, the trend data is cause for optimism, given that Latin America is a young continent, and younger people have a more positive view of the U.S. In Brazil, for example, 78% of those between 18 to 29 years of age, and 72% of those between 30 to 49, had a positive view of US popular culture. In Mexico, the percentages were 79% and 70% respectively. And for those over 50 years of age? Only 55% of Brazilians had a positive view, and 57% of Mexicans.¶ But Latin America is more than Mexico and Brazil, and the greater region is experiencing an ideological divide between populist left leaning governments (Argentina, Venezuela, Bolivia, Ecuador, Cuba, and Nicaragua) and neo-liberal regimes embracing market reforms (Colombia, Chile, and most of Central America). The populist governments like to ratchet up the anti-US rhetoric, echoing the Cold War divide when the United States supported many repressive right wing dictatorships.¶ The irony is that the overall perceptions are not that bad, and that the lower the economic engagement with the United States, the less favorable the view. This is interesting in that “business” scores low, suggesting that there is a more general challenge faced by the private sector, and not one that is specific to U.S. businesses. In fact, when U.S. business is involved**, the populace tends to have a positive view.**¶Consequently, **high-contact and business friendly governments** like Chile and El Salvador **have favorable views**, at 68% and 79%, respectively. By comparison, 55% of Bolivians see the U.S. in a favorable light. In Argentina – a country that makes a habit of rounding out the bottom of positive attitudes to the U.S. – only 41% of the population has a positive view of the U.S.¶ Other research has revealed that **Latin America, as a region, has a more positive view of the United States and her people than any other**. The tenth joint report by Americas Quarterly and Efecto Naím, for example, has indicated that popular support for the U.S. exists even in those countries that have populist regimes critical of the United States. And ongoing research from Latinobarómetro has shown that majorities in most Latin American countries have a positive view of the United States.¶ As with other research, Latinobarómetro has found that close economic and cultural ties build a positive experience. Trade, remittances, and investment – including in technology driven areas that involve a skilled workforce, such as Business Process and IT Outsourcing – can build goodwill.
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### Impact

#### Deal failure itself causes global war

**PressTV, 11/13/13** (“Global nuclear conflict between US, Russia, China likely if Iran talks fail,” <http://www.presstv.ir/detail/2013/11/13/334544/global-nuclear-war-likely-if-iran-talks-fail/>)

A global conflict between the US, Russia, and China is likely in the coming months should the world powers fail to reach a nuclear deal with Iran, an American analyst says.

“If the talks fail, if the agreements being pursued are not successfully carried forward and implemented, then there would be enormous international pressure to drive towards a conflict with Iran before [US President Barack] Obama leaves office and that’s a very great danger that no one can underestimate the importance of,” senior editor at the Executive Intelligence Review Jeff Steinberg told Press TV on Wednesday.

“The United States could find itself on one side and Russia and China on the other and those are the kinds of conditions that can lead to miscalculation and general roar,” Steinberg said.

“So the danger in this situation is that if these talks don’t go forward, we could be facing a global conflict in the coming months and years and that’s got to be avoided at all costs when you’ve got countries like the United States, Russia, and China with” their arsenals of “nuclear weapons,” he warned.

The warning came one day after the White House told Congress not to impose new sanctions against Tehran because failure in talks with Iran could lead to war.

#### Causes Israel strikes

Jon Perr 12/24/13**,** B.A. in Political Science from Rutgers University; technology marketing consultant based in Portland, Oregon, has long been active in Democratic politics and public policy as an organizer and advisor in California and Massachusetts. His past roles include field staffer for Gary Hart for President (1984), organizer of Silicon Valley tech executives backing President Clinton's call for national education standards (1997), recruiter of tech executives for Al Gore's and John Kerry's presidential campaigns, and co-coordinator of MassTech for Robert Reich (2002).(Jon, “Senate sanctions bill could let Israel take U.S. to war against Iran” Daily Kos, [http://www.dailykos.com/story/2013/12/24/1265184/-Senate-sanctions-bill-could-let-Israel-take-U-S-to-war-against-Iran#](http://www.dailykos.com/story/2013/12/24/1265184/-Senate-sanctions-bill-could-let-Israel-take-U-S-to-war-against-Iran)

As 2013 draws to close, the negotiations over the Iranian nuclear program have entered a delicate stage. But in 2014, the tensions will escalate dramatically as a bipartisan group of Senators brings a new Iran sanctions bill to the floor for a vote. As many others have warned, that promise of new measures against Tehran will almost certainly blow up the interim deal reached by the Obama administration and its UN/EU partners in Geneva. But Congress' highly unusual intervention into the President's domain of foreign policy doesn't just make the prospect of an American conflict with Iran more likely. As it turns out, the Nuclear Weapon Free Iran Act essentially empowers Israel to decide whether the United States will go to war against Tehran.¶ On their own, the tough new sanctions imposed automatically if a final deal isn't completed in six months pose a daunting enough challenge for President Obama and Secretary of State Kerry. But it is the legislation's commitment to support an Israeli preventive strike against Iranian nuclear facilities that almost ensures the U.S. and Iran will come to blows. As Section 2b, part 5 of the draft mandates:¶ If the Government of Israel is compelled to take military action in legitimate self-defense against Iran's nuclear weapon program, the United States Government should stand with Israel and provide, in accordance with the law of the United States and the constitutional responsibility of Congress to authorize the use of military force, diplomatic, military, and economic support to the Government of Israel in its defense of its territory, people, and existence.¶ Now, the legislation being pushed by Senators Mark Kirk (R-IL), Chuck Schumer (D-NY) and Robert Menendez (D-NJ) does not automatically give the President an authorization to use force should Israel attack the Iranians. (The draft language above explicitly states that the U.S. government must act "in accordance with the law of the United States and the constitutional responsibility of Congress to authorize the use of military force.") But there should be little doubt that an AUMF would be forthcoming from Congressmen on both sides of the aisle. As Lindsey Graham, who with Menendez co-sponsored a similar, non-binding "stand with Israel" resolution in March told a Christians United for Israel (CUFI) conference in July:¶ "If nothing changes in Iran, come September, October, I will present a resolution that will authorize the use of military force to prevent Iran from developing a nuclear bomb."¶ Graham would have plenty of company from the hardest of hard liners in his party. In August 2012, Romney national security adviser and pardoned Iran-Contra architect Elliott Abrams called for a war authorization in the pages of the Weekly Standard. And just two weeks ago, Norman Podhoretz used his Wall Street Journal op-ed to urge the Obama administration to "strike Iran now" to avoid "the nuclear war sure to come."¶ But at the end of the day, the lack of an explicit AUMF in the Nuclear Weapon Free Iran Act doesn't mean its supporters aren't giving Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu de facto carte blanche to hit Iranian nuclear facilities. The ensuing Iranian retaliation against to Israeli and American interests would almost certainly trigger the commitment of U.S. forces anyway.¶ Even if the Israelis alone launched a strike against Iran's atomic sites, Tehran will almost certainly hit back against U.S. targets in the Straits of Hormuz, in the region, possibly in Europe and even potentially in the American homeland. Israel would face certain retaliation from Hezbollah rockets launched from Lebanon and Hamas missiles raining down from Gaza.¶ That's why former Bush Defense Secretary Bob Gates and CIA head Michael Hayden raising the alarms about the "disastrous" impact of the supposedly surgical strikes against the Ayatollah's nuclear infrastructure. As the New York Times reported in March 2012, "A classified war simulation held this month to assess the repercussions of an Israeli attack on Iran forecasts that the strike would lead to a wider regional war, which could draw in the United States and leave hundreds of Americans dead, according to American officials." And that September, a bipartisan group of U.S. foreign policy leaders including Brent Scowcroft, retired Admiral William Fallon, former Republican Senator (now Obama Pentagon chief) Chuck Hagel, retired General Anthony Zinni and former Ambassador Thomas Pickering concluded that American attacks with the objective of "ensuring that Iran never acquires a nuclear bomb" would "need to conduct a significantly expanded air and sea war over a prolonged period of time, likely several years." (Accomplishing regime change, the authors noted, would mean an occupation of Iran requiring a "commitment of resources and personnel greater than what the U.S. has expended over the past 10 years in the Iraq and Afghanistan wars combined.") The anticipated blowback?¶ Serious costs to U.S. interests would also be felt over the longer term, we believe, with problematic consequences for global and regional stability, including economic stability. A dynamic of escalation, action, and counteraction could produce serious unintended consequences that would significantly increase all of these costs and lead, potentially, to all-out regional war.

#### Great power war

Rafael Reuveny 10, PhD, Professor in the School of Public and Environmental Affairs at Indiana University, "Unilateral Strike on Iran could trigger world Depression", Op-ed distributed through McClatchy Newspaper Co, <http://www.indiana.edu/~spea/news/speaking_out/reuveny_on_unilateral_strike_Iran.shtml>

A unilateral Israeli strike on Iran’s nuclear facilities would likely have dire consequences, including a regional war, global economic collapse and a major power clash. For an Israeli campaign to succeed, it must be quick and decisive. This requires an attack that would be so overwhelming that Iran would not dare to respond in full force. Such an outcome is extremely unlikely since the locations of some of Iran’s nuclear facilities are not fully known and known facilities are buried deep underground. All of these widely spread facilities are shielded by elaborate air defense systems constructed not only by the Iranians, but also the Chinese and, likely, the Russians as well. By now, Iran has also built redundant command and control systems and nuclear facilities, developed early-warning systems, acquired ballistic and cruise missiles and upgraded and enlarged its armed forces. Because Iran is well-prepared, a single, conventional Israeli strike — or even numerous strikes — could not destroy all of its capabilities, giving Iran time to respond. A regional war Unlike Iraq, whose nuclear program Israel destroyed in 1981**,** Iran has a second-strike capability comprised of a coalition of Iranian, Syrian, Lebanese, Hezbollah, Hamas, and, perhaps, Turkish forces. Internal pressure might compel Jordan, Egypt, and the Palestinian Authority to join the assault, turning a bad situation into a regional war. During the 1973 Arab-Israeli War, at the apex of its power, Israel was saved from defeat by President Nixon’s shipment of weapons and planes. Today, Israel’s numerical inferiority is greater, and it faces more determined and better-equipped opponents. Despite Israel’s touted defense systems, Iranian coalition missiles, armed forces, and terrorist attacks would likely wreak havoc on its enemy, leading to a prolonged tit-for-tat. In the absence of massive U.S. assistance, Israel’s military resources may quickly dwindle, forcing it to use its alleged nuclear weapons, as it had reportedly almost done in 1973. An Israeli nuclear attack would likely destroy most of Iran’s capabilities, but a crippled Iran and its coalition could still attack neighboring oil facilities, unleash global terrorism, plant mines in the Persian Gulf and impair maritime trade in the Mediterranean, Red Sea and Indian Ocean. Middle Eastern oil shipments would likely slow to a trickle as production declines due to the war and insurance companies decide to drop their risky Middle Eastern clients. Iran and Venezuela would likely stop selling oil to the United States and Europe. The world economy would head into a tailspin; international acrimony would rise; and Iraqi and Afghani citizens might fully turn on the United States, immediately requiring the deployment of more American troops. Russia, China, Venezuela, and maybe Brazil and Turkey — all of which essentially support Iran — could be tempted to form an alliance and openly challenge the U.S. hegemony. Replaying Nixon’s nightmare Russia and China might rearm their injured Iranian protege overnight, just as Nixon rearmed Israel, and threaten to intervene, just as the U.S.S.R. threatened to join Egypt and Syria in 1973. President Obama’s response would likely put U.S. forces on nuclear alert, replaying Nixon’s nightmarish scenario. Iran may well feel duty-bound to respond to a unilateral attack by its Israeli archenemy, but it knows that it could not take on the United States head-to-head. In contrast, if the United States leads the attack, Iran’s response would likely be muted. If Iran chooses to absorb an American-led strike, its allies would likely protest and send weapons, but would probably not risk using force.

¶ While no one has a crystal ball, leaders should be risk-averse when choosing war as a foreign policy tool. If attacking Iran is deemed necessary, Israel must wait for an American green light. A unilateral Israeli strike could ultimately spark World War III.

#### Turns agriculture – industrialized ag is inevitable in a world of conflict – rolls back the aff

Allouche, research Fellow – water supply and sanitation @ Institute for Development Studies, frmr professor – MIT, ‘11

(Jeremy, “The sustainability and resilience of global water and food systems: Political analysis of the interplay between security, resource scarcity, political systems and global trade,” Food Policy, Vol. 36 Supplement 1, p. S3-S8, January)

Armed conflict is the main cause of emergency food insecurity in the world today (FAO, 2000) and, hunger is routinely used as a weapon or a political tool during conflicts. In Ethiopia for example, the government attempted to deny food to rebel forces and their supporters – livestock, farms and food stores in Tigre and Eritrea were systematically bombed (Keller, 1992, p. 620). More generally, it has been estimated that approximately 24 million people in 28 countries across the world are hungry and in need of humanitarian assistance due to war (Messer et al., 2001). The most affected people are usually refugees and internally displaced persons of which women and children are a large majority. The impact of armed conflict on food production and food availability is important especially in the African context where most people earn at least a part of their livelihood through agriculture or livestock keeping. One study estimated that food production in 13 war-torn countries of Sub-Saharan Africa during 1970–1994 was on average 12.3% lower in war years compared to peace adjusted values (Messer et al., 1998). In another study covering all developing countries the FAO estimated that from 1970 to 1997 conflict induced losses of agricultural output totalled $121 billion in real terms (or an average of $4.3 billion annually) (FAO, 2000).

These impacts are not just on food production but there is also a devastating human dimension in terms of hunger and malnutrition. So far the emphasis has been on the impacts of armed conflict on food security but there is also an important post-conflict dimension. A number of studies have shown how violent conflict in Africa plays a decisive role in the creation of conditions leading to famine ( [De Waal, 1990] , [De Waal, 1993] and [Macrae and Zwi, 1994] ), and point to the changing nature of the relationship between conflict and vulnerability to famine. As highlighted by a recent FAO study (2008), food shortages linked to conflict set the stage for years of long-term food emergencies, continuing well after fighting has ceased. These situations can be characterized as chronic entitlement failures where communities, households and individuals who have had their assets stripped through conflict, lack the income and livelihood resources to access food and assure their food security, even where food is available (see Macrae and Zwi, 1994).

The impact of war on water is also a serious issue. Ensuring safe water and decent sanitation for civilians in conflict zones is crucial in the sense that diseases have an even large impact in terms of mortality than military casualties during conflicts. The provision of water and sanitation is of utmost priority in post-conflict states. Unsafe water equates directly with poor health, but the lack of adequate public revenues, government capacity, and investor interest often results in failure to re-establish access to basic infrastructural services (Allouche, 2010).

#### Turns disease – war’s the biggest internal link

Jordan S. Kassalow, Council on Foreign Relations, May 2001, “Why Health is Important to US Foreign Policy,” <http://www.milbank.org/reports/Foreignpolicy.html>

A fourth way in which health affects the international system is through the direct links between health and war. The link from war to health is clearer: wars kill and injure soldiers and civilians, but they also destroy infrastructure and social structures, in both cases with adverse effects on the population's general health. In the eastern Democratic Republic of Congo, for example, war and ill health are tightly entwined. Of 1.7 million excess deaths between August 1998 and May 2000, only 200,000 were attributable to acts of violence, and wherever the war worsened, infectious disease and malnutrition followed (International Rescue Committee 2000). Medical facilities are often singled out for attack in "new wars" because they provide valuable loot, easy victims, and a way to demoralize civilian populations. War also causes exceptional mobility, and armies, peacekeepers, and refugees act as vectors for the transmission of disease.

#### Israeli motive exists, Menedez lowers the threshold and green lights attack

Lennard 13 (Natasha, assistant news editor , “Senate resolution would greenlight Israeli attack,” Salon, 3-1, <http://www.salon.com/2013/03/01/senate_resolution_would_greenlight_israeli_attack_on_iran/>)

Senate resolution would greenlight Israeli attack

On Thursday, Ali Gharib at the Daily Beast drew attention to a resolution set to be introduced in the Senate, which declares U.S. support for an Israeli military strike against Iran’s nuclear program. The resolution, to be introduced by Sens. Lindsey Graham, R-S.C., and Robert Menendez, D-N.J., has bipartisan support and the backing of AIPAC. Via Gharib:

With prominent liberal Democrats already signing on, AIPAC’s lobbying heft will likely propel a bill that, in Congressional sentiment at least, commits the U.S. to active support of a potential Israeli attack that experts think could have consequences as grave as further destabilization in the region, adverse global economic consequences, and even a hardening of Iranian resolve to get a weapon.

Although the bill’s supporters have stressed that it is does not advocate war or use of force, the non-binding resolution’s language is strong. Gharib cites a passage that reads, “if the Government of Israel is compelled to take military action in self-defense, the United States Government should stand with Israel and provide diplomatic, military, and economic support to the Government of Israel in its defense of its territory, people, and existence.”

A CIA official dismissed the resolution’s geopolitical importance. He told Gharib that “the discussions between the Obama administration and the Israelis about potential military action on Iran have nothing to do with these kinds of resolutions.” However, Gharib, who has reported U.S. foreign policy and the Middle East for many years sees these non-binding resolutions, although not policy decisions, as among the many incremental pushes that create the conditions for conflict. He explained:

While non-binding Congressional resolutions don’t directly make policy, the language therein often manifests itself both in later, binding legislative efforts and, more frequently, in the public discourse. In this case, the resolution builds steam for a hawkish push against Iran at a time when the Islamic Republic and world powers are amid a negotiating process over the former’s nuclear program, which is widely believed to be aimed at producing weapons.

Indeed, with strong AIPAC support, these resolutions have in the past had profound impact on the public discourse on Israel and Iran, in turn impacting policy frameworks. Gharib highlights as exemplar the shift in the U.S. “red line” on Iran moving from Tehran acquiring a weapon to having the “capability” to do so:

Like a previous Graham effort, the new resolution misstates U.S. policy as “to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon capability” (my emphasis)—phrasing the Senate overwhelmingly approved in another AIPAC-backed measure last September. The “capability” language sets a lower threshold for war than Barack Obama’s stated policy to “prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon,” fullstop—a distinction at the heart of Obama’s flaplast autumn with Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu.

#### Sanctions collapse the deal, cause Israeli strikes

**Keller, 12/11**/13 - Former New York Times Executive Editor and currently an Op-Ed columnist (Bill, “Iran’s Hardliners, and Ours” New York Times, http://keller.blogs.nytimes.com/2013/12/11/irans-hardliners-and-ours/?\_r=0)

America’s hawks, in turn, would suffer a serious blow to their bellicose notion of America’s role if the evilest spoke in the Axis of Evil turned out to be amenable to diplomacy.

And so a failure of negotiations would delight both of them – American hawks because Israel could get on with the business of bombing, Iranian hawks because there’s nothing like an attack by the infidels to unify a fractious public behind an authoritarian regime.

For the moment, our hard-liners pose a greater problem than Iran’s. The moves on Capitol Hill to impose new sanctions before the interim deal even takes effect may pass for tough-mindedness, but they are effectively sabotage. They would undermine President Rouhani’s precarious position at home. Paradoxically, they could also endanger the cooperation Obama has painstakingly earned from the other nuclear powers, and lead to the collapse of the global sanctions. We would lose a united front (which includes China and Russia) against the nuclearization of Iran, and demonstrate that Iranian hardliners are right about what really motivates Washington.

#### Proliferation leads to extinction – human nature risks arms races and pre-emptive nuclear strikes

Victor AUtgoff**,** Deputy Director of Strategy, Forces, and Resources Institute for Defense Analysis, Summer 2002, Survival,p.87.90

Further, the large number of states that became capable of building nuclear weapons over the years, but chose not to, can be reasonably well explained by the fact that most were formally allied with either the United States or the Soviet Union. Both these superpowers had strong nuclear forces and put great pressure on their allies not to build nuclear weapons. Since the Cold War, the US has retained all its allies. In addition, NATO has extended its protection to some of the previous allies of the Soviet Union and plans on taking in more. Nuclear proliferation by India and Pakistan, and proliferation programmes by North Korea, Iran and Iraq, all involve states in the opposite situation: all judged that they faced serious military opposition and had little prospect of establishing a reliable supporting alliance with a suitably strong, nuclear-armed state. What would await the world if strong protectors, especially the United States, were [was] no longer seen as willing to protect states from nuclear-backed aggression? At least a few additional states would begin to build their own nuclear weapons and the means to deliver them to distant targets, and these initiatives would spur increasing numbers of the world’s capable states to follow suit. Restraint would seem ever less necessary and ever more dangerous. Meanwhile, more states are becoming capable of building nuclear weapons and long-range missiles. Many, perhaps most, of the world’s states are becoming sufficiently wealthy, and the technology for building nuclear forces continues to improve and spread. Finally, it seems highly likely that at some point, halting proliferation will come to be seen as a lost cause and the restraints on it will disappear. Once that happens, the transition to a highly proliferated world would probably be very rapid. While some regions might be able to hold the line for a time, the threats posed by wildfire proliferation in most other areas could create pressures that would finally overcome all restraint. Many readers are probably willing to accept that nuclear proliferation is such a grave threat to world peace that every effort should be made to avoid it. However, every effort has not been made in the past, and we are talking about much more substantial efforts now. For new and substantially more burdensome efforts to be made to slow or stop nuclear proliferation, it needs to be established that the highly proliferated nuclear world that would sooner or later evolve without such efforts is not going to be acceptable. And, for many reasons, it is not. First, the dynamics of getting to a highly proliferated world could be very dangerous. Proliferating states will feel great pressures to obtain nuclear weapons and delivery systems before any potential opponent does. Those who succeed in outracing an opponent may consider preemptive nuclear war before the opponent becomes capable of nuclear retaliation. Those who lag behind might try to preempt their opponent’s nuclear programme or defeat the opponent using conventional forces. And those who feel threatened but are incapable of building nuclear weapons may still be able to join in this arms race by building other types of weapons of mass destruction, such as biological weapons. The war between Iran and Iraq during the 1980s led to the use of chemical weapons on both sides and exchanges of missiles against each other’s cities. And more recently, violence in the Middle East escalated in a few months from rocks and small arms to heavy weapons on one side, and from police actions to air strikes and armoured attacks on the other. Escalation of violence is also basic human nature. Once the violence starts, retaliatory exchanges of violent acts can escalate to levels unimagined by the participants before hand. Intense and blinding anger is a common response to fear or humiliation or abuse. And such anger can lead us to impose on our opponents whatever levels of violence are readily accessible. In sum, widespread proliferation is likely to lead to an occasional shoot-out with nuclear weapons, and that such shoot-outs will have a substantial probability of escalating to the maximum destruction possible with the weapons at hand. Unless nuclear proliferation is stopped, we are headed toward a world that will mirror the American Wild West of the late 1800s. With most, if not all, nations wearing nuclear 'six-shooters' on their hips, the world may even be a more polite place than it is today, but every once in a while we will all gather on a hill to bury the bodies of dead cities or even whole nations.

#### Nuclear proliferation escalates regional conflicts and pulls great powers into greater war

Muller 2008

Harald Muller, director of the Peace Research Institute Frankfurt in Germany and a professor of international relations at Frankfurt University, Spring 2008, “The Future of Nuclear Weapons in an Interdependent World”, The Washington Quarterly, 31:2, <http://www.twq.com/08spring/docs/08spring_muller.pdf>

A world populated by many nuclear-weapon states poses grave dangers. Regional conflicts could escalate to the nuclear level. The optimistic expectation of a universal law according to which nuclear deterrence prevents all wars15 **rests on scant historical evidence and is dangerously naive**. Nuclear uses in one part of the world could trigger “catalytic war” between greater powers, drawing them into smaller regional conflicts, particularly if tensions are high. This was always a fear during the Cold War, and it motivated nonproliferation policy in the first place. Moreover, the more states that possess nuclear weapons and related facilities, the more points of access are available to terrorists.

#### Prolif forces the US into deterring numerous rogue states, causing deterrence failure and war

Carpenter 1994

Ted Galen Carpenter, Director of Foreign Policy Studies at Cato, April 1994 “Closing The Nuclear Umbrella”, Foreign Affairs, 00157120, Mar/Apr94, Vol. 73, Issue 2

The issue that U.S. policymakers must face--and have thus far refused to face is whether assuming the risk of nuclear war is justifiable absent the security challenge of a superpower rival. **If proliferation trends continue, Washington could face the prospect of having to deter numerous nuclear-weapon states from attacking or intimidating U.S. allies and clients**. That could be a more unwieldy and **more dangerous mission than was deterring the U.S.S.R**. Some new nuclear powers are likely to be governed by regimes considerably less predictable and "rational" than the Kremlin leadership proved to be. Such regimes might gamble that, while Washington was willing to court nuclear war to block Soviet global hegemony, it will not be merely to prevent a shift in a regional balance of power. Further, even a reasonably rational government might conclude that stiffing a hated adversary is worth risking Washington's wrath. Only **one deterrence failure would cause a catastrophe** for the United States.

#### Nuclear Iran leads Middle East Prolif and nuclear war

Cirincione, 8

[Joseph, President of the [Ploughshares Fund](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ploughshares_Fund), adjunct faculty of the Georgetown University School of Foreign Service and a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, December, “A Mideast Nuclear Chain Reaction?,” Current History, Vol. 107, Iss. 713;  pg. 439, 4 pgs]

A nuclear arms race has begun in the Middle East. It is not overt - no country has declared its desire for nuclear weapons, and none is rushing to build a bomb through a "Manhattan Project." But there is a race nonetheless, one with the potential to be truly catastrophic.

In the past two years, over a dozen Middle Eastern nations have declared their interest in civilian nuclear power or research programs. While several nations in the region already have small nuclear research reactors, and Israel has used its research reactor to produce enough plutonium for 100 to 180 nuclear weapons, the only Middle East nation to build a nuclear power plant has been Iran. In all of Africa, meanwhile, there are only two nuclear power reactors, both in South Africa. But suddenly, 63 years after the dawn of the nuclear age, these dozen states in the Middle East are rushing to invest billions in nuclear plants. This is not about energy; this is about Iran.

It is not Iran's nuclear reactor that concerns its neighbors - more than 40 nations around the world have nuclear power reactors. What is ringing alarm bells around the region is Iran's drive to build facilities to enrich uranium and produce plutonium. The same centrifuges that can enrich uranium to low levels for fuel can be used to produce highly enriched uranium for bombs. The same factories that can reprocess nuclear fuel rods for waste disposal can separate out plutonium for bombs from the spent fuel

Once Iran's plants are fully operational, the nation will be just a political decision away from a nuclear weapon. A US National Intelligence Estimate on Iran in December 2007 concluded that, while Iran had ended its dedicated nuclear weapons programs in 2003 and had not resumed them since, it would be technically capable of producing enough highly enriched uranium for a weapon some time between 2010 and 2015.

Iran denies wanting nuclear weapons, and public opinion polls show most Iranians want the right to make nuclear fuel and energy but do not want the weapons. (I confirmed these views in interviews during a visit to Iran in 2005.) Nor does it appear that an official decision has been made to acquire nuclear weapons. Most likely, there is a consensus among the ruling factions to acquire the technologies that would allow Tehran to build weapons in the future should it decide to do so - a situation similar to Japan's.

The likely factors driving Iran's considerations are those that influence most nations: the three P's of power, prestige, and politics. Nuclear weapons would offer some protection against attacks by the United States or Israel and enhance Iran's ability to project power throughout the region. Nuclear bombs are also still seen as a totem of great power status, a status that Iranians believe their history and geopolitical role warrant. Finally, President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad has skillfully used the nuclear issue to mobilize nationalist sentiment behind his otherwise unpopular government. By posing as the

warrior leader defending Iran from the United States and Israel, he is able to distract attention - at least for a while - from

his failed economic and reform policies.

TlT FOR TAT

In any case, the Sunni Arab and Turkish rivals of this Shiite Persian state have decided that they cannot allow Iran alone to gain the military, political, and diplomatic advantage that nuclear weapons confer. They are now embarked on the decades-long process of acquiring the technological and industrial capacity to match Iran. And it is all legal - all allowed under the rules of the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty that each of the nations has signed.

These nations claim that their purpose in developing nuclear capacity is to diversify energy sources, combat global warming, and preserve oil for export. And perhaps it is for some. But King Abdullah of Jordan, in a rare moment of candor, admitted in January 2007: "The rules have changed on the nuclear subject through the whole region. Where I think Jordan was saying, 'We'd like to have a nuclear-free zone in the area,' after this summer, everybody's going for nuclear programs."

The summer of 2006 was indeed a critical time, but not because any breakthroughs were achieved regarding the cost, safety, or waste disposal problems of nuclear reactors, nor because of regional screenings of the climate change documentary An Inconvenient Truth. Instead, Sunni Muslim states decided at that time to hedge their nuclear bets as US and European efforts to rein in Iran's enrichment program faltered; as the United States appeared bogged down in Iraq and Afghanistan, limiting its ability to confront Iran militarily even as its removal of two regional rivals strengthened Tehran; and as Iran demonstrated its expanded strategic reach in the 2006 Lebanon war, thwarting Israel through its ally, Hezbollah.

Egypt and Turkey, two of Iran's main rivals, have progressed the furthest in the nuclear race. Both haveflirted with nucle- ar weapons programs in the past and both have now announced ambi- tious nuclear construc- tion plans. In March 2008, Egypt signed a $1.5 billion agreement with Russia that will result in the first of several Egyptian nuclear power reactors that were proposed by President Hosni Mubarak in October 2007. Turkey plans to build three reactors, with the first slated to start construction by the end of 2008.

Not to be outdone, Saudi Arabia this year has signed nuclear energy agreements with France and the United States. The United States in May agreed to help Saudi Arabia "develop civilian nuclear energy for use in medicine, industry, and power generation." This followed France's winning a multibillion-dollar deal in January to assist in the construction of nuclear power stations. France, in fact, has been the most aggressive of the nuclear salesmen rushing to the region. In addition to working with Saudi Arabia, France in January agreed to a $3.4 billion deal to build nuclear power stations in Qatar and the United Arab Emirates. France over the past year also has inked nuclear agreements with Algeria, Jordan, Morocco, and Libya.

The Gulf Cooperation Council (representing Bahrain, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, and the United Arab Emirates) is conducting a joint study on the use of nuclear technology for peaceful purposes. An overall umbrella for such initiatives was provided by the Arab League when, at the end of its summit meeting in March 2007, it called on the Arab states to expand the use of peaceful nuclear technology in all domains. Thus far, only Turkey has hinted that its nuclear plans could include uranium enrichment facilities. But if the nuclear programs proceed and nations in the region acquire a broad range of nuclear technology and skills, enrichment or reprocessing capabilities would be far easier to justify (as a necessary domestic source of fuel) and to develop (as foreign companies transfer nuclear skills and knowledge to national engineers and scientists).

A RECIPE FOR NUCLEAR WAR

Thus, the true danger of Iran's developing the ability to make a nuclear weapon is not that Iran would use the weapon against its neighbors or the United States. The threat of instant and overwhelming response would de- ter such use. Nor is the critical danger that Iran would will- ingly provide a nuclear weapon to a terrorist group. No nation ever has, not China during the Cultural Revolution nor North Korea over the 20 years that it has had bomb material. The real danger is that Iran's nuclearization would help create a region in which four or five nations are nucleararmed, instead of just one (Israel). If existing territorial, political, and religious disputes remain unresolved, this is a recipe for nuclear war.