## 1ac

### 1ac – the embargo

#### The thesis of status quo governmental policy is to support “human rights”- this is hypocritical in nature- sanctions cause life to be worse for those experiencing its negative effects and lead to a perpetuating cycle of oppression

A. Sanctions and military interventions are both rooted in the logic of supporting human rights

B. Perceiving life this way is bad because whenever a minor infraction of human rights is seen the United States will bully its way into getting what it wants which ends up causing more oppression

Arvan 13- Marcus, University of Tampa, 1998 Tufts University, B.A.

2008 University of Arizona, Ph.D. (“A Better, Dual Theory of Human Rights”, http://philpapers.org/archive/ARVABD.pdf\\CLans)

Coercive international actions, from political and economic sanctions to outright military force, have been repeatedly used over the past several decades – most often, by the United States – in the name of “human rights.” For example, the US has coercively imposed a commercial, economic, and financial embargo on the nation of Cuba ever since 1960 in response to Cuba’s refusal to move toward “democratization and greater respect for human rights.”65 The US has also imposed coercive sanctions on China in response to the military crackdown on public protests and free speech in Tiananmen Square in 1989. And, of course, the US has not only imposed economic sanctions on Iraq from 1990 to the present, but also invaded Iraq militarily in 2003 and occupied Iraq until 2011. Although the US government initially justified the invasion and occupation on the grounds that Saddam Hussein’s regime was a threat to international peace and security due to allegations it had weapons of mass destruction, as time went on, and weapons of mass destruction are not found, many US politicians increasingly attempted to justify the war and occupation on human rights grounds, citing the history of violence the Hussein regime was known to have taken against its own citizens.67 Although coercive sanctions and military intervention have been repeatedly justified on “human rights” grounds, many people – not only social and political theorists, but the public at large – have been morally uncomfortable with many of these cases. Long-term US economic sanctions on Iraq, for example, have been estimated to have cost anywhere between 100- and 500-thousand lives.68 The 2003 invasion and subsequent occupation of Iraq, on other hand, is estimated to have cost anywhere between 600 and one million lives.69 The United States’ embargo of Cuba has been continually criticized as unjust and disproportionate to actual state of life in Cuba, causing the Cuban people to suffer from lack of food, clean water, medicine, and even soap, resulting in medical crises and higher rates of serious infectious diseases.70 Indeed, the UN General Assembly has repeatedly passed resolutions from 1992 to the present protesting the US embargo of Cuba. Finally, US sanctions on China and Burma have been criticized as ineffective and failing to properly appreciate cultural differences.71 Indeed, some have argued that the deployment of economic sanctions has demonstrated a clear and consistent kind of moral and cultural imperialism that is insensitive to the actual needs and quality of life of people living in “human rights violating” regimes.72 The reason, in short, why people are often morally uncomfortable with the use of sanctions and military force on human rights grounds is simple. As unjust as places like Cuba or China may be, and as oppressive as Saddam Hussein’s regime was in Iraq prior to 2003, the human costs of coercive international actions – from sanctions to military force – seem disproportionate to the actual human situation in those regimes. For the simple facts are these. Although the average Cuban, Chinese, or Iraqi citizen may not enjoy the “human rights” codified in the UDHR or existing human rights covenants, on a day to day basis people in those nations have still been able to live recognizably human lives, and are treated on a day-to-day basis like human beings, not mere animals. The average Iraqi citizen did, in the Hussein regime, have to worry about being kidnapped or executed for certain kinds of speech – but still, as long as they did not behave in those ways, they could go about everyday human life in relative peace: they could have families, hold jobs, etc. The same is true in present-day China and Cuba. Although both nations’ governments violate numerous UDHR articles and human rights covenants, Chinese and Cuban citizens still live recognizably human lives, and are treated as human beings, on a day-to-day basis. For although their citizens do not enjoy anything remotely like freedom of speech, expression, or religion, in conformity with existing human rights standards, their citizens do get to do all of the things that make a human life a human life: they can hold jobs, have families, have friends and acquaintances, and so on. In all of these places, however unjust their governments may be by Western standards, people still enjoy the basic human capacity that Griffin’s account draws our attention: the distinctly human capacity to develop and pursue a conception of a worthwhile life. Yes, these governments set limits – sometimes quite extensive limit – on the kind of life their citizens are permitted to live; but setting limits on a person’s choices is still consistent with treating them like a human being rather than an animal. This is intuitively what is wrong with the imposition of coercive sanctions or military force on citizens in places like Cuba, China, or Iraq. Mere injustices – even severe injustices violating existing “human rights” standards – are not severe enough to morally justify international force or coercion. People are morally entitled to coercive international action when, and only when, they are treated so badly that they do not even live recognizably human lives, such as when people are being enslaved, exterminated, or terrorized by their government to such an extent that they cannot go about their daily lives developing and pursuing a conception of a worthwhile life. The theory of international human rights I have developed and defended here is the only theory that provides a detailed, and compelling, account of why this is. When people are treated like animals, or mere objects – when they cannot even go about their daily lives in peace, developing and pursuing a conception of a worthwhile life, due government terrorism, genocide, etc. – the rest of us are all morally required, as fellow human beings, to ensure that our governments take coercive actions, up to and including military force, to prevent and protect people from such abuses.

#### Specifically, sanctions require the US to oppose any loans to Cuba, financial restrictions prevent normal banking transactions, and dual-use restrictions prevent importation of critical medical supplies.

A. We can’t give cuba normal practices of banking which is necessary for advancement they desire

B. Medical supplies shut off which hurt Cuban people

Bolender, 13

[Keith, 4-22-13, Council on Hemispheric Affairs, “The Terrorist List, and Terrorism as Practiced Against Cuba,” http://www.coha.org/22355/,]

Of all the components to the United States hostile strategy against Cuba, nothing raises the ire of the Castro government more than its inclusion on the State Department’s list of states that sponsor terrorism. The designation is seen by Havana as an impediment towards improving relations and as a cruel hypocrisy that provides political cover for Washington to justify the imposition of economic penalties along with the perpetuation of anti-revolutionary propaganda.¶ There is an opportunity to eliminate that stumbling block in the next few weeks, if newly appointed Secretary of State John Kerry decides to recommend Cuba’s deletion from the list to President Obama. Kerry has until the release of the State Department’s annual terror report on April 30 to make the determination of whether Cuba will remain on the terrorist list. High ranking Cuban officials are closely watching this development, indicating the removal could offer an opportunity to re-engage with the United States. [1]¶ The history of Cuba’s controversial inclusion goes back to 1982, the same year Iraq was taken off the list by the Reagan administration. Besides Cuba, only Sudan, Iran, and Syria continue to be labeled as state sponsors of terrorism. North Korea was dropped in 2008, while Pakistan, long the home of Osama Bin Laden and recognized as a haven for Islamic terrorists, has never been considered. Saudi Arabia, where the majority of the 9/11 terrorists came from, is looked upon as a staunch ally of the United States.¶ There are numerous reasons why the Castro government finds its insertion on the list so galling. First are the real economic consequences to the designation. By law the United States must oppose any loans to Cuba by the World Bank or other international lending institutions. Obama administration officials have been using Cuba’s inclusion to make it increasingly difficult for Havana to conduct normal banking transactions that involve U.S. financial establishments, regardless of which currency is being used. Furthermore, the United States has imposed an arms embargo against all parties placed on the list (which the Castro government has experienced since the triumph of the Revolution) as well as prohibiting sales of items that could be considered to have both military and non-military dual use, including hospital equipment. For example, the William Soler children’s hospital in Havana was labeled a ‘denied hospital’ in 2007 by the State Department, bringing with it serious ramifications. Various medicines and technology have become impossible to obtain, resulting in the deaths of children and the inability of staff to properly deal with a variety of treatable conditions. [2] For Cuba, these restrictions are additionally damaging as the island continues to suffer from the comprehensive embargo the United States has imposed since the early 1960s.

#### The sanctions imposed on Cuba are a modern version of siege warfare – they purposefully deprive civilians of basic necessities putting the most vulnerable at risk

A. To get what we want we operate under “siege warfare” we basically restrict any goods that people need to survive

B. This puts citizens who have nothing to do with the Castro regime at the center of this oppression

Gordon 6-prof philosophy Fairfield- (Joy, Professor of Philosophy at Fairfield University, published in the Harvard University Press, “A Peaceful, Silent, Deadly Remedy: The Ethics Of Economic Sanctions,” Ethics and International Affairs, Volume 13, Issue 1, 4-11-06, <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com.turing.library.northwestern.edu/doi/10.1111/j.1747-7093.1999.tb00330.x/pdf>)

In many regards, sanctions are the modern version of siege warfare: each involves the systematic deprivation of a whole city or nation of economic resources. Although in siege warfare this is accomplished by surrounding the city with an army, the same effect can be achieved by using international institutions and international pressure to prevent the sale or purchase of goods, as well as to stop migration. It is sometimes argued that an embargoed nation can still engage in marginal trade, despite sanctions; but in a siege as well there may be marginal ways of getting goods through gaps in the blockade. In both cases, however, the unit under embargo or siege is a mixed population rather than a military installation, or is entirely civilian. In both cases, the net effect is the same: the disrup- tion or strangulation of the economy as a whole. As Michael Walzer notes, siege is the oldest form of total war; in siege, noncombatants are not only exposed, but in fact are more likely to be killed than combatants, given that the goal of siege “is surrender, not by defeat of the enemy army, but by the fearful spectacle of the civilian dead. ” 3 The principle of discrim- ination in just war doctrine requires the attacker to distinguish between combat- ants and noncombatants; between combatants who are injured and those who are uninjured; between combatants who are armed and those who have surrendered and are defenseless; and so forth.4 There has never been a strict prohibition against killing civilians, or killing injured or unarmed combatants, when it is required by “military necessity” or as an unavoidable consequence of an attack on a legitimate military target. A common example is that an ammunition facto- ry is a legitimate military target in wartime; if during the bombing of the factory civilians who live nearby are also killed, no war crime has been committed. What is prohibited is to target civilians, or injured or defenseless combatants, directly, or to bomb indiscriminately where the deaths of civilians are foreseeable. Siege warfare reverses these priorities: civilian suffering is not “collateral” damage, but rather is the primary objective of the siege strategy, or at least the foreseeable and direct result of siege. Siege operates by restricting the economy of the entire community, creating shortages of food, water, and fuel. Those who are least able to survive the ensuing hunger, illness, and cold are the very young, the elderly, and those who are sick or injured. Thus the direct consequence of siege is that harm is done to those who are least able to defend themselves, who present the least military threat, who have the least input into policy or military decisions, and who are the most vulnerable. The harm done by the enemy’s deprivation is exacerbated by domestic policy, which typically shifts whatever resources there are to the military and to the political leadership. This is sometimes done for security reasons, in the belief that defending against military attack is the highest priority, more immedi- ately urgent than the slower damage of hunger and illness to which the civilian population is subjected. It may also happen because the leadership is corrupt, or because the desperation creates conditions for black marketeering. Both of these consequences —the suffering of the innocent and helpless, and the shifting of resources to the military and the privileged—are as old as siege itself. Thus, the argument can be made that siege is a form of warfare that itself constitutes a war crime. In just war doctrine we could demand a justification for a military strategy in terms of the obligation to minimize harm to civilians: the ammunition factory was a legitimate target, and there was no way to bomb it without collateral damage to nearby residential areas. But siege is peculiar in that it resists such an analysis: the immediate goal is precisely to cause suffering to civilians. In the case of the ammunitions factory, we can answer the question, how is this act consistent with the moral requirement to discriminate? In the case of siege, we cannot. Sanctions are subject to many of the same moral objections as siege. They intentionally, or at least predictably, harm the most vulnerable and the least political, and this is something the party imposing sanctions either knows or should know. To the extent that economic sanctions seek to undermine the economy of a society and thereby prevent the production or importation of necessities, they are functioning as the modern equivalent of siege. To the extent that sanctions deprive the most vulnerable and least political sectors of society of the food, potable water, medical care, and fuel necessary for survival and basic human needs, sanctions should be subject to the same moral objections as siege warfare.

#### This direct violence against the Cuban people is a form of economic terrorism, but is concealed by an ethically bankrupt form of consequentialism that excuses this violence in the name of national security

A. We operate under victim blaming in where we look at how Cubans are suffering and just are like “yeah they deserve it”

B. We never look at how we messed or how we can improve from our mess ups

C. The state is the main actor responsible because decisionmakers have to operate within the state to determine who becomes a victim

Kauzlarich et al 1 (DAVID KAUZLARICH, Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville;¶ RICK A. MATTHEWS, Ohio University; WILLIAM J. MILLER, Carthage College; Critical Criminology 10: 173–194, 2001. “TOWARD A VICTIMOLOGY OF STATE CRIME,” <http://jthomasniu.org/class/781/Assigs/kauzvictimology.pdf>)

Propositions about the victimology of state crime can be developed from this¶ review to help shed light on the larger phenomenon of state crime victimization, although a caveat is in order because state crime takes a variety of¶ forms. For instance, it is difﬁcult to compare the victimology of international¶ economic terrorism against the people of Cuba and Iraq to institutionalized¶ racism, sexism, and classism, or the suffering of human radiation subjects to¶ unjust criminal justice system practices. Nevertheless, several general propositions about the victims of state crime may be formulated based on current and¶ prior research in the area.¶ (1) Victims of State Crime Tend to be among the Least Socially Powerful¶ Actors¶ Even a cursory examination of state crime reveals large power differences¶ between the victim and victimizer. The authority of the state extends well¶ beyond crude asymmetries in the ability to control others, and constitutional¶ and due process protections also vary relative to the power of subjects.¶ State ofﬁcers, agencies, and organizations often exploit scarce resources to¶ advance larger agendas through the use of specialized terminology, scientiﬁc¶ knowledge, and information technology. Clearly the victims of the human¶ radiation experiments, those harmed by environmental degradation, atomic¶ and nuclear weapons tests, and the COINTELPRO, did not have the resources¶ to marshal commensurate levels of technological, terminological, or scientiﬁc¶ expertise. The state also has the ability to conceal illegalities and immoralities¶ by privileging concerns about “national security” over humane, fair, and due¶ processes. In the case of those victimized by criminal justice and the prison experiments, one senses a great deal of dehumanization and ideology, which¶ allows unjust practices and policies to ﬂourish.¶ Victims of other state crimes – such as civilians in war, people targeted for¶ genocide, workers, and the homeless – also have less social power than state¶ agencies and ofﬁcials. Scapegoating, stereotyping, proﬁling, and typifying¶ people belonging to these groups is far easier for the state because of broad¶ asymmetries in power. It is therefore not surprising that galvanizing support¶ for unethical and illegal practices and policies against these groups is not¶ difﬁcult for the state. As a result, the likelihood of the legitimation of a crisis¶ or substantial social protest movements is diminished. It also militates against¶ conceptualizing unjust state actions as crime. One can see evidence of this¶ process at work in the cases of economic and domestic terrorism and the¶ support of terrorism abroad.¶ More broadly, there seems to be a positive relationship between the¶ unequal distribution of power and the level and frequency of state crime, both¶ domestically and internationally. Clearly, social power is unevenly distributed among states as well, providing further opportunities for state crime.¶ The United States has more control over the deﬁnition, enforcement, and¶ prosecution of state crime than most countries. The World Court, the United¶ Nations’ Security Council, the World Bank, and the International Monetary¶ Fund are likely to support U.S. interests. With few exceptions, peripheral and¶ semi-peripheral states are less likely to have any victimization by the U.S.¶ acknowledged and redressed. There is a direct link between U.S. supported¶ and enforced sanctions against Iraq and the death of innocent Iraqi children¶ because of starvation. Sanctions against the Cuban people have also resulted¶ in social and physical harms.¶ Authority-subject relationships (Turk 1969) in an international context¶ help explain how these harms are marginalized in popular U.S. discourses:¶ The claims-making and legitimation exercises of the authority (the U.S. state)¶ are seldom met with organized opposition by subjects. If there is a sizeable movement against U.S. policy and practice, citizens might either be¶ unaware of its existence or may perceive opposition as the work of radicals¶ disconnected with reality (Iraqi politicians, Castro, prisoners’ rights, welfare¶ rights, and anti-nuclear weapons groups). Social harms and higher immoralities might therefore be overlooked, or even worse, supported because of¶ the apparent lack of overt conﬂict over the policy or practice. This makes it¶ appear as though the harms are actually necessary, fair, and consensus-based.¶ U.S. public support of the Gulf War is most illustrative of this point. (2) Victimizers Generally Fail to Recognize and Understand the Nature,¶ Extent, and Harmfulness of Institutional Policies. If Suffering and Harm¶ are Acknowledged, It Is often Neutralized within the Context of a Sense¶ of “Entitlement”¶ The most important difference between victimizers and their victims is the¶ power to exert their will. Victimizers often do not acknowledge the degree¶ to which their policies have caused harm while assessing the effectiveness of¶ their policies to bring about desired change, maintain hegemony, or promote¶ other forms of dominance. Unjust and deleterious domestic and international policies can also be downplayed by neutralizing reasonable categorical¶ imperatives (e.g. do no harm) by employing bankrupt consequentialism,¶ perhaps guided by ethnocentric paternalism. Following Sykes and Matza¶ (1957), others have found evidence of this at work in the wider problem¶ of elite deviance. Denying responsibility, dehumanizing the powerless for¶ purposes of exploitation, and appealing to higher loyalties (i.e. the capitalist¶ political economy and national security) are often employed in the victimology of state crime. Specialized vocabularies may also be used to aide in the¶ dehumanization.¶ Tifft and Markham (1991) have noted that the way policy makers¶ neutralize the destructive and harmful effects of their policies is similar to the¶ manner batterers view their victims. Noting the long history of U.S. abuses in¶ Latin and Central America, they argue that:¶ U.S. policy makers have consciously decided (1) that the U.S. is entitled¶ to control Central America and that the peoples of Central America are¶ obligated to acquiesce in this power exercise; (2) that violence is permissible, and policy makers can live with themselves and conclude that they¶ are ethical/moral persons and that these policies are ethical/moral even if¶ they involve violence; (3) that the use of violence, intimidation, and threat¶ of violence will produce the desired effect or minimize a more negative¶ one; and (4) that the policy of violence and control will not unduly¶ endanger the United States, and the country will neither sustain physical harm nor suffer legal, economic, or political consequences that will¶ outweigh the beneﬁts achieved through this violence (Tifft and Markham¶ 1991: 125–126).¶ Similarly, Cohen (1996) has documented how governments construct ofﬁ-¶ cial responses to allegations of human rights violations. Cohen (1996: 522)¶ contends that the forms of denial on the part of governmental ofﬁcials to such¶ allegations typically include one of the following: “a literal denial (nothing¶ happened); interpretive denial (what happened is really something else); and¶ implicatory denial (what happened is justiﬁed).” At the domestic level, few policy makers have recognized that the cumulative effects of the policies supportive of institutionalized racism and structural inequality have caused considerable harm to various minority groups¶ and women. Often times, the victims are viewed as undeserving or unworthy¶ of the social, political, or economic rights bestowed to others.¶ (3) Victims of State Crime are often Blamed for Their Suffering¶ Victim blaming is unfortunately a common reaction to those most wounded¶ by state crime. The poor, minorities, the homeless, and women become targets¶ of criticism because of the false belief in the ease of achieving vertical intergenerational mobility in the U.S., even in the face of overwhelming structural¶ odds. Prisoners and those accused of crimes are less likely to be treated¶ sympathetically because their assigned master status solipsistically leads to¶ a marginalization of their human worth, morality, and potential. Subjects in¶ the prisoner experiments were viewed as less deserving of informed consent¶ at best and expendable at worst.¶ Harms caused by economic terrorism and the support of anti-democratic¶ governments can be neutralized by popular audiences (and victimizers) as¶ a part of the United States’ interests in national security or the previously¶ mentioned technique of neutralization, “appealing to higher loyalties.” The¶ harms caused by sanctions in Cuba and Iraq are good examples because,¶ while they are easy to see, there is a tendency to assume victim responsibility on the part of citizens because they have not waged successful civil¶ insurrections against their oppressors.¶ (4) Victims of State Crime Must Generally Rely on the Victimizer, an¶ Associated Institution, or Civil Social Movements for Redress¶ Theoretically, the U.S. criminal justice system carries out the criminalization¶ process in the name of the state, not the particular victim. The “people”¶ are identiﬁed as the abstracted victim. What happens, however, when “the¶ people” or a group of peoples are victimized by the body who holds dominion¶ over them and the law? What institutionalized justice process is available to¶ the victim?¶ Often times, as in the case of the prisoner and plutonium experiments,¶ and some instances of racial and gender discrimination, reparations may¶ come about in civil court, and often involve the efforts of special interest¶ groups, people in social movements, and of course private attorneys. In other¶ cases, appeal may be made to the United Nations Human Rights Committee,¶ through the United Nations General Assembly, or the International Court¶ of Justice. The opportunities for international redress of domestic victimi- zation, to some extent, depend on the primary state’s membership status.¶ For example, the United States did not ratify the Genocide Convention for¶ decades because it sought to limit “foreign intrusion” into what were deﬁned¶ as domestic affairs. Citizens victimized in countries with tenuous or marginal¶ standing in the international community as it pertains to human rights may¶ therefore ﬁnd little in the way of assistance.¶ The most potentially dangerous act that could ever by undertaken by a¶ state, the use of nuclear weapons, has recently been criminalized through this¶ latter avenue. Six billion people still live under the nuclear threat, but at least¶ one organization of legitimate authority, the World Court, has conceptualized¶ the entire world population as potential victims of state crime by declaring¶ the use and threat to use nuclear weapons illegal under international law¶ (see Kramer and Kauzlarich 1999). More often than not, however, international organizations like the U.N. have been slow to enforce existing laws or¶ to punish nation-states that are powerful. For example, each year, the U.N.¶ General Assembly has voted to condemn the U.S. embargo on Cuba, but no¶ ofﬁcial action has been taken by the U.N. to end it. In short, there is little¶ hope of formal intervention on the part of the international community when¶ the offending state is powerful like the U.S. On another level, U.S. opposition¶ to international agreements because of the state’s fear of the loss of sovereignty (no matter how slight) also thwart the materializing of democratic and¶ restorative justice.¶ In any case, the process of helping victims or even ending the victimization of state crime is very different than in cases of traditional or white-collar¶ crime. This stems from problems related to the identiﬁcation of the actors,¶ organizations, and institutional forces responsible for state crime, if the¶ policy, actions, or omissions are even recognized as unethical, harmful,¶ criminal, or worthy of resistance.¶ (5) Victims of State Crime Are Easy Targets for Repeated Victimization¶ The manner in which victims of state crime are harmed may change over¶ time; however, the harm incurred by most victims of state crime does not¶ decrease – rather it merely takes another form. Additionally, some victims are¶ continually victimized by the same organization. Examples include women,¶ minorities, the poor, workers, and those living in less developed countries,¶ in much the same manner as some victims of traditional street crime (e.g.,¶ domestic violence and child abuse) who are targeted for repeat victimization.¶ In the cases of the poor, there have been few genuine attempts to alleviate¶ the structural conditions that create abject poverty (Bohm 1993). Women have¶ faced institutional sexism and the “glass ceiling” in spite of superﬁcial efforts¶ designed to give them equal status in society. Minorities have long been the targets of overt and institutionalized racism. While some have argued that¶ afﬁrmative action policies have eliminated the effects of racism, institutionalized racism persists in spite of the progress which has been made. Native¶ Americans have been repeatedly victimized throughout U.S. history, and¶ remain one of the most repressed minority groups in our society (Churchill¶ 1995).¶ Another example is the repeated victimization of the plutonium subjects¶ and their families, who continued to be treated unethically by state agencies¶ for decades. Several years after the deaths of many of the plutonium subjects,¶ the families were sent a letter from the Atomic Energy Commission, which¶ exhumed the bodies for additional research:¶ The purpose of the exhumation was to examine the remains in order to¶ determine ...residual radioactivity from past medical treatment, and that¶ the subjects had an unknown mixture of radioactive isotopes (Advisory¶ Committee on Human. Radiation Experiments 1995: 260).¶ Two willful lies are told in this memo: (1) that the subjects were treated, and¶ (2) that they had received an unknown quantity of radiation. The truth is this:¶ (a) the subjects were guinea pigs not expected to react favorably to the injections, and (b) internal records clearly showed how much plutonium had been¶ injected into their veins (Kauzlarich and Kramer 1998). Rowland provides¶ further evidence of higher immorality when he wrote to his colleagues about¶ the exhumation project:¶ Please note that outside the Center ... we will never use the word¶ plutonium in regard to these cases. “These individuals are of interest to us¶ because they may have received a radioactive material at some time is the¶ kind of statement to be made, if we need to say anything at all” (Markey¶ Report 1986: 27).¶ (6) Illegal State Policies and Practices, while Committed by Individuals and¶ Groups of Individuals, Are Manifestations of the Attempt to Achieve¶ Organizational, Bureaucratic, or Institutional Goals¶ A recurrent theme has been that the harms caused by the state are due to the¶ actions of individuals or groups of individuals who are pursuing the larger¶ goals of their respective organizations. These larger institutional goals may¶ or may not be consistent with the goals of particular individuals. Rather¶ than viewing the harm to the victims of state crime as the result of a few¶ people engaging in immoral, unethical, and/or illegal behavior, it is more¶ instructive to conceptualize state crime as the product of organizational pressures to achieve organizational goals. Many forms of state crime persist for long periods of time (e.g., Iran-Contra, the economic embargo against¶ Cuba, institutionalized discrimination in the criminal justice system), and¶ are carried out by many different actors. If the unethical, immoral, and/or¶ illegal behavior in question were the result of a handful of people, then one¶ would presume that either the activities would desist once those people left¶ the organization or that there would be other people waiting to ﬁll those roles.¶ Since many state crimes persist over time with different people ﬁlling various¶ roles, one can only presume that either there are a lot of immoral people¶ who come into positions of power to carry out the immoral or unethical¶ behavior, or that there is something about the organizational culture itself¶ which fosters such immorality. In the best case, the organization itself has¶ a problem screening out immoral/unethical decision-makers. In the worst¶ case, the organizational climate itself fosters, facilitates, or encourages such¶ behavior (e.g., see Braithwaite 1989: Ermann and Lundman 1996).¶ Also, to reduce state crimes to the individual level is to ignore the¶ social, political, and historical contexts which shape the nature, form, and¶ goals of state agencies. Even a cursory examination of the various forms¶ of state crime reveals that these larger contexts are macrologically linked¶ to state crime victimization and offending. Sometimes these contexts are¶ exigent, such as when cold war hysteria provided motivation for illegal and¶ unethical human radiation experiments, weapons testing, and environmental¶ degradation. Other times, the crimes may be politically and geographically¶ contextualized (i.e., Cuba’s proximity to the U.S.). The state, therefore, may¶ be instrumental in creating and sustaining the conditions that account for the¶ persistence of institutional harms caused by its agencies.

#### Sanctions preclude the possibility of resolving hunger and suffering in Cuba by any alternative- this thought process is not created from ourselves, rather groups in Cuba themselves have been desiring such a process to resolve their ailments

Peter 2K- Philip, Policy Analyst for the Cato Institute (“A Policy toward Cuba That Serves

U.S. Interests”, November 2, 2000 <http://object.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/pubs/pdf/pa384.pdf\\CLans>)

A. Numerous agencies in Cuba have wanted a lifting of the embargo

B. Violate human rights violations the only way to resolve this is through removing the embargo because that is what constructed it to begin with

The economic and political isolation of Cuba was America’s goal in the early 1960s and, in spite of periodic tinkering, it remains the goal of policy today. With limited exceptions, the embargo bans trade, travel, and investment. Contacts between officials are kept to relatively low levels. The economic objective is to block hard currency flows that would benefit the Cuban government. The political aim has been to deny Cuba’s government any prestige or “political victory that might accompany improved relations. To reexamine this policy framework today it is useful to bear in mind five factors. First, any credible US. policy toward Cuba must place human rights at the forefront not simply to be true to American values but to keep faith with Cuban citizens who have stood up for human rights and who see dissent and free speech not as threats but as vital attributes of a strong, self-critical society. Second, current American policy finds little to no support in Cuba. In 1992 a pastoral letter from Cuba’s Catholic bishops said that the US embargo “directly affects the people who suffer the consequences in hunger and illness. If what is intended by this approach is to destabilize the government by using hunger and illness to pressure civic society to revolt then the strategy is also cruel.” In November 1999 a statement issued at ‘Encounter of Cuban Non-Government Organizations” said ‘We do not support nor do we seek actions from abroad that isolate Cuba. Whoever wishes to act with moral integrity, to respect our sovereignty, and to act in solidarity with Cuba should always demand both the end of the embargo and a democratic opening In Cuba.’ Oswaldo Paya leader of the Christian Liberation Movement, directed a message to Congress In 1996: The US economic embargo against Cuba. In all its expressions, goes against the will arid the needs of Cubans and for that reason it should end. We request that you take a first step, above all for justice and also to good faith toward the people of Cuba l lifting unconditionally, the embargo against Cuba In food and medicine. Another dissident group the Democratic Socialist Current, says that the embargo has allowed the Cuban government to present itself as the only defender of the Interests of a threatened nation.” “It only stands to reason that Cubans would hold this opinion; Cubans like America and people who have lived under communism have generally wanted to be connected to, not isolated from the United States. It may be that there are Cubans who support the embargo but are afraid to voice that opinion, but in hundreds of my own private conversations across that island I have never heard a Cuban express support for the embargo. Typically. Cubans associate relations with the United States with economic improvement, and they ask when relations might resume. Third, the policy denying hard currency earnings to the Cuban government carries a tradeoff: reduced American Influence. It is impossible to isolate Cuba without also erecting barriers between Americans and Cubans, cutting off a free flow of people activities, and ideas that could constitute a powerful source of American Influence in Cuba. Fourth the United States has little to lose by experimenting with different approaches to Cuba. It is now dear that the pressure of US economic sanctions will not bring down the Cuban government—and. 1f that policy had indeed worked,” It could have produced a social collapse and a migration crisis that would have been costly for both nations. Unless one views US sanctions merely as a means of expressing disapproval of the Cuban government, the policy has yielded very few measurable results, and the opportunity cost of change is negligible. Finally, the sanctions violate the rights of the American people to trade and travel that Americans enjoy in parts of the world that are not considered national security threats and that hardly have enviable human rights records.

### 1ac – plan

#### The United States federal government ought to remove economic sanctions against Cuba.

### 1ac - framing

#### Concrete political action is key – absent removal propaganda will dominate embargo debates

Henriette M Rytz 2 Research Associate in the Americas Research Division of the German Institute for International and Security Affairs 2013 October 17 Ethnic Interest Groups in US Foreign Policy-Making: A Cuban-American Story of Success and Failure

However, it is difficult to speak of far-reaching generational change in attitudes, as some commentators do (and have for a long time) (e.g., Nordheimer 1988), when the drop in support of Cuban-Americans in favor of the embargo has decreased from 62.4 percent in 2000 to 56 percent in 2011. Nevertheless, the polls do confirm the trend displayed in the empirical analysis of this book that older Cuban-Americans with long residence in the United States tend to favor the embargo more strongly than younger and/or more recent community members do. Furthermore, the segment of the community in favor of the embargo continues to be better mobilized politically than the anti-embargo segment. Among registered Cuban-American voters, the percentage of embargo proponents rises to 64 percent in the 2011 FIU Cuba poll (FIU 2000c, 2011). As long as the embargo skeptics lag behind the embargo proponents in political mobilization, the former camp will likely continue to dominate the debate. Although the political landscape In the making of US Cuba policy has changed significantly since the year 2000 with regard to interest group advocacy and also, though much less, with regard to the interests represented in Congress, the political process has not swung in favor of a veritable overhaul of US dealings with Cuba. In addition to the discussed actors, this outcome can also be explained by looking at structural factors. ¶ This brings us to the third (and major) reason for continuity instead of change in US dealings with Cuba – the codification of the embargo in the mid-1990s through the so-called Helms-Burton bill. Based on this law, any attempt to substantially change US Cuba policy has to be approved by Congress. At the same time, Cuba remains an issue at the sidelines of the foreign policy debate. As long as no large coalition assembles and convinces a majority of members of Congress in both chambers its embrace a policy change, the embargo will stay in place. Given the political gridlock in Washington, which has prevented progress on much more urgent and “popular” issues, such as funding for government operations or the creation of jobs, the prospects for change are very slim as of summer 2013.

#### Sanctions are part of a bad approach to the world—the advocacy is the first step to changing policy

Sjoberg 2k—Associate Professor of Political Science and affiliate faculty in Women's Studies at the University of Florida. She has previously taught and researched at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University, Duke University, Boston College, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Brandeis University, and Merrimack College. She holds a Ph.D. in International Relations and Gender Studies from the University of Southern California, and a law degree from Boston College. Chair of the International Studies Association Committee on the Status of Women (Laura, TOWARDS A FEMINIST THEORY OF SANCTIONS, <http://www.laurasjoberg.com/BA.pdf>,)

The United States’ power-over mindset is not just evident in its direct relationship with Iraq, but also evident in the principles behind the institution of sanctions policy for security reasons. The security that is being prioritized is the security of those within the borders of the United States of America, and the quality of life that is being sacrificed is that of people outside those borders. The idea of national sovereignty as the location of the privilege of security is contrary to a feminist interpretation of international relations. While a feminist interpretation would not necessarily abolish the concept of the state, it would reject the prioritization of one state over another. The feminist interpretation would value equality above absolute security for the few, and would value understanding and cooperation over competitive power. Sanctions do not fit this model of understanding of the lack of hierarchy of people around the world. The feminist redefinition of power, as mentioned in Chapter 1, necessarily attacks the hierarchy involved in elitism, and dominant-subordinate relationships. Sanctions reinforce elitism in two ways. First, nations cannot have a sanctioner-sanctioned relationship without having a dominant-subordinate relationship. The sanctioner must be dominant, as coercion cannot be described in other terms but an attempt to assert dominance to force change. The sanctioned, even if it does not give into the demands of sanctions, is subordinated, as their quality of life and membership in the international community are damaged by the simple existence of sanctions. While the sanctioned may not give in, they are still subordinated by the destruction of sanctions, which they are powerless to do anything about. The dominant sanctioner makes the rules that the subordinate sanctioned is required to follow, or else. And the ‘or else’ is as subordinating as following the rules. Second, the dominant is fighting for control of the subordinate with the subordinate. Elites compete with non-elites for control of even the most meager things, as power- over is the sustaining breath of elitism. An ambiguity about the feminist recalculation of international relations’ relationship with sanctions is on the issue of national sovereignty. Jill Steans’ ideas about the problems of sovereignty as it relates to the prioritization of national interests, an area where we clearly can critique the sanctions policy. But this criterion is a double-edged sword, because national sovereignty is the reason that Saddam Hussein claims he has a right to stop United States’ weapons inspectors from coming into Iraq and looking for weapons. Still, there are differences between these concepts of sovereignty. The concept of sovereignty that the United States utilizes in making sanctions policy is one that prioritizes the possible violation of the sanctity of its borders over the lives of millions of people who live outside of them. The concept of sovereignty that Iraq uses is requiring that another power cannot violate its borders for reasons ultimately damaging to Iraq’s security. In other words, Saddam Hussein’s claim to sovereignty is on balance defensive, and the United States’ claim to sovereignty is on balance aggressive. Also, I think that there is space for a feminist viewpoint concerning international relations to recognize Iraq’s claim to sovereignty and not to recognize the United States’ claim to sovereignty, even if they were equivalent. Because there is a constant power inequality in international relations between the United States and Iraq, where the United States is always more powerful. This power inequality is a barrier to the sort of interactions between nations that feminist international relations envisions. Recognizing the claim of Iraq while ignoring the claim of the United States would be a transgression against the normal power structures of international relations, a transgression that would contribute to the deconstruction of those structures. Recognizing that sanctions operate with a power-over mindset of international relations causes a feminist viewpoint of international relations to critique them. Stopping sanctions from being United States policy towards the sanctioned nations will be a step towards changing the unequal power dynamic between the United States and those nations.

#### Rejecting the embargo on the basis of ethical considerations of the cuban people is critical to reorienting government decisionmkaing away from its current util framework

A. Sanctions are immoral because they directly are formed to cause harm in order to create change

B. People that had nothing to do with being punished are in the center of punishment which utilitarianism can’t account for

Kochler 94 [Dr. Hans, International Press Organization and Professor of Philosophy, “Ethical Aspects of Sanctions in International Law The Practice of the Sanctions Policy and Human Rights”, <http://i-p-o.org/sanctp.htm#I>, accessed 7/8/13]

Comprehensive economic sanctions which heavily impact the life and health of the civilian population need to be analyzed from an ethical standpoint before a normative evaluation of the current practice in international law can be undertaken. Indeed, comprehensive economic sanctions seem to be the "classical" instruments for inducing submission in the power politics of the so-called "New World Order"14 – and instruments whose permissibility must be critically examined from the standpoint of ethics as well as of international law. It does not of necessity follow that a measure praised as the panacea of power politics fulfills the requirements placed on a legitimate international order. In the first place, coercive measures like economic sanctions represent a form of collective punishment15 and thus do not comply with the ethical principle of individual responsibility, i. e. with the ability to attribute behaviour to an individual. The punishment of people not responsible for political decisions is most akin to a terrorist measure; the aim of such a measure is to influence the government's course of action by deliberately assaulting the civilian population.16 Purpose fully injuring the innocent is, however, an immoral act per se, one which cannot be justified by any construction of utilitarian ethics. In accordance with the conception of Thomas Aquinas, inquiring into the intention behind a particular decision is of decisive value for an ethical evaluation.17 In the present context, several conditions govern the moral permissibility of acts in which a morally questionable bad upshot is foreseen: (a) the intended final end must be good, (b) the intended means to it must be morally acceptable; (c) the foreseen bad upshot must not itself be willed (that is, must not be, in some sense, intended); and (d) the good end must be proportionate to the bad upshot18, (that is, must be important enough to justify the bad upshot).19 The problematic nature of this utilitarian context of evaluation is plain to view. Are those who suffer under a certain measure to be viewed sympathetically as the victims of the pursuit of a good intention, or is their suffering to be regarded as the deliberate component of a strategy? This debate seems merely to invite hypocritical casuistry. The outcome for the affected population is one and the same. A "superficial" difference may only be discerned by an ethics of attitude from the viewpoint of the perpetrator. The latter appeases his conscience with reference to the unintentional but "inevitable" side effects. In the Anglo-Saxon tradition, the so-called "Doctrine of Double Effect" was developed, following a distinction made by Thomas Aquinas.20 It was designed to help clarify ethical questions that arise when a morally good end can only be reached through inflicting harm upon other people.21 In the concrete instance of comprehensive economic sanctions in accordance with Chapter VII of the UN Charter, the moral good that is aspired is the maintenance or restoration of international peace; the wrong that is thereby effected is the suffering of the civilian population (including sickness and death as results of the mass suffering that accompanies the breakdown in the distribution of essential commodities). According to Quinn's ethical analysis, it is necessary to take into account the relation which the aspired goal has to the foreseen wrong that results from it.22 In this context, Quinn refers to the difference between "terror bombing" and "strategic" bombing in war: in the first instance, the suffering of the civilian population is deliberately intended; in the second, the possibility that the population will suffer is merely tolerated. In the first instance, harm is directly inflicted, in the second case indirectly. (In accordance with the currently valid rules of international humanitarian law, which we will later examine more closely, terror bombings are strictly prohibited, for the civilian population is never allowed to be the direct target in a military conflict.) Economic sanctions, however, are in line with the first case mentioned above: harm is directly and deliberately inflicted so as to force the government to alter its course of action.

#### Utilitarianism destroys decision-making— it justifies atrocities in a framework of “necro-economics”

A. We always look at things as what is the lesser evil while in reality all evil should be rejected

B. It makes it ok to torture and cause people to suffer for things they didn’t know because it is “necessary” to maintain the current world order

**Weizman 11** [Eyal, Prof of visual and spatial cultures @ Goldsmiths, U of London, The Least of All Possible Evils: Humanitarian Violence from Arendt to Gaza, p. 8-10, accessed 9/12/13]

The theological origins of the lesser evil argument cast a long shadow on the present. In fact the idiom has become so deeply ingrained, and is invoked in such a staggeringly diverse set of contexts – from individual situational ethics and international relations, to attempts to govern the economics of violence in the context of the ‘war on terror’ and the efforts of human rights and humanitarian activists to manoeuvre through the paradoxes of aid – that it seems to have altogether taken the place previously reserved for the ‘good’. Moreover, the very evocation of the ‘good’ seems to everywhere invoke the utopian tragedies of modernity, in which evil seemed lurking in a horrible manichaeistic inversion. If no hope is offered in the future, all that remains is to insure ourselves against the risks that it poses, to moderate and lessen the collateral effects of necessary acts, and tend to those who have suffered as a result. In relation to the ‘war on terror,’ the terms of the lesser evil were most clearly and prominently articulated by former human rights scholar and leader of Canada’s Liberal Party Michael Ignatieff. In his book *The Lesser Evil*, Ignatieff suggested that in ‘balancing liberty against security’ liberal states establish mechanisms to regulate the breach of some human rights and legal norms, and allow their security services to engage in forms of extrajudicial violence – which he saw as lesser evils – in order to fend off or minimize potential greater evils, such as terror attacks on civilians of western states.11 If governments need to violate rights in a terrorist emergency, this should be done, he thought, only as an exception and according to a process of adversarial scrutiny. ‘Exceptions’, Ignatieff states, ‘do not destroy the rule but save it, provided that they are temporary, publicly justified, and deployed as a last resort.’12 The lesser evil emerges here as a pragmatist compromise, a ‘tolerated sin’ that functions as the very justification for the notion of exception. State violence in this model takes part in a necro-economy in which various types of destructive measures are weighed in a utilitarian fashion, not only in relation to the damage they produce, but to the harm they purportedly prevent and even in relation to the more brutal measures they may help restrain. In this logic, the problem of contemporary state violence resembles indeed an all-too-human version of the mathematical minimum problem of the divine calculations previously mentioned, one tasked with determining the smallest level of violence necessary to avert the greater harm. For the architects of contemporary war this balance is trapped between two poles: keeping violence at a low enough level to limit civilian suffering, and at a level high enough to bring a decisive end to the war and bring peace.13 More recent works by legal scholars and legal advisers to states and militaries have sought to extend the inherent elasticity of the system of legal exception proposed by Ignatieff into ways of rewriting the laws of armed conflict themselves.14 Lesser evil arguments are now used to defend anything from targeted assassinations and mercy killings, house demolitions, deportation, torture,15 to the use of (sometimes) non-lethal chemical weapons, the use of human shields, and even ‘the intentional targeting of some civilians if it could save more innocent lives than they cost.’16 In one of its more macabre moments it was suggested that the atomic bombings of Hiroshima might also be tolerated under the defence of the lesser evil. Faced with a humanitarian A-bomb, one might wonder what, in fact, might come under the definition of a greater evil. Perhaps it is time for the differential accounting of the lesser evil to replace the mechanical bureaucracy of the ‘banality of evil’ as the idiom to describe the most extreme manifestations of violence. Indeed, it is through this use of the lesser evil that societies that see themselves as democratic can maintain regimes of occupation and neo-colonization. Beyond state agents, those practitioners of lesser evils, as this book claims, must also include the members of independent nongovernmental organizations that make up the ecology of contemporary war and crisis zones. The lesser evil is the argument of the humanitarian agent that seeks military permission to provide medicines and aid in places where it is in fact the duty of the occupying military power to do so, thus saving the military limited resources. The lesser evil is often the justification of the military officer who attempts to administer life (and death) in an ‘enlightened’ manner; it is sometimes, too, the brief of the security contractor who introduces new and more efficient weapons and spatio-technological means of domination, and advertises them as ‘humanitarian technology’. In these cases the logic of the lesser evil opens up a thick political field of participation belonging together otherwise opposing fields of action, to the extent that it might obscure the fundamental moral differences between these various groups. But, even according to the terms of an economy of losses and gains, the conception of the lesser evil risks becoming counterproductive: less brutal measures are also those that may be more easily naturalized, accepted and tolerated – and hence more frequently used, with the result that a greater evil may be reached cumulatively, Such observations amongst other paradoxes are unpacked in one of the most powerful challenges to ideas such as Ignatieff’s – Adi Ophir’s philosophical essay *The Order of Evils*. In this book Ophir developed an ethical system that is similarly not grounded in a search for the ‘good’ but the systemic logic of an economy of violence – the possibility of a lesser means and the risk of more damage – but insists that questions of violence are forever unpredictable and will always escape the capacity to calculate them. Inherent in Ophir’s insistence on the necessity of calculating is, he posits, the impossibility of doing so. The demand of his ethics are grounded in this impossibility.

#### Sanctions use the citizens of the target state as a means to an end—to effectuate political change—this never works and it justifies the sacrificing of whole populations to maintain or achieve order—this is the genocidal impulse

A. The theory of sanctions is flawed because when sanctions harm people it just causes the regime to hate the creator of those sanctions more and they become more authoritarian

B. We have become so desensitized through the use of sanctions we think it’s alright to kill hundreds of thousands of people to create the lesser evil

Addis 3 Adeno Addis is William Ray Forrester Professor of Public and Constitutional Law at Tulane University Law School. He received his B.A. and LL.B. (Honours) from Macquarie University (Australia), and an LL.M. and a J.S.D from Yale. He has published extensively in the areas of American constitutional law, communications law, human rights, and jurisprudence. Human Rights Quarterly 25.3 (2003) 573-623

In fact, as argued earlier, in a general sense, a major reason for the ineffectiveness of economic sanctions is a result of this conceptual confusion. In relation to the behavior modification objective, it was argued earlier that economic sanctions falsely assume that the people of the target state could pressure the regime to alter the offending policies and behavior. Many studies indicate that multilateral (or, for that matter, even unilateral) economic sanctions do not often force regimes to alter their conduct or policy. To add another voice to that general conclusion, below are comments from the Sub-Commission of the UN Commission on Human Rights: The "theory" behind economic sanctions is that economic pressure on civilians will translate into pressure on the Government for change. This "theory" is bankrupt both legally and practically, as more and more evidence testifies to the inefficacy of comprehensive economic sanctions as a coercive tool. The traditional calculation of balancing civilian suffering against the desired political effects is giving way to the realization that the efficacy of a sanctions regime is in inverse proportion to its impact on civilians. 94 This is not to say, of course, that sanctions are not economically effective—they are. They have devastating impacts on the target nation and its citizens, as the UN sanctions against Iraq and US trade embargoes against Cuba 95 [End Page 606] testify. The point here, rather, is that "the relation[ship] between economic effectiveness and political effectiveness is not at all clear; indeed, it may be an inverse relation." 96 An unaccountable regime will always externalize the cost from itself and its supporters to the ordinary citizens. And the power of the ordinary citizen to punish the regime for the consequences of the sanction is rather negligible, if not non-existent. A newspaper report on the effects of the decade old UN imposed sanctions against Iraq concluded that in Baghdad those sanctions have created two classes of people, a small group of citizens who are "close to the ruling circles" and who are still doing very well, on the one hand, and on the other hand, the overwhelming majority of Iraqi citizens "whose income has been so devalued that few . . . can afford a helping of chicken at al-Sa'ah [the equivalent of Kentucky Fried Chicken]." 97 Treating civilians in such circumstances effectively as "outlaws" is the cruelest form of indifference. Economic effectiveness does not correlate with political effectiveness. 98 Even in relation to the identity-constituting objective, many of the sanction regimes seem to be spectacularly unsuccessful. The image they project is not an international community that believes in the centrality of human rights as its very identity, but the opposite. Once again, consider Iraq. When the lives of many civilians, including many children, are put at risk or even lost as a result of sanctions, part of whose purpose is said, at least publicly, to be the protection of human rights, 99 the image (the identity) [End Page 607] of the international community becomes one that is quite willing to sacrifice the rights and lives of a considerable number of individuals from certain parts of the world to achieve certain political goals. For many individuals from developing countries and from non-western traditions, this suspicion gets strengthened when they hear statements such as the one from former US Secretary of State and Ambassador to the United Nations, Madeline Albright. Albright was asked by Lesley Stahl of "60 Minutes" whether the death of a half-million people—which reports had suggested might have taken place—was an acceptable price for sanctions and Albrght responded: "we think the price is worth it." 100 The image of the international community is, therefore, one that devalues not only non-western traditions and horizons of significance, 101 but the very lives of non-western peoples as well. 102 A public attempt to dissociate oneself from evil ends up creating an even greater evil.

#### The way we approach Cuba has an profound impact through the international sphere

A. Spills over to how we deal with other countries

B. subsumes any alt causes because we overlook past US politices to formulate better ones and not just endlessly critique how the past has failed

Chelala 11/4—MD, PhD, is a co-winner of an Overseas Press Club of America award. He is also the foreign correspondent for Middle East Times International (Australia). (Cesar, 2013, The Folly of the Embargo on Cuba, <http://thewip.net/talk/2013/11/the_folly_of_the_embargo_on_cu.html>)

At a time when relations between Iran and the West have the potential to improve, after many years of antagonism, it is worth reflecting on the fact that relations between nations can contribute either to a climate of antagonism and war, or one of cooperation and peace that extends even beyond the countries in conflict. Nowhere is this truer than in the relationship between the United States and Cuba. Irrationality reigns. The trade embargo against Cuba, the most enduring in modern history, has been strongly criticized

not only by those sympathetic to the Cuban regime but also by many leading US officials and legislators. In 2005, George P. Schultz, Secretary of State under President Ronald Reagan, called the continuing embargo “insane.” Now, by a vote 188 to 2, and for the 22nd time, the United Nations condemned the US blockade of Cuba. Former President Jimmy Carter says anti-Castro leaders in Florida have a major and exaggerated influence on the US presidential election in that battleground state. Carter, a severe critic of US policy on Cuba, estimates that most Cuban-Americans now want open borders and an end to the trade embargo. Before taking office, President Barack Obama declared that he wanted to recast long-hostile U.S.-Cuba relations. After Pope Benedict XVI’s 2012 visit to Cuba, the US Bishops called for an end to the embargo. The embargo has gained the US universal condemnation without making a dent in the Castro brothers’ policies. Paradoxically, in absolute terms, the embargo now costs the United States far more than it costs Cuba. The Cuban Policy Foundation (CPF), a US nonprofit organization dedicated to the study of the benefits of expanding trade and people-to-people contact with Cuba, estimated that up to $4.84 billion are lost annually by the US because of the restrictions on exports to Cuba. The Cuban government estimates that the embargo costs Cuba $685 million annually. Many Cubans consider the embargo a political measure that doesn’t respond to the wishes of the majority of Americans. The time is overdue to implement a diplomatic approach that would lead to the lifting of the embargo and the reestablishment of normal relations between both countries. If we can have normal relations with Vietnam, the reasoning goes, why not have them with Cuba?

#### Knowledge is controlled by neoconservatives and hacks—it allows unspeakable violence

Lamrani and Estrade 13—is professor of Spanish and Latin American Studies at the University of Paris-Sorbonne (Paris IV) and an associate professor at the University of la Réunion. Lamrani is a member of the Center for Arts and Historical Research of Indian Ocean, University of la Réunion; the Center for Interdisciplinary Research on Contemporary Iberian Worlds (CRIMIC), University of Paris-Sorbonne; and the Interdisciplinary Research Group on the Hispanic Caribbean and Latin America (GRIAHAL), University of Cergy Pontoise. He is also a member of the French Society of Hispanists (SHF) and the scientific council of the Revista Latina de Communicaci ó n Social, of the Universidad de la Laguna, Tenerife, Canary Islands. P AUL E STRADE is professor emeritus at the University of Paris VIII and a recognized expert on contemporary Hispanic Caribbean history. He is considered the most knowledgeable French scholar of the works of José Martí, the Cuban national hero, and Ramon Emeterio Betances, the principal figure in the Puerto Rican independence movement against the Spanish Empire. Estrade is the author of many works, including José Martí (1853–1895) ou des fondements de la démocratie en Amérique latine (1970), which has become a standard reference work, José Martí en su siglo y en el nuestro (2008), and Iniciación a Betances (2008). He is a member of the Interdisciplinary Research Group on the Hispanic Caribbean and Latin America (GRIAHAL), University of Cergy Pontoise. (Salim and Paul, The Economic War Against Cuba: A Historical and Legal Perspective on the U.S. Blockade” this card is the introduction,)

This book presents a little-known reality, equivocal, even consciously obscured, and in any case, underreported by the media that are charged with selecting and analyzing information. The mainstream media, multiple but unambiguous, hide a reality that Salim Lamrani is working to restore. Cuban “institutional specialists” and the “special envoys” in Havana certainly mention the existence of an “embargo” in their commentaries concerning the difficulties endured by the Cuban people. But they always mention it in the same way: as briefly and as vaguely as possible, through the turn of a phrase or even with a single word. They cannot deny, of course, the existence of the embargo, but in their analyses they treat it as though it hardly exists. Thus they see no need to recall its deplorable effects. They often fail even to name the country responsible for it. For them, the embargo is an incidental factor without importance, a mere circumstance devoid of meaning and consequence. When they deign to mention it, they turn it into an alibi or even a boon for Cuba. And, as Voltaire said, that “is exactly how history is written.” But what a strange coincidence this convergence is! Of course, one cannot contend—now less than ever—that the only cause of the present serious economic stagnation in Cuba is due to the blockade imposed by all U.S. administrations since 1960. The drastic reforms being carried out in Cuba prove the contrary. Still, some argue that the Cuban government has for decades used these unjust sanctions afflicting its people as propaganda designed to minimize its own errors and the shortcomings of its system. But if this were the case one would need to explain why the United States has not ended the sanctions. Indeed, ending the sanctions is something that a near-unanimous United Nations General Assembly asks it to do each year. In October 2010, for example, 187 states, with only two opposed (the United States and Israel) and three abstentions (Micronesia, the Marshall Islands, and Palau) once again demanded dropping the sanctions when they voted yes on the resolution titled “Necessity of ending the economic, commercial and financial embargo imposed by the United States against Cuba.” Now, either the embargo is outdated, expensive and unnecessary, in which case those responsible should renounce it immediately, or, worse, the embargo is a convenient excuse for the Cuban government to hide its faults, in which case it would also seem judicious for its instigators to drop it. Yet they persist in maintaining it—Democrats as well as Republicans, Obama as well as Bush—in the face of world opinion, against the majority opinion of their own citizens, against the vital interests of a Cuban population victimized by this state of siege. How? Why? For what reason? Salim Lamrani is not content simply to underscore the human suffering caused by an embargo that was imposed in another century (think of the boycott of Haiti) and has ravaged the island for more than fifty years. He examines, point by point, the stages of its development and its effectiveness, places it in a historical context, and considers it from the perspective of international law. He has little difficulty in pointing out its iniquities. At the same time, he does this without pomposity and without acrimony. As is his habit, he rests his arguments on primary source materials, most of which are official documents published in the United States. In so doing, the author builds upon specific facts and dates, while presenting a wide range of official opinions. His tone is measured, even sober, but he is prolific in his exposition. Is all this too serious? The business at hand hardly lends itself to humor, but we can smile here and there while reading about the follies that the strict application of the embargo entails. In the words of American judges we learn, for example, that importing dolphins from, or selling pianos to, Cuba are actions detrimental to the interests and the internal security of the United States. Ridicule never kills. But the blockade does, certainly, by banning irreplaceable medicines from being exported to Cuba. Call it what you will—blockade—or embargo—the economic sanctions leveled against Cuba are groundless. The pretexts Washington uses to justify them go up in smoke one by one. Furthermore, who can seriously pretend that Cuba has menaced or might represent a menace to the United States? We all know which country has been the aggressor throughout history and which has been aggressed, notably since 1959. We are also quite aware that the Bay of Pigs, where mercenaries tried to land in 1961, is in Cuba and not in California. We also know, or should know, that when New York’s Twin Towers were brought down, the Cuban government immediately offered help, and when Hurricane Katrina devastated New Orleans, Cuban authorities spontaneously offered their disinterested aid. All this occurred despite the tightening of the embargo. The undisputed success Cuba has achieved in the fields of education and health, culture and sports, has been achieved in spite of the embargo, the cost of which, aside from the expenses generated by the various aggressions and menaces of armed intervention, was evaluated in October 2010 by the Cuban Minister of Foreign Affairs, Bruno Rodriguez, at more than $750 billion (current value) for the past fifty years. This is money that could have paid off many public debts, beginning with those of Cuba. Despite the incongruity of this permanent state of siege and the enormity of the suffering it causes, the author does not use overly emotional language nor is he ironic nor does he resort to invective. He even shows some consideration for President Barack Obama and acknowledges the positive steps he has taken to loosen travel restrictions on Cuba. But how much more his reputation would be burnished were he to order the lifting of the embargo! The Nobel Peace Prize he received somewhat prematurely would then appear to have been justified. France, through its representative to the United Nations, regularly votes in favor of the resolution that advocates lifting the embargo. But the commitment of France ends there. Elsewhere, in Africa or Asia, France advocates for the environment and follows an aggressive policy for “the protection of civilian populations” that it applies, unfortunately, in a quite arbitrary manner. Salim Lamrani does not tell us what we should do. But his rigorous exposé would be in vain if friends of justice and the rule of law did not seize upon it. We must circulate this book, which is at once strong and relentless. We must indignantly pursue this state of siege, struggle against it, and contribute to its unconditional end

#### Even if this stance of unconditional hospitality is impossible to legislate, we should constantly attempt to make society more open to the other – ending the drive to spread American democracy is necessary to end cultures of xenophobia which demonize Latin America.

Brock Bahler, Spring-xx-2010, Duquesne University, Philosophy, Graduate Student, “Derridean Hospitality in an Age of Political Xenophobia,” http://www.academia.edu/2235169/Derridean\_Hospitality\_in\_an\_Age\_of\_Political\_Xenophobia

The Cult(ure)ivation of Fear Consequently, however, we are not a nation of people who know how to practice philoxenia, despite how much we claim to give to non-profit organizations or to foreign aid. Instead, we have opted for a culture of xenophobia instead. Fear drives the installation of security systems, fenced-in homes, and our ever-increasingly private lives. Fear is what sells our newspapers, drives our political policies, and often ultimately influences our vote. Rather than a culture of welcoming the stranger, we have witnessed a cultivation of fear. Insidious in our thinking is a belief that anything foreign is dangerous and ought to be feared. As a result, much of the inflammatory rhetoric in the public square is aimed at spreading distrust and a complete dismissal of the other rather than willingness for open dialogue. Such rhetoric can be clearly seen in the speech revolving around terrorism and American foreign policy with the Middle East, the issue of immigration and undocumented immigrants in the United States, and most recently in the 2008 presidential campaign. A common view pervades our culture, for instance, that all Muslims support terrorism, and that the Middle East is in desperate need of American democracy. Such views have led to the mistreatment of Muslim and Arab-native people in our country, and in the blacklisting and deportation of some of them. It can be observed in the way “being Arab” has become a kind of racial slur in our society. And this xenophobia is evidenced in the up-to-date tally of U.S. military deaths in Iraq and Afghanistan while there is virtually no report of the possibly 1.3 million Iraqis who have died since the American occupation in 2003 and millions of others who have fled from their homes.9 Xenophobia can be seen in the way many people have responded to the problem of undocumented workers, particularly in those who are convinced “those Mexicans”—as if every one of them is from Mexico—are going to steal our jobs and force us to all learn Spanish, and that the only proper response is to round them up and ship them home. Convinced that to be “all-American” is to be White and English-speaking, there exists a large portion of our population who are wary of the foreign tongues and faces of immigrants. This white supremacist thinking is exhibited in the comments of Pat Buchanan, for instance, who said that the diverse immigration population that is eradicating a white majority in the U.S. will bring about a “Third World America.” Such convictions have not only led to the subhuman treatment of undocumented workers but have also made it more difficult for refugees, individuals seeking asylum, and immigrants to obtain U.S. citizenship. This culture of xenophobia seems no more vivid in our imagination currently than in how it has been portrayed in the finally over 2008 presidential campaign. Numerous Republicans utilized countless fear tactics to try to deter people from voting for our new President, Barack Obama. They chanted his middle name “Hussein” in order to incite distrust and fear into Americans. They fabricated lies that Obama is a Muslim— which, again, would having a Muslim as President really be such a bad thing? In fact, Rush Limbaugh went so far as to say that Obama was not American but was an Arab (codeword for “Muslim,” which is then a codeword for “terrorist”) and came from an Arab part of Africa. His comment not only encourages the breeding of a culture of fear, but it is simply not true—Kenya (even though Obama is not “from” Kenya) is in sub-Saharan Africa, where, ironically enough, the national language is English and 90% of its population identify themselves as Christian. Obama has been said to “pal around with terrorists,” has been called a socialist, a Marxist, and a communist—as if all of these terms were synonymous and were somehow evil in themselves. He has been called unpatriotic and un-American (i.e., not White), and even the anti-Christ. This billowing racist neo-McCarthyism is expounded with the view in mind that Obama, because of his blackness, is somehow not one of us, is mysterious and strange—is the enemy—and we ought to do everything to shore up our defenses against those who may take away what we hold to be “American.” Indeed, one article which noted the many hate crimes which occurred after Obama won the election—from campaign signs vandalized to schoolchildren chanting “Assassinate Obama”—cited how there is “a large subset of white people…who feel that they are losing everything they know, that the country their forefathers built has somehow been stolen from them” because of the results of this election. One man went so far as to say, “If you had real change it would involve all the members of (Obama's) church being deported” (Washington).10 The (Im)Possibility of a Politics of Hospitality What then can be said about the state of our nation and its need for hospitality? Derrida himself made it extremely clear he did not think it possible to legislate unconditional hospitality. Nations, governments, & communities have multiple ethical obligations constantly interfering with and overriding each other. Nations are just as equally obligated to create asylums for the stranger, the orphan, and the widow as they are to protect against the threat of terrorism, for example. In other words, Derrida The American Future: www.American-Future.com writes, “Hospitality is doomed to be conditional and limited—and therefore violent” (Smith 70). But even if unconditional hospitality cannot be legislated—which is undesirable in many ways—it nonetheless is the very thought which allows us to think of the idea of alterity and is, therefore, “the condition of the political” (Borradori 129). In other words, all of our limited kinds of hospitality, no matter how fractured or discriminating they are, can only be conceptualized in light of unconditional hospitality. As Derrida states, “If we want to understand what hospitality means, we have to think of unconditional hospitality, that is, openness to whomever, to any newcomer” (Derrida, Caputo, & Kearney 304).11 Furthermore, unconditional hospitality is like a specter haunting us from the future, reminding us that we have yet to arrive at “real” democracy, that democracy is always “to come.” Unconditional hospitality, then, haunts us as a healthy reminder that, for Derrida, the “(essential) opposition between the unconditional ideal and the conditions of reality, does not issue in either complacency or despair; rather, [it] finds in this disparity a call and a challenge: to make laws more hospitable” (Smith 70). It is an ideal that should permeate our life and political practice in such a way that it breaks forth as justice through the cracks of the law. What then are some ways in which unconditional hospitality can challenge our laws and stretch our current thresholds of hospitality? A formidable response to the complex matter of the proliferate racism in America would require far more than this paper can offer, but it is safe to say that such acts and attitudes should be roundly condemned. And the notion that there exists an essential, unified “American identity” that ought to be preserved—whether that consists of being White, Christian, English speaking, pro-war, or pro-capitalist—ought to be seriously questioned.

## 2ac

### 2ac – embargo

#### The use of sanctions constitutes the other as evil and irredeemable and the US as the virtuous savior—this undermines the effectiveness of sanctions and only serves to create a self fulfilling prophecy where the target state begins to act in the way in which it has been rhetorically constructed

Addis 3 Adeno Addis is William Ray Forrester Professor of Public and Constitutional Law at Tulane University Law School. He received his B.A. and LL.B. (Honours) from Macquarie University (Australia), and an LL.M. and a J.S.D from Yale. He has published extensively in the areas of American constitutional law, communications law, human rights, and jurisprudence. Human Rights Quarterly 25.3 (2003) 573-623

This essay will dispute the assumption that behavior modification is the sole justification for which sanctions are or should be adopted. It will argue that, in fact, there is another important goal which is often pursued through sanctions (and boycotts), albeit not always explicitly or even reflectively. This shall be referred to as the Identitarian Justification, meaning that economic sanctions, just like other forms of sanctions, are also a process through which the sanctioning community (party) defines its identity through the act of dissociating itself from the target regime that it considers to be "the troublesome or the evil other." The "virtuous self" is defined through this process of dissociation. 18 Under this account, even if the sanctioning party has not vanquished or transformed the targeted "evil" through the sanctioning process it still has a valid interest in avoiding collaboration with evil and in the process defining its very identity. That interest ought to be part of the mix when one assesses the success or failure of sanctions. This essay shall contend that to the extent that critics often have not realized this and tended to judge the success or failure of sanctions through the Instrumentalist Justification alone, their analyses have been highly incomplete and very misleading.

Of course, to say that the Identitarian Justification is as important as the Instrumentalist Justification is not to suggest that economic sanctions, whether unilateral or multilateral, are always designed to, and/or always will, achieve those objectives. Indeed, as shall be demonstrated in this essay, at least in relation to multilateral sanctions, given the processes through which sanctions are currently imposed they often fail to achieve either of the objectives. The target regimes rarely change their policies and practices as a result of economic sanctions. And in the name of minimizing its participation with evil the sanctioning community creates an even greater evil and consequently presents an image of itself that is contrary to what it seeks to project. Part of the purpose of this essay is, therefore, to explore conceptual and institutional schemes that may make it more likely that the two objectives will be pursued effectively and justly.

#### The affirmative opens ourselves up to autonomous action

Harris 02—Trinity University (Jonathan, U.S. should lift embargo, respect Cuban autonomy, <http://www.dukechronicle.com/articles/2002/07/30/us-should-lift-embargo-respect-cuban-autonomy>,

Some recent letters have appeared in The Chronicle that criticize the Editorial Board's support for ending the U.S. embargo against Cuba. These letters reflect how many in the United States do not understand our own government's policies toward Cuba, nor do they understand what contemporary life is like on the island. In the June 27 issue, J. Edgar Williams wrote, "The U.S. embargo... has not affected Cuba's ability to trade with the rest of the world." To the contrary, the "Cuban Liberty and Solidarity Act," the 1996 legislation that details the specific provisions of the U.S. embargo, penalizes all nations that trade with Cuba by disallowing ships to port in the United States for six months after they have visited any Cuban port. Additionally, the act allows the United States to enact economic sanctions against countries that trade with Cuba. Both of these policies starve the small island nation of billions of dollars in potential revenue. As we speak, President George W. Bush pressures Mexican President Vicente Fox and other Latin American leaders to cut economic ties with Cuba in exchange for closer trade relations with the United States. I am disturbed by the dichotomist options that the current debate has left us with, forcing us to decide whether the United States should: a) maintain the embargo or b) lift the embargo and allow Cubans to experience the "wonders" of free market capitalism. Cuba needs neither. Contrary to the dictates of our country's power-brokers, capitalism does not work for everyone. Cubans in Cuba have chosen a socialist economy, and they should not be punished or patronized for that decision. Indeed, it is a tough lesson to learn that we in the United States do not know what is right for all the world's inhabitants. I am not an apologist for the Cuban revolutionary government. I simply ask that we learn more about how things really work before judging a people and their right to self-determination. We can begin this process by respecting Cuba as an autonomous nation and lifting the unjust embargo. What do you think?

### 2ac – framework

#### Performance is not a mode of resistance – it gives too much power to the audience because the performer is structurally blocked from controlling the (re)presentation of their representations. Appealing to the ballot is a way of turning over one’s identity to the same reproductive economy that underwrites liberalism

Peggy Phelan 96, chair of New York University's Department of Performance Studies, Unmarked: the politics of performance, 146-9
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Performance’s only life is in the present. Performance cannot be saved, recorded, documented, or otherwise participate in the circulation of representations of representations: once it does so, it becomes something other than performance. To the degree that performance attempts to enter the economy of reproduction it betrays and lessens the promise of its own ontology. Performance’s being, like the ontology of subjectivityproposed here, becomes itself through disappearance.

The pressures brought to bear on performance to succumb to thelaws of the reproductive economy are enormous. For only rarely in this culture is the “now” to which performance addresses its deepest questions valued. (This is why the now is supplemented and buttressedby the documenting camera, the video archive.) Performance occursover a time which will not be repeated. It can be performed again, butthis repetition itself marks it as “different.” The document of a performance then is only a spur to memory, an encouragement of memory to become present.

The other arts, especially painting and photography, are drawnincreasingly toward performance. The French-born artist Sophie Calle,for example, has photographed the galleries of the Isabella StewartGardner Museum in Boston. Several valuable paintings were stolen fromthe museum in 1990. Calle interviewed various visitors and membersof the muse um staff, asking them to describe the stolen paintings. She then transcribed these texts and placed them next to the photographs of the galleries. Her work suggests that the descriptions and memories of the paintings constitute their continuing “presence,” despite the absence of the paintings themselves. Calle gestures toward a notion of the interactive exchange between the art object and the viewer. While such exchanges are often recorded as the stated goals of museums and galleries, the institutional effect of the gallery often seems to put the masterpiece under house arrest, controlling all conflicting and unprofessional commentary about it. The speech act of memory and description (Austin’s constative utterance) becomes a performative expression when Calle places these commentaries within the
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representation of the museum. The descriptions fill in, and thus supplement (add to, defer, and displace) the stolen paintings. The factthat these descriptions vary considerably—even at times wildly—onlylends credence to the fact that the interaction between the art objectand the spectator is, essentially, performative—and therefore resistantto the claims of validity and accuracy endemic to the discourse of reproduction. While the art historian of painting must ask if thereproduction is accurate and clear, Calle asks where seeing and memoryforget the object itself and enter the subject’s own set of personalmeanings and associations. Further her work suggests that the forgetting(or stealing) of the object is a fundamental energy of its descriptiverecovering. The description itself does not reproduce the object, it ratherhelps us to restage and restate the effort to remember what is lost. Thedescriptions remind us how loss acquires meaning and generatesrecovery—not only of and for the object, but for the one who remembers.The disappearance of the object is fundamental to performance; itrehearses and repeats the disappearance of the subject who longs alwaysto be remembered.

For her contribution to the Dislocations show at the Museum of Modern Art in New York in 1991, Calle used the same idea but this time she asked curators, guards, and restorers to describe paintings that were on loan from the permanent collection. She also asked them to draw small pictures of their memories of the paintings. She then arranged the texts and pictures according to the exact dimensions of the circulating paintings and placed them on the wall where the actual paintings usually hang. Calle calls her piece Ghosts, and as the visitor discovers Calle’s work spread throughout the museum, it is as if Calle’s own eye is following and tracking the viewer as she makes her way through the museum.1 Moreover, Calle’s work seems to disappear because it is dispersed throughout the “permanent collection”—a collection which circulates despite its “permanence.” Calle’s artistic contribution is a kind of self-concealment in which she offers the words of others about other works of art under her own artistic signature. By making visible her attempt to offer what she does not have, what cannot be seen, Calle subverts the goal of museum display. She exposes what the museum does not have and cannot offer and uses that absence to generate her own work. By placing memories in the place of paintings, Calle asks that the ghosts of memory be seen as equivalent to “the permanent collection” of “great works.” One senses that if she asked the same people over and over about the same paintings, each time they would describe a slightly different painting. In this sense, Calle demonstrates the performative quality of all seeing.
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I Performance in a strict ontological sense is nonreproductive. It is this quality which makes performance the runt of the litter of contemporary art. Performance clogs the smooth machinery of reproductive representation necessary to the circulation of capital. Perhaps nowhere was the affinity between the ideology of capitalism and art made more manifest than in the debates about the funding policies for the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA).2 Targeting both photography and performance art, conservative politicians sought to prevent endorsing the “real” bodies implicated and made visible by these art forms. Performance implicates the real through the presence of living bodies. In performance art spectatorship there is an element of consumption: there are no left-overs, the gazing spectator must try to take everything in. Without a copy, live performance plunges into visibility—in a maniacally charged present—and disappears into memory, into the realm of invisibility and the unconscious where it eludes regulation and control. Performance resists the balanced circulations of finance. It saves nothing; it only spends. While photography is vulnerable to charges of counterfeiting and copying, performance art is vulnerable to charges of valuelessness and emptiness. Performance indicates the possibility of revaluing that emptiness; this potential revaluation gives performance art its distinctive oppositional edge.3 To attempt to write about the undocumentable event of performance is to invoke the rules of the written document and thereby alter the event itself. Just as quantum physics discovered that macro-instruments cannot measure microscopic particles without transforming those particles, so too must performance critics realize that the labor to write about performance (and thus to “preserve” it) is also a labor that fundamentally alters the event. It does no good, however, to simply refuse to write about performance because of this inescapable transformation. The challenge raised by the ontological claims of performance for writing is to re-mark again the performative possibilities of writing itself. The act of writing toward disappearance, rather than the act of writing toward preservation, must remember that the after-effect of disappearance is the experience of subjectivity itself. This is the project of Roland Barthes in both Camera Lucida and Roland Barthes by Roland Barthes. It is also his project in Empire of Signs, but in this book he takes the memory of a city in which he no longer is, a city from which he disappears, as the motivation for the search for a disappearing performative writing. The trace left by that script is the meeting-point of a mutual disappearance; shared subjectivity is possible for Barthes because two people can recognize the same Impossible. To live for a love whose goal is to share the Impossible is both a humbling project and an exceedingly ambitious one, for it seeks to find connection only in that which is no longer there. Memory. Sight. Love. It must involve a full seeing of the Other’s absence (the ambitious part), a seeing which also entails the acknowledgment of the Other’s presence (the humbling part). For to acknowledge the Other’s (always partial) presence is to acknowledge one’s own (always partial) absence. In the field of linguistics, the performative speech act shares with the ontology of performance the inability to be reproduced or repeated. “Being an individual and historical act, a performative utterance cannot be repeated. Each reproduction is a new act performed by someone who is qualified. Otherwise, the reproduction of the performative utterance by someone else necessarily transforms it into a constative utterance.”4
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Writing, an activity which relies on the reproduction of the Same(the three letters cat will repeatedly signify the four-legged furry animalwith whiskers) for the production of meaning, can broach the frame of performance but cannot mimic an art that is nonreproductive. Themimicry of speech and writing, the strange process by which we put words in each other’s mouths and others’ words in our own, relies on a substitutional economy in which equivalencies are assumed and re-established. Performance refuses this system of exchange and resists the circulatory economy fundamental to it. Performance honors the idea that a limited number of people in a specific time/space frame can have an experience of value which leaves no visible trace afterward. Writing about it necessarily cancels the “tracelessness” inaugurated within this performative promise. Performance’s independence from mass reproduction, technologically, economically, and linguistically, is its greatest strength. But buffeted by the encroaching ideologies of capitaland reproduction, it frequently devalues this strength. Writing aboutperformance often, unwittingly, encourages this weakness and falls inbehind the drive of the document/ary. Performance’s challenge to writingis to discover a way for repeated words to become performative utterances, rather than, as Benveniste warned, constative utterances.

### 2ac – psycho

#### The Role of the Ballot is to simulate the enactment of the plan—effective choices regarding Latin American foreign policy require the ability to test the real world outcomes of our scholarship and advocacies.

Baxter 10 (Jorge, Education Specialist, Department of Education and Culture in the Organization of American States, Former Coordinator of the Inter-American Program on Education for Democratic Values and Practices at the OAS, PHD in International Comparative Education and Policy from University of Maryland College Park, “Towards a Deliberative and Democratic Model of International Cooperation in Education in Latin America”, Inter-American Journal of Education for Democracy, 3(2), 224-254, <https://scholarworks.iu.edu/journals/index.php/ried/article/viewFile/1016/1307>, Accessed: 7/30/13)OG

In the context of international¶ education cooperation and international¶ development in Latin America, where¶ there are great asymmetries in power and¶ resources, it seems that this critique could¶ have some validity. However, rather than¶ concluding that deliberation and participation¶ should be reduced, one could conclude (as¶ is argued in this paper) that they should¶ be enhanced and expanded. Those that¶ advocate for a “thicker” democratization in¶ the region would likely advocate for a more¶ substantive approach to deliberation in policy¶ which establishes certain parameters such¶ as “education is an intrinsic human right,”¶ and which would place an emphasis on¶ achieving quality education outcomes¶ for all as the goal. This does not mean that¶ they would not advocate for deliberation but¶ rather would set parameters for deliberation¶ in order to ensure that the outcomes do not¶ lead to “unjust” policy (e.g., a policy that¶ might promote more inequity in education).¶ Those that advocate for a “thinner” approach¶ to democratization would tend to advocate¶ for a procedural approach to deliberation in¶ education policy and would most likely place¶ emphasis on equal opportunity of access¶ to quality education.¶ Instability critique: Education in Latin¶ America suffers from too much instability and¶ is too politicized. Increasing participation and¶ deliberation would only further politicize the¶ situation and polarize those who advocate for¶ educational reform and those who block it.¶ The average term of a minister of education¶ is one-and-a-half years; each time a new¶ minister comes to office, new policies are¶ passed which, according to deliberative¶ democratic theory, would need to be reasoned¶ and debated with citizens. Deliberation in this¶ context would promote even more instability¶ and would lead to further politicization of¶ education reform.¶ Response: Political instability and¶ lack of continuity in policy reform are serious¶ limitations that to some degree are inherent¶ in democratic institutions and processes. The¶ reality is that if any education reform is to¶ succeed in the long term, it needs more than¶ the efforts of governments or international¶ organizations. It needs the sustained support¶ of stakeholders across sectors (public,¶ private, and civil society) and over time. It¶ has been argued that the main problem in¶ basic education in Latin America is the lack¶ of a broad social consensus, recognizing¶ that there is a problem of equity and quality¶ in the provision of education (Schiefelbein,¶ 1997). This lack of broad social consensus¶ is especially challenging where there is, as¶ noted in the critique, a lack of continuity¶ in education reform. Reform in education¶ takes time, sometimes decades. Ensuring¶ continuity in education reform policies is¶ therefore crucial, and this requires public¶ consensus. Deliberative forums convening¶ government, private sector, and civil society¶ groups can contribute to developing this public¶ consensus and to providing more continuity¶ in policy. Deliberative forums combined¶ with collaborative projects can help promote¶ learning, distribute institutional memory,¶ support capacity-building efforts, and bring¶ more resources to bear on the education¶ reform process. Creating a space for citizens¶ to deliberate on the role of education is¶ fundamental for promoting broad social¶ consensus around education reforms. In Latin¶ America, the most innovative and successful¶ reforms have all created multiple and¶ continuous opportunities for diverse groups¶ across the education sector and society to¶ provide input and to have opportunities for¶ meaningful collaborative action. International¶ organizations, leveraging their regional and¶ international position, can contribute by¶ promoting policy dialogue and collaborative¶ actions among ministries and also with key¶ stakeholders across sectors. The challenge¶ is to develop a better understanding of how¶ deliberation can be used to promote more¶ collaborative as opposed to more adversarial¶ and partisan forms of politics. This is perhaps¶ one area which deliberative theorists need to¶ explore more.¶ 5. Power critique: The final critique relates¶ the possibility that increasing deliberation¶ and participation can lead to increased¶ inequality. Fung and Wright (2003) note¶ that deliberation can turn into domination¶ in a context where “participants in these¶ processes usually face each other from¶ unequal positions of power.” Every reform¶ in education creates winners and losers, and¶ very few create “win-win” situations. Those¶ in power would have to submit to the rules of¶ deliberation and relinquish “control” over the¶ various dimensions of democratic decisionmaking.¶ This is naïve and not politically¶ feasible.¶ Response: This is a valid critique¶ worth considering. Structural inequalities¶ and asymmetries of power in governments¶ and international institutions in Latin America¶ have facilitated domination by elites in terms¶ of authority, power, and control in politics.¶ Asymmetries of power in international¶ cooperation in education are also clear,¶ especially when powerful financial (World¶ Bank, IDB, IMF) or political (OAS, UNESCO)¶ organizations engage with local stakeholders¶ and condition policy options with funding¶ or political support. What this paper has¶ argued is relevant again here: that instead of¶ rejecting further democratization in the face¶ of these challenges, including the challenge¶ of elite “domination,” what is needed is more¶ and better democracy, defined in terms of its¶ breadth, depth, range, and control. Finally,¶ dealing with elite domination in international¶ deliberative forums will require conscious and¶ skilled facilitation on the part of international¶ organizations, which themselves are often¶ elitist and hegemonic.¶ Final Thoughts: So What?¶ Perhaps the most critical question¶ that emerges in the argument for increased¶ democratization and deliberation is simply:¶ So what? Does increased democratization and¶ deliberation actually lead to better outcomes¶ in education? More empirical research on this¶ critical question is needed. However, experiments¶ in deliberative democracy in education reform¶ in Brazil through the UNESCO and Ministry of¶ Education Coordinated Action Plan and Porto¶ Alegre‘s Citizen School, and also to some degree¶ at the international level with the OAS pilot¶ experiment in developing a more democratic¶ model of international cooperation from 2001-¶ 2005, have shown that deliberative processes¶ can enhance learning on the part of those¶ participating. Fung and Wright (2003) refer to¶ these experiments in deliberation as “schools¶ of democracy” because participants exercise¶ their capacities of argument, planning, and¶ evaluation. Deliberation promotes joint reflection¶ and consideration of others’ views. Citizens¶ who participate in deliberative forums develop¶ competencies that are important not only for¶ active citizenship (listening, communication,¶ problem-solving, conflict resolution, selfregulation skills) but also crucial for managing¶ change and school reform. Many of the same¶ skills that are developed through citizen¶ deliberation and participation are also essential¶ for transforming school cultures, promoting¶ “learning organizations” (Senge, 2000), fostering¶ communities of reflective practitioners (Schon,¶ 1991) and developing communities of practice¶ (Wenger, 2001). There is evidence from some¶ research that democratic interactions can create¶ knowledge that is more rigorous, precise, and¶ relevant than that produced in authoritarian¶ environments (Jaramillo, 2005). Another¶ important aspect of enhancing deliberative¶ democracy and democratization is that it moves¶ from a focus on individuals and their own¶ preferences towards more collective forms of¶ learning and collaboration.¶ Up to now, international organizations¶ have endorsed a “thin” version of democratization¶ that is content with formal and centralized¶ mechanisms of “representation” and “policy¶ dialogue.” If a new, more deliberative and¶ democratic model of cooperation in education in¶ the region were to emerge, what would it look¶ like?¶ First of all, a more deliberative and¶ democratic model of international cooperation in¶ education would involve more direct and deeper¶ forms of participation from everyday citizens,¶ including teachers, school directors, families,¶ school communities, students, and mesolevel¶ actors such as civil society organizations.¶ This participation would move beyond simple¶ consultation to more authentic forms of joint¶ decision-making and deliberation. The model¶ would involve more accountability on the¶ part of international organizations in terms¶ of transparency, and would require injecting¶ ethical reasoning into policies and programming.¶ In addition, a new more democratic model of¶ international cooperation would expand the¶ range of policy options available to countries¶ through devolution of authority, power, and¶ control, combined with oversight and horizontal¶ accountability mechanisms. A more democratic¶ model of international cooperation would stress¶ valuing, systematizing, and disseminating¶ local knowledge and innovation. Finally,¶ democratization and deliberation in international¶ cooperation in education would lead to enhanced¶ learning and agency on the part of participating¶ countries, groups, and individuals, and thus¶ contribute to better outcomes in terms of quality¶ and equity in education at national and local¶ levels.

#### These sanctions aren’t neutral but uniquely upheld by securitization

Sjoberg 2k—Associate Professor of Political Science and affiliate faculty in Women's Studies at the University of Florida. She has previously taught and researched at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University, Duke University, Boston College, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Brandeis University, and Merrimack College. She holds a Ph.D. in International Relations and Gender Studies from the University of Southern California, and a law degree from Boston College. Chair of the International Studies Association Committee on the Status of Women (Laura, TOWARDS A FEMINIST THEORY OF SANCTIONS, <http://www.laurasjoberg.com/BA.pdf>,)

The United States’ policy determination to keep sanctions in its arsenal of policy choices brings up the question: why? How does the government that imposes most of the world’s sanctions justify the policy? Aside from the justification, why do they implement sanctions? The question of how sanctions are justified can be best answered by looking for statements of sanctions’ proponents in government. The United States justifies and campaigns for sanctions based on the security threats to the United States and its allies, governments’ disregard for international standards, and governments’ human rights records. Most of the rhetoric concerning economic sanctions coming from the United States government emphasizes the potential security threat of the sanctioned nations. Fidel Castro is willing to house ‘our’ enemies a short distance from ‘our shore.’ The Democratic People’s Republic of Korea has missiles that will reach Japan, and (gasp) might get ‘The Bomb.’ The threat coming from the nations that are sanctioned is categorized in two different ways. The threats come stem a combination of the dictator and the weapons capacity of these nations. Donna Kaplowitz documents that one of the primary reasons for United States sanctions on Cuba is to encourage the overthrow of Fidel Castro.32 The Air Force’s counterproliferation experts speculate, “Iraq will likely be a potential threat as long as it is governed by Saddam Hussein.”33 The specific threat coming from these sanctioned nations is interpreted in the form of weapons of mass destruction. A writer for the Washington Times jumps on the government bandwagon and asserts, “Iran and Iraq may join North Korea in presenting a ballistic missile threat to the mainland United States within the next ten years.”34A ballistic missile threat is, presumably, bad and dangerous. Never mind that the United States ‘presents a ballistic missile threat’ to every citizen of every nation of the world, if ‘ballistic missile threat’ means the capability to hit the -Continental Ballistic Missile. Still, the security threat posed to the United States is one of the major arguments used to support the use of sanctions. In the words of the State Department, discussing sanctions on ‘rogue nations,’ “we are committed to containing the threat that the regime poses.”35 More often than they use the rhetoric of security threat to the United States to support sanctions, United States policymakers frame nations under U. S. sanctions as security threats to their regions. Referencing the Gulf War and the Iran-Iraq war, Thomas Pickering depicts Iraq as a state of international threats and violence. He argues, “Saddam has repeatedly used force against his neighbors, developed weapons of mass destruction and used those weapons on citizens and neighbors.”36Syria is under sanctions as a security threat for its potential aggression against Israel.37 The Democratic People’s Republic of Korea is a potential threat to Japan. Iraq is described as a regional security threat in many different scenarios. Anthony Cordesman lists many potential regional war scenarios that could result from an unrestrained Iraq. They include a “confrontation with Israel”38, a “strike at Jordan”, and “clashes with Turkey or Iran38 over Iraqi efforts to attack the Kurds.”39These wouldn’t be small confrontations, the United States’ government argues. Instead, they have the potential to be explosive conflicts. Cordesman speculates that Iraq will engage in activities to upgrade its weapons capabilities in order to threaten its neighbors. He foresees Iraq’s “creation of biological strike capability, purchase nuclear weapon(s) to intimidate region.”40The United States does not just argue that sanctions are necessary to protect the region from Iraq, but that sanctions are necessary to protect the region from Iraq because the region being safe is in United States’ interests. Pickering argues that the United States must guard against Iraq’s serious “potential to destabilize regions of great importance to U. S. interests.”41Thus, sanctions protect both regional stability and United States’ interest, according to their proponents and institutors. In addition to the concern about normative military threats, the United States uses sanctions because of a problem with threats coming from state-sponsored international terrorism. The United States has sanctions on Libya because of Libya’s refusal to extradite the alleged Lockerbie bombers. The United States maintains a list of nations that it believes engage in state sponsored terrorism. Among those nations are five nations that are major targets of United States sanctions, Iran, Syria, The Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Cuba, and Iraq. The Counterterrorism Branch of the State Department claims that, in the 1990s, “Iraq continued to engage in state-sponsored internal and international terrorism.”42Cordesman fears that Iraq will engage in the sort of international terrorism it did immediately preceding the Gulf War, that is, nation-nabbing for ransom. He predicts that lifting of sanctions on Iraq might cause a “sudden invasion of Kuwait: Attempt to create ‘hostage state/people.’”43In addition to the use of normative military force for the purposes of terrorism, Cordesman fears that Iraq could resort to “use of chemical or biological terrorism.”44

#### Such a logic requires an endless recreation of existential threats

Ružić 13—researcher and author for the Central and Eastern European Online Library (Maja, Securitization Outside the Liberal Political Context: Did Cuba Matter in the Cuban Missile Crisis?, <http://www.sintezis.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/Securitization-Outside-the-Liberal-Context.pdf>,)

After 1990s the international relations scholarship, once dominated by the traditional notion of power politics, became open to and inﬂuenced by the emerging constructivist line of thought. The critiques of traditionalist theories emphasize that the changes that came forth with the end of the Cold War politics had an unprecedented effect on the nature of international relations. The state and military perspective of international relations was no longer dominant, and such a change had to be followed by the re-conceptualization of old concepts and the development of new ones that would reﬂect the new state of affairs. The same constructivist line of thought also made an impact on the security studies scholarship. The new security theories, which make an essential part of what is now known as the critical branch of security studies, challenge the very meaning of the concept of security. According to the challengers, the traditional meaning of the concept of security as the defence of the state from external military threats had to be re-conceptualized in order to embrace security dynamics in the new post-Cold War environment.1 The concept of security had to be diverged from what Berry Buzan and Richard Little had marked as the “Westphalian straitjacket”. The “Westphalian straitjacket” refers to the core concept of traditional security studies that views the state as the only referent object of security.2 Drawn by such incentives, while deﬁ ning the concept of security, critically orientated scholars emphasize above all the non-state and non-military aspects of the potential threat. The most signiﬁcant contribution to the constructivist and critical side of the security studies has been made through the work of scholars within the Copenhagen Conﬂ ict and Peace Research Institute (COPRI), later known as the Copenhagen School. Drawing from the European security agenda from the mid- 1980s and onwards, the Copenhagen scholars introduced the concept of security sectors with the purpose of redeﬁning not only the nature of potential threats but also the nature of the threatened objects. The concept of security sectors outlines that security deals with threats coming not just from military but also from sectors such as economy, environment, politics and society. In addition, the legitimate threatened object for security is not just state, but also society, collective identity, culture, economic integration, popular migration, survival of the species and the survival of the human civilization.3 Therefore, Jef Huysmans is right in pointing out that the Copenhagen’s concept of security sectors can be “universally applied to classify a possible diversity of security problems”.4 Apart from the concept of security sectors, the Copenhagen scholars have also contributed to the scholarship with the development of the securitization theory. The main purpose of the securitization theory is to offer an analytical tool for analysing the emergence of security processes in security sectors. In the centre of the theory is the re-conceptualized concept of security, which deﬁ nes security as a self-referential, intersubjective and socially constructed practice. In other words, securitization theory moves security from being a fact of perception to the fact of utterance. By calling something a security issue, it necessarily becomes one o.5 Deﬁ ned in such a way and placed within the Copenhagen’s theory of securitization, the concept of security is presented as an act of utterance that takes an issue beyond the realm of normal politics, by presenting it as an existential threat to the referent object, and upholds the support of audience for the extraordinary measures that are to eliminate this existential threat.6 Consequently, an analysis of security with the Copenhagen’s securitization framework becomes an examination of the process through which an issue moves from the realm of normal politics, where it could be dealt with communal governance, to the realm of securitization where it is presented as an existential threat that requires the implementation of emergency measures.

**No empirical basis for applying psychoanalysis to state action**

**Epstein 10**, senior lecturer in government and IR – University of Sydney

(Charlotte, “Who speaks? Discourse, the subject and the study of identity in international politics,” European Journal of International Relations XX(X) 1–24)

¶ One key advantage of the Wendtian move, granted even by his critics (see Flockhart, 2006), is that it simply does away with the level-of-analysis problem altogether. If states really are persons, then we can apply everything we know about people to understand how they behave. The study of individual identity is not only theoretically justified but it is warranted. This cohesive self borrowed from **social psychology** is what allows Wendt to bridge the different levels of analysis and travel between the self of the individual and that of the state, by way of a third term, ‘group self’, which is simply an aggregate of individual selves. Thus for Wendt (1999: 225) ‘the state is simply a “group Self” capable of group level cognition’. Yet that the individual possesses a self does not logically entail that the state possesses one too. It is in this leap, from the individual to the state, that IR’s fallacy of composition surfaces most clearly.¶ Moving beyond Wendt but maintaining the psychological self as the basis for theorizing the state¶ Wendt’s bold ontological claim is far from having attracted unanimous support (see nota­bly, Flockhart, 2006; Jackson, 2004; Neumann, 2004; Schiff, 2008; Wight, 2004). One line of critique of the states-as-persons thesis has taken shape around the resort to psy­chological theories, specifically, around the respective merits of Identity Theory (Wendt) and SIT (Flockhart, 2006; Greenhill, 2008; Mercer, 2005) for understanding state behav­iour.9 Importantly for my argument, that the state has a self, and that this self is pre-social, remains unquestioned in this further entrenching of the psychological turn. Instead questions have revolved around how this pre-social self (Wendt’s ‘Ego’) behaves once it encounters the other (Alter): whether, at that point (and not before), it takes on roles prescribed by pre-existing cultures (whether Hobbessian, Lockean or Kantian) or whether instead other, less culturally specific, dynamics rooted in more universally human char­acteristics better explain state interactions. SIT in particular emphasizes the individual’s basic need to belong, and it highlights the dynamics of in-/out-group categorizations as a key determinant of behaviour (Billig, 2004). SIT seems to have attracted increasing interest from IR scholars, interestingly, for both critiquing (Greenhill, 2008; Mercer, 1995) and rescuing constructivism (Flockhart, 2006).¶ For Trine Flockart (2006: 89–91), SIT can provide constructivism with a different basis for developing a theory of agency that steers clear of the states-as-persons thesis while filling an important gap in the socialization literature, which has tended to focus on norms rather than the actors adopting them. She shows that a state’s adherence to a new norm is best understood as the act of joining a group that shares a set of norms and val­ues, for example the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). What SIT draws out are the benefits that accrue to the actor from belonging to a group, namely increased self-esteem and a clear cognitive map for categorizing other states as ‘in-’ or ‘out-group’ members and, from there, for orientating states’ self–other relationships.¶ Whilst coming at it from a stance explicitly critical of constructivism, for Jonathan Mercer (2005: 1995) the use of psychology remains key to correcting the systematic evacuation of the role of emotion and other ‘non-rational’ phenomena in rational choice and behaviourist analyses, which has significantly impaired the understanding of inter­national politics. SIT serves to draw out the emotional component of some of the key drivers of international politics, such as trust, reputation and even choice (Mercer, 2005: 90–95; see also Mercer, 1995). Brian Greenhill (2008) for his part uses SIT amongst a broader array of psychological theories to analyse the phenomenon of self–other recog­nition and, from there, to take issue with the late Wendtian assumption that mutual recognition can provide an adequate basis for the formation of a collective identity amongst states.¶ The main problem with this psychological turn is the very utilitarian, almost mecha­nistic, approach to non-rational phenomena it proposes, which tends to evacuate the role of meaning. In other words, it further shores up the pre-social dimension of the concept of self that is at issue here. Indeed norms (Flockhart, 2006), emotions (Mercer, 2005) and recognition (Greenhill, 2008) are hardly appraised as symbolic phenomena. In fact, in the dynamics of in- versus out-group categorization emphasized by SIT, language counts for very little. Significantly, in the design of the original experiments upon which this approach was founded (Tajfel, 1978), whether two group members communicate at all, let alone share the same language, is non-pertinent. It is enough that two individuals should know (say because they have been told so in their respec­tive languages for the purposes of the experiment) that they belong to the same group for them to favour one another over a third individual. The primary determinant of individual behaviour thus emphasized is a pre-verbal, primordial desire to belong, which seems closer to pack animal behaviour than to anything distinctly human. What the group stands for, what specific set of meanings and values binds it together, is unimportant. What matters primarily is that the group is valued positively, since posi­tive valuation is what returns accrued self-esteem to the individual. In IR Jonathan Mercer’s (2005) account of the relationship between identity, emotion and behaviour reads more like a series of buttons mechanically pushed in a sequence of the sort: posi­tive identification produces emotion (such as trust), which in turn generates specific patterns of in-/out-group discrimination.¶ Similarly, Trine Flockhart (2006: 96) approaches the socializee’s ‘desire to belong’ in terms of the psychological (and ultimately social) benefits and the feel-good factor that accrues from increased self-esteem. At the far opposite of Lacan, the concept of desire here is reduced to a Benthamite type of pleasure- or utility-maximization where mean­ing is nowhere to be seen. More telling still is the need to downplay the role of the Other in justifying her initial resort to SIT. For Flockhart (2006: 94), in a post-Cold War con­text, ‘identities cannot be constructed purely in relation to the “Other”’. Perhaps so; but not if what ‘the other’ refers to is the generic, dynamic scheme undergirding the very concept of identity. At issue here is the confusion between the reference to a specific other, for which Lacan coined the concept of *le petit autre*, and the reference to *l’Autre*, or Other, which is that symbolic instance that is essential to the making of *all* selves. As such it is not clear what meaning Flockhart’s (2006: 94) capitalization of the ‘Other’ actually holds.¶ The individual self as a proxy for the state’s self¶ Another way in which the concept of self has been centrally involved in circumventing the level-of-analysis problem in IR has been to treat the self of the individual as a proxy for the self of the state. The literature on norms in particular has highlighted the role of individuals in orchestrating norm shifts, in both the positions of socializer (norm entre­preneurs) and socializee. It has shown for example how some state leaders are more sus­ceptible than others to concerns about reputation and legitimacy and thus more amenable to being convinced of the need to adopt a new norm, of human rights or democratization, for example (Finnemore and Sikkink, 1998; Keck and Sikkink, 1998; Risse, 2001). It is these specific psychological qualities pertaining to their selves (for example, those of Gorbachev; Risse, 2001) that ultimately enable the norm shift to occur. Once again the individual self ultimately remains the basis for explaining the change in state behaviour.¶ To summarize the points made so far, whether the state is literally considered as a person by ontological overreach, whether so only by analogy, or whether the person stands as a proxy for the state, the ‘self’ of that person has been consistently taken as the reference point for studying state identities. Both in Wendt’s states-as-persons thesis, and in the broader psychological turn within constructivism and beyond, the debate has con­sistently revolved around the need to evaluate which of the essentialist assumptions about human nature are the most useful for explaining state behaviour. **It has never ques­tioned the validity of starting from these assumptions in the first place.** That is, what is left unexamined is this assumption is that what works for individuals will work for states too. This is IR’s central fallacy of composition, by which it has persistently eschewed rather than resolved the level-of-analysis problem. Indeed, in the absence of a clear dem­onstration of a logical identity (of the type A=A) between states and individuals, the assumption that individual interactions will explain what states do rests on **little more than a leap of faith**, or indeed an analogy.

#### No self-fulfilling prophecy – they’ve got it backwards – failure to plan for catastrophes causes them

**Macy 95, General Systems Scholar and deep ecologist, (Joanna, Ecopsychology)**

There is also the superstition that negative thoughts are self-fulfilling. This is of a piece with the notion, popular in New Age circles, that we create our own reality I have had people tell me that “to speak of catastrophe will just make it more likely to happen.” Actually, the contrary is nearer to the truth. Psychoanalytic theory and personal experience show us that it is precisely what we repress that eludes our conscious control and tends to erupt into behavior. As Carl Jung observed, “When an inner situation is not made conscious, it happens outside as fate.” But ironically, in our current situation, the person who gives warning of a likely ecological holocaust is often made to feel guilty of contributing to that very fate.

#### No impact – threat construction isn’t sufficient to cause wars

**Kaufman 09**, Prof Poli Sci and IR – U Delaware,

(Stuart J, “Narratives and Symbols in Violent Mobilization: The Palestinian-Israeli Case,” *Security Studies* 18:3, 400 – 434)

Even when hostile narratives, group fears, and opportunity are strongly present, war occurs **only if these factors are harnessed.** Ethnic narratives and fears must combine to create significant ethnic hostility among mass publics. Politicians must also seize the opportunity to manipulate that hostility, evoking hostile narratives and symbols to gain or hold power by riding a wave of chauvinist mobilization. Such mobilization is often spurred by prominent events (for example, episodes of violence) that increase feelings of hostility and make chauvinist appeals seem timely. If the other group also mobilizes and if each side's felt security needs threaten the security of the other side, the result is a security dilemma spiral of rising fear, hostility, and mutual threat that results in violence. **A virtue of** this **symbolist theory is that symbolist logic explains why** ethnic **peace is more common than ethnonationalist war.** Even if hostile narratives, fears, and opportunity exist, severe violence usually can still be avoided if ethnic elites skillfully define group needs in moderate ways and collaborate across group lines to prevent violence: this is consociationalism.17 War is likely only if hostile narratives, fears, and opportunity spur hostile attitudes, chauvinist mobilization, and a security dilemma.

#### **Lacanian theory places itself in a double bind - either it "loses its universalist status" or it links back into what it critiques**

Robinson ‘4 - Professor of Politics at Nottingham University [Andrew, "The Political Theory of Constitutive Lack: A Critique," <http://andyrobinsontheoryblog.blogspot.com>]

The idea of "constitutive lack" is supposed to entail a rejection of neutral and universal standpoints, and it is this rejection which constructs it as an "anti-essentialist" position. In practice, however. Lacanians restore the idea of a universal framework through the backdoor; the universality of a statement such as that "there is no neutral universality" is constructed so as to privilege whichever side in a conflict accepts the statement more completely. "Acceptance" or "awareness" of the fundamental ontological level becomes the very neutral standpoint of objectivity it claims to obliterate, reasserting essentialism in the very act of denying it. Take, for instance, Zizek's claim that 'a true Leninist is not afraid... to assume all the consequences, unpleasant as they may be, of realizing his political project... [A] Leninist, like a conservative, is authentic [because]... fully aware of what it means to take power and to exert it' (2001b, 4). Can one find a clearer example of a claim to a status of authenticity due to a position of ontological privilege, in this case a privilege conferred by "awareness" of the underlying lack? It should be added that this is by no means the only reference to "authenticity" in Zizek's work. The Act, his primary ethical concept, is constructed around a reference to authenticity, defined in exclusion of the various instances of 'false' acts and 'shirking of the Act'. Beneath the idea that "there is no neutral universality" lurks a claim to know precisely SUCh a "neutral Universality" and to claim a privileged position on this basis. A consistent belief in contingency and "anti-essentialism" entails scepticism about the idea of constitutive lack. After all, how does one know that the appearance that 'experience' shows lack to be constitutive reflects an underlying universality, as opposed to the contingent or even simulated effects of a particular discourse or episteme? Alongside its opponents, shouldn't Lacanian theory also be haunted by its Own fallibility and incompletion? There is a paradox in the idea of radical choice, for it is unclear whether Lacanians believe this should be applied reflexively. Is the choice of Lacanian theory itself an ungrounded Decision? If so, the theory loses the universalist status it implicitly claims. If not, it would seem to be the kind of structural theory it attacks. A complete structural theory would seem to assume an extra-contingent standpoint, even if the structure includes a reference to constitutive lack. Such a theory would seem to be a radical negation of the incompletion of "I don't know".

#### Psychoanalytic critique causes passivity and destroys political struggle

Paul Gordon, psychotherapist living and working in London, Race & Class, 2001, v. 42, n. 4, p. 30-1

The postmodernists' problem is that they cannot live with disappointment. All the tragedies of the political project of emancipation -- the evils of Stalinism in particular -- are seen as the inevitable product of men and women trying to create a better society. But, rather than engage in a critical assessment of how, for instance, radical political movements go wrong, they discard the emancipatory project and impulse itself. The postmodernists, as Sivanandan puts it, blame modernity for having failed them: `the intellectuals and academics have fled into discourse and deconstruction and representation -- as though to interpret the world is more important than to change it, as though changing the interpretation is all we could do in a changing world'.58 To justify their flight from a politics holding out the prospect of radical change through self-activity, the disappointed intellectuals find abundant intellectual alibis for themselves in the very work they champion, including, in Cohen's case, psychoanalysis. What Marshall Berman says of Foucault seems true also of psychoanalysis; that it offers `a world-historical alibi' for the passivity and helplessness felt by many in the 1970s, and that it has nothing but contempt for those naive enough to imagine that it might be possible for modern human- kind to be free. At every turn for such theorists, as Berman argues, whether in sexuality, politics, even our imagination, we are nothing but prisoners: there is no freedom in Foucault's world, because his language forms a seamless web, a cage far more airtight than anything Weber ever dreamed of, into which no life can break . . . There is no point in trying to resist the oppressions and injustices of modern life, since even our dreams of freedom only add more links to our chains; however, once we grasp the futility of it all, at least we can relax.59 Cohen's political defeatism and his conviction in the explanatory power of his new faith of psychoanalysis lead him to be contemptuous and dismissive of any attempt at political solidarity or collective action. For him, `communities' are always `imagined', which, in his view, means based on fantasy, while different forms of working-class organisation, from the craft fraternity to the revolutionary group, are dismissed as `fantasies of self-sufficient combination'.60 In this scenario, the idea that people might come together, think together, analyse together and act together as rational beings is impossible. The idea of a genuine community of equals becomes a pure fantasy, a `symbolic retrieval' of something that never existed in the first place: `Community is a magical device for conjuring something apparently solidary out of the thin air of modern times, a mechanism of re-enchantment.' As for history, it is always false, since `We are always dealing with invented traditions.'61 Now, this is not only nonsense, but dangerous nonsense at that. Is history `always false'? Did the Judeocide happen or did it not? And did not some people even try to resist it? Did slavery exist or did it not, and did not people resist that too and, ultimately, bring it to an end? And are communities always `imagined'? Or, as Sivanandan states, are they beaten out on the smithy of a people's collective struggle? Furthermore, all attempts to legislate against ideology are bound to fail because they have to adopt `technologies of surveillance and control identical to those used by the state'. Note here the Foucauldian language to set up the notion that all `surveillance' is bad. But is it? No society can function without surveillance of some kind. The point, surely, is that there should be a public conversation about such moves and that those responsible for implementing them be at all times accountable. To equate, as Cohen does, a council poster about `Stamping out racism' with Orwell's horrendous prophecy in 1984 of a boot stamping on a human face is ludicrous and insulting. (Orwell's image was intensely personal and destructive; the other is about the need to challenge not individuals, but a collective evil.) Cohen reveals himself to be deeply ambivalent about punitive action against racists, as though punishment or other firm action against them (or anyone else transgressing agreed social or legal norms) precluded `understanding' or even help through psychotherapy. It is indeed a strange kind of `anti-racism' that portrays active racists as the `victims', those who are in need of `help'. But this is where Cohen's argument ends up. In their move from politics to the academy and the world of `discourse', the postmodernists may have simply exchanged one grand narrative, historical materialism, for another, psychoanalysis.62 For psychoanalysis is a grand narrative, par excellence. It is a theory that seeks to account for the world and which recognises few limits on its explanatory potential. And the claimed radicalism of psychoanalysis, in the hands of the postmodernists at least, is not a radicalism at all but a prescription for a politics of quietism, fatalism and defeat. Those wanting to change the world, not just to interpret it, need to look elsewhere.

### 2ac – black hole

#### The alt’s all-or-nothing choice fails – small reforms like the plan are key to institutional change and getting others to sign on to the alt

Erik Olin Wright 07, Vilas Distinguished Professor of Sociology at the University of Wisconsin, “Guidelines for Envisioning Real Utopias”, Soundings, April, www.ssc.wisc.edu/~wright/Published%20writing/Guidelines-soundings.pdf

5. Waystations¶ The final guideline for discussions of envisioning real utopias concerns the importance of waystations. The central problem of envisioning real utopias concerns the **viability of institutional alternatives** that embody emancipatory values, but the practical achievability of such institutional designs often **depends upon the existence of smaller steps**, intermediate institutional innovations **that move us in the right direction but only partially embody these values.** Institutional proposals which have an **all-or-nothing quality** to them are both **less likely to be adopted in the first place, and may pose more difficult transition-cost problems** if implemented. The catastrophic experience of Russia in the “shock therapy” approach to market reform is historical testimony to this problem.¶ Waystations are a difficult theoretical and practical problem because there are many instances in which partial reforms may have very different consequences than full- bodied changes. Consider the example of unconditional basic income. Suppose that a very limited, below-subsistence basic income was instituted: not enough to survive on, but a grant of income unconditionally given to everyone. One possibility is that this kind of basic income would act mainly as a subsidy to employers who pay very low wages, since now they could attract more workers even if they offered below poverty level¶ earnings. There may be good reasons to institute such wage subsidies, but they would not generate the positive effects of a UBI, and therefore might not function as a stepping stone.¶ What we ideally want, therefore, are **intermediate reforms** that have two main properties: first, they concretely **demonstrate the virtues of the fuller program of transformation, so they contribute to the ideological battle of convincing people that the alternative is credible and desirable;** and second, they **enhance the capacity for action of people**, increasing their ability to push further in the future. Waystations that increase popular participation and **bring people together in problem-solving deliberations** for collective purposes are particularly salient in this regard. This is what in the 1970s was called “nonreformist reforms”: reforms that are **possible within existing institutions** and that **pragmatically solve real problems** while at the same time **empowering people in ways which** **enlarge their scope of action in the future.**

## 1ar

### 1ar – black hole

#### The only way to transcend the state is to strengthen its positive elements in the short term against a conservative rollback

**Chomsky, 1997**  (Noam, Canadian Dimension, 5/14, Factiva)

By visions, I mean the conception of a future society that animates what we actually do, a society in which a decent human being might want to live. By goals, I mean the choices and tasks that are within reach, that we will pursue one way or another guided by a vision that may be distant and hazy.  On all such matters, our knowledge and understanding are shallow; as in virtually every area of human life, we proceed on the basis of intuition and experience, hopes and fears. Goals involve hard choices with very serious human consequences. Goals and visions can appear to be in conflict, and often are. There's no contradiction in that, as I think we all know from ordinary experience. Let me take my own case, to illustrate what I have in mind. My personal visions are fairly traditional anarchist ones. According to this anarchist vision, any structure of hierarchy and authority carries a heavy burden of justification, whether it involves personal relations or a larger social order. If it cannot bear the burden - sometimes it can - then it is illegitimate and should be dismantled.  I share that vision, though it runs directly counter to my goals. My short-term goals are to defend and even strengthen elements of state authority which, though illegitimate in fundamental ways, are critically necessary right now to impede the dedicated efforts to 'roll back' the progress that has been achieved in extending democracy and human rights. State authority is now under severe attack in the more democratic societies, but not because it conflicts with the libertarian vision. Rather the opposite: because it offers (weak) protection to some aspects of that vision. In today's world, I think, the goals of a committed anarchist should be to defend some state institutions from the attack against them, while trying at the same time to pry them open to more meaningful public participation - and ultimately, to dismantle them in a much more free society; if the appropriate circumstances can be achieved.

#### Their refusal to address possible catastrophes in the world is more of an attempt of escaping from realities --- it’s more productive to work to remove the causes of fear and suffering

Geshe Kelsang **Gyatso 03**, Internationally renowned teacher and author of 19 books on spirituality, 2003 Tharpa Publications, http://www.tharpa.com/uk/background/dealing-with-fear.htm

According to Buddhism, there is unhealthy fear and healthy fear. For example, when we are afraid of something that cannot actually harm us - such as spiders - or something we can do nothing to avoid - such as old age or being struck down with smallpox or being run over by a truck - then our fear is unhealthy, for it serves only to make us unhappy and paralyze our will. On the other hand, when someone gives up smoking because they are afraid of developing lung cancer, this is a healthy fear because the danger is real and there are constructive steps they can take to avoid it. IT CONTINUES However, right now we need the healthy fear that arises from taking stock of our present situation so that we can resolve to do something about it. For example, there is no point in a smoker being scared of dying of lung cancer unless there is something that he or she can or will do about it, i.e. stop smoking. If a smoker has a sufficient fear of dying of lung cancer, he or she will take steps to kick the habit. If he [or she] prefers to ignore the danger of lung cancer, he [or she] will continue to create the causes of future suffering, living in denial and effectively giving up control. Just as a smoker is vulnerable to lung cancer due to cigarettes, it is true that at the moment we are vulnerable to danger and harm, we are vulnerable to ageing, sickness, and eventually death, all due to our being trapped in samsara — the state of uncontrolled existence that is a reflection of our own uncontrolled minds. We are vulnerable to all the mental and physical pain that arises from an uncontrolled mind-such as the pains that come from the delusions of attachment, anger, and ignorance. We can choose to **live in denial** of this and thereby **give up what control we have**, or we can choose to recognize this vulnerability, recognize that awe are in danger, and then find a way to avert the danger by **removing the actual causes** of all fear (the equivalent of the cigarettes) - the delusions and negative, unskillful actions motivated by those delusions. In this way we gain control, and if we are in control we have no cause for fear. A balanced fear of our delusions and the suffering to which they inevitably give rise is therefore healthy because it serves to **motivate constructive action to avoid a real danger**. We only need fear as an impetus until we have removed the causes of our vulnerability through finding spiritual, inner refuge and gradually training the mind.