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**Text: The People’s Republic of China should cooperate with Cuba [plan]**

#### Chinese have new and improved way to solve spills – membrane separates oil from water

Sheahan, 12— Royal Society of Chemistry (Holly Sheahan, “Oil loving membranes for oil spill clean-ups”, Royal Society of Chemistry: Advancing the Chemical Science, November 12, 2012, <http://www.rsc.org/chemistryworld/2012/11/membrane-clean-oil-spills)//IK>

¶ Researchers in China have made a new type of [membrane that can separate oil from water](http://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/articlelanding/2012/nr/c2nr33063f) and could potentially be used in oil spills, such as [the one in the Gulf of Mexico](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Deepwater_Horizon_oil_spill). The membrane works by interacting differently with the substances as it is both superhydrophobic and superoleophilic, so that it repels water but attracts oil. This means that the oil is absorbed through the membrane, but the water can’t penetrate.¶ The membrane is made from a polymerised fluorinated polybenzoxazine (F-PBZ) layer on top of cellulose acetate nanofibres. The scientists used an electrospinning technique (in which a viscous liquid is passed through a conducting needle to form a thread) to create a porous structure that makes the membrane even better at absorbing the oil.¶ **Oil and water separation using the membrane. The water and oil were dyed by methyl blue and oil red, respectively¶** Bin Ding from [**Donghua University**](http://english.dhu.edu.cn/WebSite/page/front/index/index.aspx) leads the team that developed this technology. He explains that one of the best things about their membranes is that they are stable and can be used over a wide pH range, making them suitable for use in a variety of challenging environments. The complex surface of the membrane gives it a surface area of 58.96m2/g. Ding comments that ‘currently, there are no other membranes with such a high surface area for oil spill clean-up’.¶ [**John Howarter**](https://engineering.purdue.edu/MSE/People/ptProfile?id=74793), an expert in polymer membranes from Purdue University, US, thinks this research is a significant achievement. ‘The performance of their materials is remarkable with the extreme contact angle difference between the oil (at 3 degrees) and water (161 degrees),’ he says. ‘Technology such as this is useful for dealing with large scale environmental problems, but could also be used in a manufacturing setting.’¶ Ding’s team’s use of simple techniques will make it possible for them to produce their membranes on a larger, industrial sized, scale in the future, but first they will be improving the structure of the membranes to fine tune their performance. They are also working on other F-PBZ hybrid fibrous membranes to see what else they can do with them.
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#### Interpretation – economic engagement requires expanding bilateral economic relations

**Kahler, 6** - Graduate School of International Relations and Pacific Studies, University of California, San Diego (M., “Strategic Uses of Economic Interdependence: Engagement Policies on the Korean Peninsula and Across the Taiwan Strait” in Journal of Peace Research (2006), 43:5, p. 523-541, Sage Publications)

Economic engagement - a policy of deliberately expanding economic ties with an adversary in order to change the behavior of the target state and improve bilateral political relations - is a subject of growing interest in international relations. Most research on economic statecraft emphasizes coercive policies such as economic sanctions. This emphasis on negative forms of economic statecraft is not without justification: the use of economic sanctions is widespread and well documented, and several quantitative studies have shown that adversarial relations between countries tend to correspond to reduced, rather than enhanced, levels of trade (Gowa, 1994; Pollins, 1989). At the same time, however, relatively little is known about how often strategies of economic engagement are deployed: scholars disagree on this point, in part because no database cataloging instances of positive economic statecraft exists (Mastanduno, 2003). Beginning with the classic work of Hirschman (1945), most studies of economic engagement have been limited to the policies of great powers (Mastanduno, 1992; Davis, 1999; Skalnes, 2000; Papayoanou & Kastner, 1999/2000; Copeland, 1999/2000; Abdelal & Kirshner, 1999/2000). However, engagement policies adopted by South Korea and one other state examined in this study, Taiwan, demonstrate that engagement is not a strategy limited to the domain of great power politics and that it may be more widespread than previously recognized.

#### This means the plan has to be government-to-government – not civil or private economic engagement

**Daga, 13** - director of research at Politicas Publicas para la Libertad, in Bolivia, and a visiting senior policy analyst at the Heritage Foundation (Sergio, “Economics of the 2013-2014 Debate Topic:

U.S. Economic Engagement Toward Cuba, Mexico or Venezuela”, National Center for Policy Analysis, 5/15, <http://www.ncpa.org/pdfs/Message_to_Debaters_6-7-13.pdf>)

Economic engagement between or among countries can take many forms, but this document will focus on government-to-government engagement through 1) international trade agreements designed to lower barriers to trade; and 2) government foreign aid; next, we will contrast government-to-government economic engagement with private economic engagement through 3) international investment, called foreign direct investment; and 4) remittances and migration by individuals. All of these areas are important with respect to the countries mentioned in the debate resolution; however, when discussing economic engagement by the U.S. federal government, some issues are more important with respect to some countries than to others.

#### ‘Its’ is a possessive pronoun showing ownership

**Glossary of English Grammar Terms, 2005**

(http://www.usingenglish.com/glossary/possessive-pronoun.html)

Mine, yours, his, hers, its, ours, theirs are the possessive pronouns used to substitute a noun and to show possession or ownership.

EG. This is your disk and that's mine. (Mine substitutes the word disk and shows that it belongs to me.)

Violation: they aren’t gov to gov

#### **A) limits – a government limit is the only way to keep the topic manageable – otherwise they could use any 3rd party intermediary, lift barriers to private engagement, or target civil society – it makes topic preparation impossible**

#### **B) negative ground – formal governmental channels are key to predictable relations and trade disads and counterplans that test ‘engagement’**
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#### **Engagement is the lynchpin of neoliberal expansion into Cuba**

**Wenston & Woods ’08** – Trotskyist political theorist and author and leading members of the International Marxist Tendency (Fred & Alan, “[Vultures hovering over Cuba after Fidel Castro steps down](http://www.cjournal.info/2008/02/20/vultures-hovering-over-cuba-after-fidel-castro-steps-down/)”, http://www.cjournal.info/2008/02/20/vultures-hovering-over-cuba-after-fidel-castro-steps-down/)//VP

They all pretend to be democrats when it comes to Cuba. In reality they are like vultures waiting for the day they can get their beaks and claws into the flesh of Cuba. What they are after is the end of the economic system brought into being by the Cuban revolution. They want capitalism to return to Cuba. That is what they mean by “democracy”! Another fashionable term these days is “engagement”. While Bush sticks to his guns and insists on the embargo being stepped up, the more intelligent bourgeois, both in the USA and Europe are raising the need for “engagement”, i.e. on removing the embargo and opening up trade channels. Does this wing of the bourgeois have different interests or aims? No, they simply understand better than Bush and his obtuse circle of friends that the best way to re-introduce capitalism into Cuba is to lift the embargo, begin trading, flood Cuba with cash and let the process unfold.¶ That is why it is even more disgusting when we hear some reformist elements on the left advocating such “engagement”.What they are actually doing is giving the bourgeois advice on how to remove this thorn in their side**.¶** All this talk of democracy is in fact a cover for the real aims of imperialism. Not so long ago the Financial Times was giving more sober advice. They were suggesting a “Chinese road” for Cuba accompanied by a lifting of the US-sponsored embargo. The Chinese model would envisage an opening up of Cuba to capitalism accompanied by a firm grip on state power at the top.

#### Neoliberalism causes extinction

Darder, 10 – Professor Antonia Darder, Distinguished Professor of Education, University of Illinois, Urbana Champaign (“Preface” in *Critical Pedagogy, Ecoliteracy, & Planetary Crisis: The Ecopedagogy Movement* by Richard V. Kahn, 2010, pp. x-xiii)//VP

GENDER MODIFIED

It is fitting to begin my words about Richard Kahn’s Critical Pedagogy, Ecoliteracy, and Planetary Crisis: The Ecopedagogy Movement with a poem. The direct and succinct message of The Great Mother Wails cuts through our theorizing and opens us up to the very heart of the book’s message—to ignite a fire that speaks to **the ecological crisis** at hand; a crisis orchestrated by the inhumane greed and economic brutality of the wealthy. Nevertheless, as is clearly apparent, none of us is absolved from complicity with the devastating destruction of the earth. As members of the global community, we are all implicated in this destruction by the very manner in which we define ourselves, each other, and all living beings with whom we reside on the earth. Everywhere we look there are glaring signs of political systems and social structures that propel us toward **unsustainability and extinction**. In this historical moment, the planet faces some of the most horrendous forms of “[hu]man-made” devastation ever known to humankind. Cataclysmic “natural disasters” in the last decade have sung the environmental hymns of planetary imbalance and reckless environmental disregard. A striking feature of this ecological crisis, both locally and globally, is the **overwhelming concentration of wealth** held by the ruling elite and their agents of capital. This environmental malaise is characterized by the staggering loss of livelihood among working people everywhere; gross inequalities in educational opportunities; an absence of health care for millions; an unprecedented number of people living behind bars; and trillions spent on fabricated wars fundamentally tied to the control and domination of the planet’s resources. The Western ethos of mastery and supremacy over nature has accompanied, to our detriment, the unrelenting expansion of capitalism and its unparalleled domination over all aspects of human life. This hegemonic worldview has been unmercifully imparted through a host of public policies and practices that conveniently gloss over gross inequalities as commonsensical necessities for democracy to bloom. As a consequence, the liberal democratic rhetoric of “we are all created equal” hardly begins to touch the international pervasiveness of racism, patriarchy, technocracy, and economic piracy by the West, all which have fostered the erosion of civil rights and the unprecedented ecological exploitation of societies, creating conditions that now threaten our peril, if we do not reverse directions. Cataclysmic disasters, such as Hurricane Katrina, are unfortunate testimonies to the danger of ignoring the warnings of the natural world, especially when coupled with egregious governmental neglect of impoverished people. Equally disturbing, is the manner in which ecological crisis is vulgarly exploited by unscrupulous and ruthless capitalists who see no problem with turning a profit off the backs of ailing and mourning oppressed populations of every species—whether they be victims of weather disasters, catastrophic illnesses, industrial pollution, or inhumane practices of incarceration. Ultimately, these constitute ecological calamities that speak to the inhumanity and tyranny of material profiteering, at the expense of precious life. The arrogance and exploitation of neoliberal values of consumption dishonor the contemporary suffering of poor and marginalized populations around the globe. Neoliberalism denies or simply mocks (“Drill baby drill!”) the interrelationship and delicate balance that exists between all living beings, including the body earth. In its stead, values of individualism, competition, privatization, and the “free market” systematically debase the ancient ecological knowledge of indigenous populations, who have, implicitly or explicitly, rejected the fabricated ethos of “progress and democracy” propagated by the West. In its consuming frenzy to gobble up the natural resources of the planet for its own hyperbolic quest for material domination, the exploitative nature of capitalism and its burgeoning technocracy has dangerously deepened the structures of social exclusion, through the destruction of the very biodiversity that has been key to our global survival for millennia. Kahn insists that this devastation of all species and the planet must be fully recognized and soberly critiqued. But he does not stop there. Alongside, he rightly argues for political principles of engagement for the construction of a critical ecopedagogy and ecoliteracy that is founded on economic redistribution, cultural and linguistic democracy, indigenous sovereignty, universal human rights, and a fundamental respect for all life. As such, Kahn seeks to bring us all back to a formidable relationship with the earth, one that is unquestionably rooted in an integral order of knowledge, imbued with physical, emotional, intellectual, and spiritual wisdom. Within the context of such an ecologically grounded epistemology, Kahn uncompromisingly argues that our organic relationship with the earth is also intimately tied to our struggles for cultural self-determination, environmental sustainability, social and material justice, and global peace. Through a carefully framed analysis of past disasters and current ecological crisis, Kahn issues an urgent call for a critical ecopedagogy that makes central explicit articulations of the ways in which societies construct ideological, political, and cultural systems, based on social structures and practices that can serve to promote ecological sustainability and biodiversity or, conversely, lead us down a disastrous path of unsustainability and extinction. In making his case, Kahn provides a grounded examination of the manner in which consuming capitalism manifests its repressive force throughout the globe, disrupting the very ecological order of knowledge essential to the planet’s sustainability. He offers an understanding of critical ecopedagogy and ecoliteracy that inherently critiques the history of Western civilization and the anthropomorphic assumptions that sustain patriarchy and the subjugation of all subordinated living beings—assumptions that continue to inform traditional education discourses around the world. Kahn incisively demonstrates how a theory of multiple technoliteracies can be used to effectively critique the ecological corruption and destruction behind mainstream uses of technology and the media in the interest of the neoliberal marketplace. As such, his work points to the manner in which the sustainability rhetoric of mainstream environmentalism actually **camouflages** wretched neoliberal policies and practices that left unchecked **hasten the annihilation of the globe’s ecosystem**. True to its promise, the book cautions that any anti-hegemonic resistance movement that claims social justice, universal human rights, or global peace must contend forthrightly with the deteriorating ecological crisis at hand, as well as consider possible strategies and relationships that rupture the status quo and transform environmental conditions that threaten disaster. A failure to integrate ecological sustainability at the core of our political and pedagogical struggles for liberation, Kahn argues, is to blindly and misguidedly adhere to an anthropocentric worldview in which emancipatory dreams are deemed solely about human interests, without attention either to the health of the planet or to the well-being of all species with whom we walk the earth.

#### The alternative is to reject the 1ac to interrogate neoliberal economic engagement with latin America from the starting point of knowledge production- that is a prerequisite to breaking down neoliberalism

**Walsh, 12** – Estudios Culturales Latinoamericanos de la Universidad Andina Simón Bolívar (Catherine, “The Politics of Naming”, Cultural Studies, 26.1, Project Muse)//VP

Cultural Studies, in our project, is constructed and understood as more than a field of ‘study’. It is broadly understand as a formation, a field of possibility and expression. And it is constructed as a space of encounter between disciplines and intellectual, political and ethical projects that seek to combat what Alberto Moreiras called the impoverishment of thought driven by divisions (disciplinary, epistemological, geographic, etc.) and the socio-political-cultural fragmentation that increasingly makes social change and intervention appear to be divided forces (Moreiras 2001). As such, Cultural Studies is conceived as a place of plural-, inter-, transand in-disciplinary (or undisciplined) critical thinking that takes as major concern the intimate relationships between culture, knowledge, politics and economics mentioned earlier, and that sees the problems of the region as both local and global. It is a space from which to search for ways of thinking, knowing, comprehending, feeling and acting that permit us to intervene and influence: a field that makes possible convergence and articulation, particularly between efforts, practices, knowledge and projects that focus on more global justice, on differences (epistemic, ontological, existential, of gender, ethnicity, class, race, nation, among others) constructed as inequalities within the framework of neo-liberal capitalism. It is a place that seeks answers, encourages intervention and engenders projects and proposals. It is in this frame of understanding and practice in our Ph.D. programme in Latin-American Cultural Studies at the Universidad Andina Simo´n Bolı´var, that this broad description-definition continues to take on more concrete characteristics. Here I can identify three that stand out: the inter-cultural, the inter-epistemic and the de-colonial. The inter-cultural has been and still is a central axis in the struggles and processes of social change in the Andean region. Its critical meaning was first affirmed near the end of the 1980s in the Ecuadorian indigenous movement’s political project. Here inter-culturality was positioned as an ideological principal grounded in the urgent need for a radical transformation of social structures, institutions and relationships, not only for indigenous peoples but also for society as a whole. Since then, inter-culturality has marked a social, political, ethical project and process that is also epistemological;6 a project and a process that seek to re-found the bases of the nation and national culture, understood as homogenous and mono-cultural. Such call for re-founding does not to simply add diversity to what is already established, but rather to rethink, rebuild and inter-culturalize the nation and national culture, and with in the terrains of knowledge, politics and life-based visions. It is this understanding of the inter-cultural that is of interest. Concretely, we are interested in the spaces of agency, creation, innovation and encounter between and among different subjects, knowledges, practices and visions. Referring to our project of Cultural Studies as (inter)Cultural Studies, enables and encourages us to think from this region, from the struggles, practices and processes that question Eurocentric, colonial and imperial legacies, and work to transform and create radically different conditions for thinking, encountering, being and coexisting or co-living. In a similar fashion, the inter-epistemic focuses on the need to question, interrupt and transgress the Euro-USA-centric epistemological frameworks that dominate Latin-American universities and even some Cultural Studies programmes. To think with knowledges produced in Latin America and the Caribbean (as well as in other ‘Souths’, including those located in the North) and by intellectuals who come not only from academia, but also from other projects, communities and social movements are, for us, a necessary and essential step, both in de-colonization and in creating other conditions of knowledge and understanding. Our project, thus, concerns itself with the work of inverting the geopolitics of knowledge, with placing attention on the historically subjugated and negated plurality of knowledge, logics and rationalities, and with the political-intellectual effort to create relationships, articulations and convergences between them. The de-colonial element is intimately related to the two preceding points. Here our interest is, on one hand, to make evident the thoughts, practices and experiences that both in the past and in the present have endeavoured to challenge the colonial matrix of power and domination, and to exist in spite of it, in its exterior and interior. By colonial matrix, we refer to the hierarchical system of racial civilizational classification that has operated and operates at different levels of life, including social identities (the superiority of white, heterosexual males), ontological-existential contexts (the dehumanization of indigenous and black peoples), epistemic contexts (the positioning of Euro-centrism as the only perspective of knowledge, thereby disregarding other epistemic rationalities), and cosmological (the control and/or negation of the ancestral-spiritual-territorial-existential bases that govern the life-systems of ancestral peoples, most especially those of African Diaspora and of Abya Yala) (see Quijano 1999). At the centre or the heart of this matrix is capitalism as the only possible model of civilization; the imposed social classification, the idea of ‘humanity’, the perspective of knowledge and the prototype life-system that goes with it defines itself through this capitalistic civilizational lens. As Quijano argues, by defending the interests of social domination and the exploitation of work under the hegemony of capital, ‘the ‘‘racialization’’ and the ‘‘capitalization’’ of social relationships of these models of power, and the ‘‘eurocentralization’’ of its control, are in the very roots of our present problems of identity,’ in Latin America as countries, ‘nations’ and States (Quijano 2006). It is precisely because of this that we consider the de-colonial to be a fundamental perspective. Within our project, the de-colonial does not seek to establish a new paradigm or line of thought but a critically-conscious understanding of the past and present that opens up and suggests questions, perspectives and paths to explore. As such, and on the other hand, we are interested in stimulating methodologies and pedagogies that, in the words of Jacqui Alexander (2005), cross the fictitious boundaries of exclusion and marginalization to contribute to the configuration of new ways of being and knowing rooted not in alterity itself, but in the principles of relation, complement and commitment. It is also to encourage other ways of reading, investigating and researching, of seeing, knowing, feeling, hearing and being, that challenge the singular reasoning of western modernity, make tense our own disciplinary frameworks of ‘study’ and interpretation, and persuade a questioning from and with radically distinct rationalities, knowledge, practices and civilizational-life-systems. It is through these three pillars of the inter-cultural, the inter-epistemic and the de-colonial that we attempt to understand the processes, experiences and struggles that are occurring in Latin America and elsewhere. But it is also here that we endeavour to contribute to and learn from the complex relationships between culture-politics-economics, knowledge and power in the world today; to unlearn to relearn from and with perspectives otherwise. Practices, experiences and challenges In this last section, my interest is to share some of the particularities of our doctorate programme/project, now in its third cycle; its achievements and advancements; and the challenges that it faces in an academic context, increasingly characterized regionally and internationally, by disciplinarity, depolitization, de-subjectivation, apathy, competitive individualism and nonintervention. Without a doubt, one of the unique characteristics of the programme/ project is its students: all mid-career professionals mainly from the Andean region and from such diverse fields as the social sciences, humanities, the arts, philosophy, communication, education and law. The connection that the majority of the students have with social and cultural movements and/or processes, along with their dedication to teaching or similar work, helps to contribute to dynamic debate and discussion not always seen in academia and post-graduate programmes. Similarly, the faculty of the programme stand out for being internationally renowned intellectuals, and, the majority, for their commitment to struggles of social transformation, critical thinking and the project of the doctorate itself. The curriculum offering is based on courses and seminars that seek to foment thinking from Latin American and with its intellectuals in all of their diversity comprehend, confront and affect the problems and realities of the region, which are not only local but global. The pedagogical methodological perspective aforementioned works to stimulate processes of collective thought and allow the participants to think from related formations, experiences and research topics and to think with the differences disciplinary, geographical, epistemic and subjective thereby fracturing individualism by dialoguing, transgressing and inter-crossing boundaries. Trans-disciplinarity, as such, is a fundamental position and process in our project. The fact that the graduate students come from an array of different backgrounds provides a plurality in which the methodologicalpedagogical practice becomes the challenge of collectively thinking, crossing disciplinary backgrounds and creating new positions and perspectives, conceived and formed in a trans-disciplinary way. The majority of courses, seminars and professors, also assume that this is a necessary challenge in today’s world when no single discipline and no single intellectual is capable alone of analyzing, comprehending or transforming social reality. Nevertheless, trans-disciplinary gains continue to be a point of criticism and contention, especially given the present trend to re-discipline the LatinAmerican university. As Edgardo Lander has argued (2000a), this tendency reflects the neo-liberalization of higher education, as well as the increasing conservatism of intellectuals, including those that previously identified as or to continue to identify themselves as progressives and/or leftists. To establish oneself in a discipline or presume truth through a discipline, a common practice today, is to reinstall the geopolitics of knowing. This, in turn, strengthens Euro-USA-centrism as ‘the place’ of theory and knowledge. As such, the subject of dispute is not simply the trans-disciplinary aspect of Cultural Studies but also its ‘indisciplinary’ nature, that is, the effort central to our project to include points of view that come from Latin America and thinkers who are not always connected to academia (see Walsh et al. 2002). Our interest is not, as some claim, to facilitate the agendas or cultural agency of subaltern groups or social movements, promote activism or simply include other knowledge forms, but instead to build a different political-intellectual project a political-intellectual project otherwise. Such project gives centrality to the need to learn to think from, together and with Latin American reality and its actors, thereby stimulating convergences, articulations and inter-culturalizations that aim at creating an academia that is committed to life itself. Such a perspective does not eliminate or deny knowledge conceived in Europe or North America usually named as ‘universal’ or its proponents and thinkers. Instead, it incorporates such knowledge as part of a broader canon and worldview that seeks pluriversality, recognizing the importance of places and loci of enunciation. For our project, all of this serves to highlight the doubly complicated situation that is still in flux. On one hand, there is the negative association with trans-disciplinarity and the academic suppositions that accompany it, particularly in the area of research; this requires that our theses be doubly rigorous. And, on the other hand, there is the geopolitical limitation not only of disciplines but also of academic disciplining. To argue, as we do, that knowledge and thought are also produced outside of universities and, in dialogue with Hall, that political movements also produce and provoke theoretic moments and movements, is to question and challenge the academic logic and the authority of a universal and singular reasoning and science. We will, through such questioning and challenges, always be marginalized, placed on the fringe, under a microscope, criticized and disputed. Because of this, the challenges that we have encountered have been many. On one hand, there are those challenges that many face in the Latin-American academic context: the real difficulties of financing, infrastructure and research support. On the other hand, are the challenges that come with the traditional academic disciplinary structure, its de-politization and de-subjectification. Here the challenge is to transgress the established norms of neutrality, distance and objectivity. It is also to confront the standards that give little relevance to historically subjugated groups, practices and knowledges, and to the interlinking of race, ethnicity, gender and sexuality with the structures and models of power and knowledge. It is to make evident past and present struggles that give real meaning to the arguments of heterogeneity, decoloniality and inter-culturality. Here the criticism and dispute comes from many sides: from those who describe these efforts as too politicized (and, as such, supposedly less ‘academic’), uni-paradigmatic (supposedly limited to only one ‘line of thought’), fundamentalist (supposedly exclusionary of those subjects not marked by the colonial wound) and as obsessed with conflict (and therefore far from the tradition of ‘culture’, its letters and object of study). These challenges together with the tensions, criticisms and disputes that they mark often times make the path more difficult. Still, and at the same time, they allow us to clarify the distinctive and unique aspects of our project and its motivations to continue with its course of construction, insurgence and struggle. Our concern here is not so much with the institutionalizing of Cultural Studies. Better yet, and in a much broader fashion, we are concerned with epistemic inter-culturalization, with the de-colonialization and pluriversalization of the ‘university’, and with a thinking from the South(s). To place these concerns, as argued here, within a perspective and a politics of naming: ‘(inter)Cultural Studies in de-colonial code,’ is to open, not close, paths. Conclusion In concluding the reflections I have presented here, it is useful to return to a fundamental point touched by Stuart Hall: ‘intervention’. In particular and with Hall, I refer to the will to intervene in and transform the world, an intervention that does not simply relate to social and political contexts and fields, but also to epistemology and theory. That is to an intervention and transformation in and a de-colonization of the frameworks and logics of our thinking, knowing and comprehending. To commit oneself in mind, body and spirit as Frantz Fanon argued. To consider Cultural Studies today a project of political vocation and intervention is to position and at the same time build our work on the borders of and the boundaries between university and society. It is to seriously reflect on whom we read and with whom we want and/or need to dialogue and think, to understand the very limits or our knowledge. And precisely because of this, it is to act on our own situation, establishing contacts and exchanges of different kinds in a pedagogicalmethodological zeal to think from and think with, in what I have elsewhere called a critical inter-culturality and de-colonial pedagogy (Walsh 2009). In universities and societies that are increasingly characterized by nonintervention, auto-complacency, individualism and apathy, intervention represents, suggests and promotes a position and practice of involvement, action and complicity. To take on such a position and practice and to make it an integral part of our political-intellectual project is to find not only ethical meaning in work on culture and power, but also to give this work some heart. That is to say, to focus on the ever-greater need and urgency of life. To call these Cultural Studies or critical (inter)Cultural Studies is only one of our options, and part of the politics of naming.
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#### Obama is pushing against new Iran sanctions – failure undermines the interim deal and future negotiations

DeYoung and Warrick 12/1 Karen and Joby, Washington Post, As senators work on Iran sanctions bill, White House lobbies lawmakers not to act, 12/1/13, http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/as-senators-work-on-iran-sanctions-bill-white-house-lobbies-lawmakers-not-to-act/2013/12/01/eb3e9d5a-5927-11e3-835d-e7173847c7cc\_story.html

A bipartisan juggernaut of senior senators is spending the remaining week of the Thanksgiving recess forging agreement on a new sanctions bill that the senators hope to pass before breaking again for Christmas. The administration believes the legislation could scuttle the interim nuclear agreement reached with Iran on Nov. 23 and derail upcoming negotiations on a permanent deal — scheduled for completion in six months — to ensure that Iran will never be able to build a nuclear weapon.¶ “If you want to hold our feet to the fire on the final deal, fine, do that,” a senior administration official said. “If people have concerns about elements of a final agreement, come in and tell us. . . . But that is a separate discussion from passing a sanctions bill in the middle of negotiations.”¶ The administration contends that new sanctions not only would violate the terms of the interim agreement — which temporarily freezes Iran’s nuclear programs and modestly eases existing sanctions — but also could divide the United States from its international negotiating partners across the table from Iran and give the upper hand to Iranian hard-liners in upcoming talks.¶ “The purpose of sanctions from the outset was to create a dynamic so that you can get a change in policy from the Iran­ians,” David Cohen, the Treasury Department’s undersecretary for terrorism and financial intelligence. said in an interview. “It’s not sanctions for the sake of having sanctions.”¶ The White House has organized a full-court press between now and the Senate’s return Dec. 9 to persuade lawmakers not to act. In addition to briefings for anyone who wants one, Obama, Secretary of State John F. Kerry, national security adviser Susan E. Rice and other top officials are making personal calls. Kerry sent a video to his former Capitol Hill colleagues explaining the deal, “because some people are putting out some misinformation on it.”

#### House GOP Members oppose drilling – empirics prove

**Stephens and Clovin, 11**, Sarah, Executive Director of the Center for Democracy in the Americas, and Jake, Vice President for Global Trade Issues at the National Foreign Trade Council (“US-Cuba policy, and the race for oil drilling”, 9/29, The Hill, http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/foreign-policy/184661-us-cuba-policy-and-the-race-for-oil-drilling)//LA  
Due to the fact that the drilling involves Cuba, American companies and workers cannot lend their expertise to what could be a risky operation.  U.S. economic sanctions prevent our private sector from helping Cuba drill safely and paralyze the U.S. government, which ought to be convening bilateral discussions on best practices and coordinating disaster response.  In fact, the U.S. has no emergency response agreement with Cuba for oil spills.  While some specific licenses have been granted to permit U.S. firms to conduct limited transactions with Cuba, current sanctions bar the United States from deploying the kind of clean-up equipment, engineers, spare parts for blow-out prevention, chemical dispersants, and rigs to drill relief wells that would be needed to address an oil crisis involving Cuba. One welcomed development came earlier this month, when William Reilly, a former head of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and co-chair of the Commission that investigated the Deepwater Horizon disaster, led a group of experts to Cuba to take a look at their plans.  While the administration has done well giving permission to Mr. Reilly, as well as to other experts, to discuss the problem with Cuban counterparts, it should move more aggressively to work with the Cuban government to cooperate on plans for safe drilling and responding to a possible crisis. Rather than moving forward, some in the U.S. Congress would make the problem worse.  Rep. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (FL-R), who criticized Mr. Reilly’s visit to Cuba as “giving credibility to the regime’s dangerous oil-drilling scheme,” has offered legislation to try and stop Repsol from drilling.  Rep. Vern Buchanan (FL-R) would deny Repsol the right to drill in U.S. waters if it helped Cuba drill in its waters.   Thirty-four members of both parties have written Repsol directly, threatening the company if it drills with Cuba.  Yet this tactic can’t work.  Even if they could deter Repsol from drilling – which is unlikely – they cannot stop Cuba and partners from countries like China, Russia, and Venezuela, from using the rig and searching for oil. At some point, it is likely that drilling will begin and the United States ought to do what it can to prepare for that eventuality.  The U.S. government should facilitate access by Cuba and its drilling partners to the resources they need to drill safely.  President Obama should instruct the Treasury Department to issue a blanket general license now that would allow private industry to provide what oil expert Jorge Piñon calls ”any conceivable response” in the event of a crisis. As we have already done with Mexico and Canada, the U.S. should join Cuba in crafting a crisis response agreement covering on-scene coordinators, a joint response team, response coordination centers, rapid notification protocols, customs and immigration procedures, and communications.  The plan should be written, signed, tested, and implemented as quickly as possible. Earlier this year, the Deep Water Horizon Commission, which Mr. Reilly co-chaired, said in its final report “that neither BP nor the federal government was prepared to deal with a spill” of its magnitude or complexity; that industry and policy makers were lulled by a “culture of complacency” that resulted in 5 million barrels of oil being dumped into the Gulf. Having seen this movie once before, complacency is inexcusable.  Politics should not blind Washington to the reality of the situation unfolding off of our shores.

#### Obama’s political capital is key – assumes all thumpers

Balakrishnan 12/1 Bhaskar, The Hindu Business Line, Time to end Iran's isolation, 12/1/13, Lexis

When the US Congress meets on December 9, it will no doubt take stock of the situation. Congress is the determining factor in easing general economic sanctions, something Iran desperately seeks, while the US President has powers to provide only limited relief. A Bill on more sanctions has been passed in the House by a huge bipartisan majority (400-22), and a similar Bill in the Senate is under active consideration. Considerable political capital and persuasion will be needed to get the Senate to hold off on more sanctions.¶ The gains¶ Iran has much to gain from a comprehensive agreement with the P5 plus Germany. (P5 refers to the five permanent members of the UN Security Council. Along with Germany — P5+1 — they are making diplomatic efforts over Iran's nuclear programme.) Lifting the sanctions would provide the benefits of economic growth for its population. The regime would find it easier to manage demands for greater freedom. A civil nuclear programme could grow rapidly. Conventional arms purchases and technology transfers would greatly strengthen the country. Its dominant position in the Gulf and as the leader of Shia Muslims would be recognised. The US and western allies would benefit from Iran's retreat from the nuclear weapons threshold. The nuclear non-proliferation movement would be strengthened and countries that emulate Iran's quest for nuclear weapons capability, discouraged. ¶ The success of diplomacy would stabilise the oil markets and boost world markets. Iran would be a counter to the Taliban-Al Qaeda influence in Afghanistan. ¶ Further, President Rouhani's success could well boost moderate candidates in the 2016 parliamentary elections in Iran.¶ However, Israel and Saudi Arabia oppose the interim agreement. ¶ The way forward¶ The US Congress is a major problem for the Obama administration in getting the sanctions lifted. There is deep suspicion over Iran's intentions, rightwing hostility, and bitter division over domestic issues such as healthcare and government spending. The approaching 2014 congressional election has also cast its shadow. Obama needs to be encouraged to go further by the international community. It is hoped that Iran's leaders will also realise the importance of gaining support from the US Congress.

#### Deal key to prevent war

Shank and Gould 9/12 Michael Shank, Ph.D., is director of foreign policy at the Friends Committee on National Legislation. Kate Gould is legislative associate for Middle East policy at FCNL, No Iran deal, but significant progress in Geneva, 9/12/13, http://communities.washingtontimes.com/neighborhood/cause-conflict-conclusion/2013/nov/12/no-iran-deal-significant-progress-geneva/

Congress should welcome, not stubbornly dismiss, diplomatic efforts to finalize the interim accord and support the continued conversation to reach a more comprehensive agreement. The sanctions that hawks on the Hill are pushing derail such efforts and increase the prospects of war. ¶ There is, thankfully, a growing bipartisan contingent of Congress who recognizes that more sanctions could undercut the delicate diplomatic efforts underway. Senator Carl Levin, D-Mich., chair of the Senate Armed Services Committee, cautioned early on that, “We should not at this time impose additional sanctions.” ¶ Senator Tim Johnson, D-S.D., chair of the Banking Committee, is still weighing whether to press forward with new sanctions in his committee. Separately, as early as next week, the Senate could vote on Iran sanctions amendments during the chamber’s debate on the must-pass annual defense authorization bill.¶ This caution against new sanctions, coming from these more sober quarters of the Senate, echoes the warnings from a wide spectrum of former U.S. military officials against new sanctions. There is broad recognition by U.S. and Israeli security officials that the military option is not the preferred option; a diplomatic one is. ¶ This widespread support for a negotiated solution was highlighted last week when 79 national security heavyweights signed on to a resounding endorsement of the Obama Administration’s latest diplomatic efforts.¶ Any member of Congress rejecting a diplomatic solution moves the United States toward another war in the Middle East. Saying no to this deal-in-the-works, furthermore, brings the world no closer toward the goal of Iran giving up its entire nuclear program. Rather, it would likely result in an unchecked Iranian enrichment program, while the United States and Iran would teeter perilously close on the brink of war. ¶ A deal to prevent war and a nuclear-armed Iran is within reach and it would be dangerous to let it slip away. Congress can do the right thing here, for America’s security and Middle East’s stability, and take the higher diplomatic road. Pandering to harsh rhetoric and campaign contributors is no way to sustain a foreign policy agenda. It will only make America and her assets abroad less secure, not more. The time is now to curb Iran’s enrichment program as well as Congress’s obstructionism to a peaceful path forward.

#### US-Iran war causes global nuclear war and collapses the global economy

Avery 11/6 John Scales, Lektor Emeritus, Associate Professor, at the Department of Chemistry, University of Copenhagen, since 1990 he has been the Contact Person in Denmark for Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs, An Attack On Iran Could Escalate Into Global Nuclear War, 11/6/13, http://www.countercurrents.org/avery061113.htm

Despite the willingness of Iran's new President, Hassan Rouhani to make all reasonable concessions to US demands, Israeli pressure groups in Washington continue to demand an attack on Iran. But such an attack might escalate into a global nuclear war, with catastrophic consequences.¶ As we approach the 100th anniversary World War I, we should remember that this colossal disaster escalated uncontrollably from what was intended to be a minor conflict. There is a danger that an attack on Iran would escalate into a large-scale war in the Middle East, entirely destabilizing a region that is already deep in problems.¶ The unstable government of Pakistan might be overthrown, and the revolutionary Pakistani government might enter the war on the side of Iran, thus introducing nuclear weapons into the conflict. Russia and China, firm allies of Iran, might also be drawn into a general war in the Middle East. Since much of the world's oil comes from the region, such a war would certainly cause the price of oil to reach unheard-of heights, with catastrophic effects on the global economy.¶ In the dangerous situation that could potentially result from an attack on Iran, there is a risk that nuclear weapons would be used, either intentionally, or by accident or miscalculation. Recent research has shown that besides making large areas of the world uninhabitable through long-lasting radioactive contamination, a nuclear war would damage global agriculture to such a extent that a global famine of previously unknown proportions would result.¶ Thus, nuclear war is the ultimate ecological catastrophe. It could destroy human civilization and much of the biosphere. To risk such a war would be an unforgivable offense against the lives and future of all the peoples of the world, US citizens included.

## Relations

#### Cant solve relations – Cuba empirically rejects U.S. disaster assistance – resents the greater damage done by the U.S. embargo

**Lacey, 8** – MA International Policy and Practice, George Washington University (Marc - “Cuba Rejects American Offer of Hurricane Aid” September 6, 2008 <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/09/07/world/americas/cubaforweb.html>) //EB

MEXICO CITY — The Cuban government turned down Washington’s offer of hurricane assistance Saturday, saying the best way for the United States to help Cuban victims of Hurricane Gustav would be for it to lift the economic embargo on the island.¶ Cuba said it had its own experts on the job while rejecting the State Department offer to send disaster specialists to assess the damages to the western Pinar del Rio Province and the Island of Youth.¶ On Wednesday, Thomas A. Shannon Jr., assistant secretary of state for Western Hemisphere Affairs, told the Cuban Interests Section in Washington that the United States would aid Cuban victims with $100,000 in immediate aid and more once the extent of the need was known. The aid, State Department officials said, would be sent through non-governmental organizations and not to the Cuban government.¶ But Cuba said that the trade embargo costs the island yearly damages that exceed the billions of dollars in destruction that it attributes to Hurricane Gustav. Cuba has accepted hurricane assistance from Russia, Venezuela and other allies. Such aid has frequently taken on a political dimension between Cuba and the United States over the years.¶ “The only correct and ethical action,” Cuba’s Foreign Ministry said in a statement, would be to end “the ruthless and cruel economic, commercial and financial blockage imposed against our Motherland for almost half a century.”

**Terrorists won’t pursue or use nuclear weapons**

**Waltz, 03** (Kenneth, The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: A Debate Renewed, 2003, p. 130)

For terrorists who abandon tactics of disruption and harassment in favor of dealing in wholesale death and destruction, instruments other than nuclear weapons are more readily available. Poisons and germs are easier to get than nuclear weapons, and poisoning a city’s water supply, though rather complicated, is more easily done than blowing a city up. Nevertheless, terrorists may seek to gain control of nuclear materials and use them to threaten or destroy. Yet, with shaky control of nuclear weapons materials in Russia and perhaps in Pakistan, and with the revelation in 1994 that the United States had lost track of some of its nuclear materials, one can hardly believe that nuclear weapons spreading to another country or two every now and then adds much to the chances that terrorists will be able to buy or steal nuclear materials. Plentiful sources are already available. Nuclear terror is a problem distinct from the spread of nuclear weapons to a few more countries. Terrorists have done a fair bit of damage by using conventional weapons and have sometimes got their way by threatening to use them. Might terrorists not figure they can achieve more still by threatening to explode nuclear weapons on cities of countries they may wish to bend to their bidding? Fear of nuclear terror arises from the assumption that if terrorists *can* get nuclear weapons they *will* get them, and then all hell will break loose. This is comparable to assuming that if weak states get nuclear weapons, they will use them for aggression. Both assumptions are false. Would the courses of action we fear, if followed, promise more gains than losses or more pains than profits? The answers are obvious. Terrorists have some hope of reaching their long-term goals through patient pressure and constant harassment. They cannot hope to do so by issuing unsustainable threats to wreak great destruction, threats they would not want to execute anyway.

## Spills

#### Status quo solves spills --- a deal will be finalized by the end of the year that provides immediate response capabilities and facilitates annual practices between nations to be ready to respond effectively to a spill

**Guzzo 11/15**(Paul Guzzo, staff writer, Tampa Tribune, Hispanicbuisness.com, “U.S., Cuba Meet for Oil Spill Talks” November 15, 2013, http://www.hispanicbusiness.com/2013/11/15/us\_cuba\_meet\_for\_oil\_spill.htm)//HA

Nov. 15--TAMPA -- Representatives from the United States and Cuba will meet in St. Petersburg today as they near agreement on a plan Caribbean nations would follow in dealing with future oil spills that span borders. The workshops have been conducted for three years and include Mexico, the Bahamas and Jamaica. Called the Multi-Lateral Technical Operating Procedure, the plan spells out responsibilities following a spill such as 2010's Deepwater Horizon disaster, including who will be contacted and how visas will be cleared for vessels and personnel. Among U.S. agencies attending the workshop will be the Coast Guard, the Department of State and the Department of the Interior. Until the plan is agreed upon, government agencies refuse to discuss specifics. They also refused to disclose the location of the gathering. "One of the things this group has done over our six meetings it try to keep it fairly low-key because they are only technical discussions," said Coast Guard Capt. John Slaughter, the service's representative at the planning meetings. "They are not political discussions or anything like that." Politics did play a role in the planning, though. Getting Cuba and the United States together proved a challenge because the trade and travel embargo imposed in 1960 barred discussion between the technical experts from each nation who would respond to an oil spill. For the United States to talk with Cuba, the meetings had to involve other countries and operate under the auspices of the United Nations and the Cartagena Convention, an agreement requiring nations in the Caribbean region to take necessary measures to protect and preserve rare and fragile ecosystems. The cleanup plan was deemed a necessary measure. "Knowing who to talk to and who needs to do what when dealing with disaster response is important," Slaughter said. \*\*\* Slaughter said he is confident the plan will be complete by the end of the year. He said that because it is a "nonbinding technical agreement," it does not require high-level approval and will go into effect as soon as the work group approves it. Recent oil exploration on Cuba's northern shore led by Spain's Repsol oil company came up dry. However, experts expect more exploration because of estimates that some 5 billion to 20 billion barrels of oil and 8 billion cubic feet of natural gas will be found beneath Cuban waters. A final plan will be the second step taken in recent years to protect the United States from spills outside its waters. In 2012, the Cuban Office of Foreign Assets Control issued the Coast Guard a license to enter Cuban waters with government approval in the event of an oil spill that could reach the United States. The Coast Guard also was licensed to bring in private companies that have the [technology](http://www.hispanicbusiness.com/technology/) to contain a spill. The 2012 agreement recognizes that private companies have the best [technology](http://www.hispanicbusiness.com/technology/) for the job, said Dan Whittle with the Environmental Defense Fund, a nonprofit environmental advocacy group. Whittle has been indirectly involved as a consultant in meetings on a clean-up plan. \*\*\* Because oil from a Cuban spill could reach [Florida](https://www.google.com/#rlz=1C2CKMB_enUS532US532&sclient=psy-ab&q=florida+site:www.hispanicbusiness.com&oq=florida+site:www.hispanicbusiness.com&gs_l=hp.3...5506.6909.1.7394.8.8.0.0.0.3.277.1369.0j7j1.8.0...0.0.0..1c.1.16.psy-ab.Rj2rtzelZlA&pbx=1&bav=on.2,or.r_cp.r_qf.&bvm=bv.47) in less than a week, U.S. interests wanted more than case-by-case permission from Cuba. The concern was that red tape would prevent an immediate response, said Lee Hunt, president-emeritus of the International Association of Drilling Contractors. That's why the plan is being developed. The association has represented the oil and gas drilling industry since 1940 and trains engineers on oil rig safety procedures. Hunt has been involved in the workshops as a technical consultant and will attend Friday's meeting. The plan stands to benefit all the participating nations. "If there was an oil spill in the Bahamas a year ago," Slaughter said, "as a technical responder I would not have known who to reach a counterpart in that country." At least not fast enough to respond in time to be effective, he added. After the plan is approved, mock operations among members of the coalition will routinely be held to prepare for the worst. The Coast Guard will be involved, making it a military operation involving two nations with no diplomatic relations. U.S. Rep. Kathy Castor said the U.S. and Cuba militaries have worked together before to battle drugs and illegal immigration, drawing objections from Cuban-American interests who resist any thawing of relations with Cuba until the Castro regime is ousted. "We do a lot of that, and it goes unnoticed by a lot of the hard-liners when it comes to Cuba and U.S. policy," said Castor, a Democrat representing Tampa. \*\*\* If Cuba does strike oil, it could provide the nation with an economic boost -- and that has critics of the Castro regime raising objections to cooperation in cleanup efforts. They say sharing knowledge with Cuba on the oil industry is a bad idea. U.S. Rep. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, a Cuba-born [Miami](https://www.google.com/webhp?hl=en#hl=en&sclient=psy-ab&q=Miami+site:www.hispanicbusiness.com&oq=Miami+site:www.hispanicbusiness.com&gs_l=hp.3...1738.11886.0.12505.35.34.0.1.1.0.290.5380.0j29j5.34.0...0.0.0..1c.1.12.psy-ab.AGfM9gYzgpg&pbx=1&bav=on.2,or.r_cp.r_qf.&bvm=bv.47008514,d.cGE&fp=5) Republican who opposes improved relations with Cuban leaders, said she is skeptical of their intentions in the cleanup talks. "The Cuban regime cares little for the health of the Cuban citizens and cares even less about protecting the environment," Ros-Lehtinen said in a statement to the Tribune. "The tyranny is always eager to sign any accord that makes it look good and then fails to comply with any word of the agreement. Thinking that the Castro brothers are negotiating in good faith is ludicrous." Whittle with the Environmental Defense Fund said he hopes to see politics kept to a minimum in the cleanup discussions. "They need to realize this is an environmental issue, not a Cuban issue," he said. [Florida](https://www.google.com/#rlz=1C2CKMB_enUS532US532&sclient=psy-ab&q=florida+site:www.hispanicbusiness.com&oq=florida+site:www.hispanicbusiness.com&gs_l=hp.3...5506.6909.1.7394.8.8.0.0.0.3.277.1369.0j7j1.8.0...0.0.0..1c.1.16.psy-ab.Rj2rtzelZlA&pbx=1&bav=on.2,or.r_cp.r_qf.&bvm=bv.47) Sen. Marco Rubio seems to share that sentiment, though he, too, remains an outspoken critic of improved relations with Cuban leaders. The Cuban-American [Miami](https://www.google.com/webhp?hl=en#hl=en&sclient=psy-ab&q=Miami+site:www.hispanicbusiness.com&oq=Miami+site:www.hispanicbusiness.com&gs_l=hp.3...1738.11886.0.12505.35.34.0.1.1.0.290.5380.0j29j5.34.0...0.0.0..1c.1.12.psy-ab.AGfM9gYzgpg&pbx=1&bav=on.2,or.r_cp.r_qf.&bvm=bv.47008514,d.cGE&fp=5) Republican would not answer questions about the St. Petersburg meeting, but his staff referred to a speech he made in March 2012 when he talked about the cleanup agreement. "I think it will generate some revenue for them," Rubio said, "but it takes years to turn that into a profit. I'm more concerned about potential environmental aspects." Castor said she is convinced Cuba takes its environmental duty seriously. She visited the island nation while Cuba was seeking oil. "They may take it more seriously than members of the United States Congress," Castor said.

**Species extinction won't cause human extinction – humans and the environment are adaptable**

**Doremus, 00** (Holly, Professor of Law at UC Davis Washington & Lee Law Review, Winter 57 Wash & Lee L. Rev. 11, lexis)

In recent years, this discourse frequently has taken the form of the ecological horror story . That too is no mystery. The ecological horror story is unquestionably an attention-getter, especially in the hands of skilled writers [\*46] like Carson and the Ehrlichs. The image of the airplane earth, its wings wobbling as rivet after rivet is carelessly popped out, is difficult to ignore. The apocalyptic depiction of an impending crisis of potentially dire proportions is designed to spur the political community to quick action . Furthermore, this story suggests a goal that appeals to many nature lovers: that virtually everything must be protected. To reinforce this suggestion, tellers of the ecological horror story often imply that the relative importance of various rivets to the ecological plane cannot be determined. They offer reams of data and dozens of anecdotes demonstrating the unexpected value of apparently useless parts of nature. The moth that saved Australia from prickly pear invasion, the scrubby Pacific yew, and the downright unattractive leech are among the uncharismatic flora and fauna who star in these anecdotes. n211 The moral is obvious: because we cannot be sure which rivets are holding the plane together, saving them all is the only sensible course. Notwithstanding its attractions, the material discourse in general, and the ecological horror story in particular, are not likely to generate policies that will satisfy nature lovers. The ecological horror story implies that there is no reason to protect nature until catastrophe looms. The Ehrlichs' rivet-popper account, for example, presents species simply as the (fungible) hardware holding together the ecosystem. If we could be reasonably certain that a particular rivet was not needed to prevent a crash, the rivet-popper story suggests that we would lose very little by pulling it out. Many environmentalists, though, would disagree. Reluctant to concede such losses, tellers of the ecological horror story highlight how close a catastrophe might be, and how little we know about what actions might trigger one. But the apocalyptic vision is less credible today than it seemed in the 1970s. Although it is clear that the earth is experiencing a mass wave of extinctions, the complete elimination of life on earth seems unlikely. Life is remarkably robust. Nor is human extinction probable any time soon. Homo sapiens is adaptable to nearly any environment. Even if the world of the future includes far fewer species, it likely will hold people. One response to this credibility problem tones the story down a bit, arguing not that humans will go extinct but that ecological disruption will bring economies, and consequently civilizations, to their knees. But this too may be overstating the case. Most ecosystem functions are performed by multiple species. This functional redundancy means that a high proportion of species can be lost without precipitating a collapse.

#### Latin America impacts are empirically denied

**Hartzell 2000** (Caroline A., 4/1/2000, Middle Atlantic Council of Latin American Studies Latin American Essays, “Latin America's civil wars: conflict resolution and institutional change.” http://www.accessmylibrary.com/coms2/summary\_0286-28765765\_ITM)

Latin America has been the site of fourteen civil wars during the post-World War II era, thirteen of which now have ended. Although not as civil war-prone as some other areas of the world, Latin America has endured some extremely violent and destabilizing intrastate conflicts. (2) The region's experiences with civil wars and their resolution thus may prove instructive for other parts of the world in which such conflicts continue to rage. By examining Latin America's civil wars in some depth not only might we better understand the circumstances under which such conflicts are ended but also the institutional outcomes to which they give rise. More specifically, this paper focuses on the following central questions regarding Latin America's civil wars: Has the resolution of these conflicts produced significant institutional change in the countries in which they were fought? What is the nature of the institutional change that has taken place in the wake of these civil wars? What are the factors that are responsible for shaping post-war institutional change?

**Diversionary theory --- it’s wrong**

Boehmer, 07 – political science professor at the University of Texas (Charles, Politics & Policy, 35:4, “The Effects of Economic Crisis, Domestic Discord, and State Efficacy on the Decision to Initiate Interstate Conflict” Pismarov)

This article examines the contemporaneous effect of low economic growth and domestic instability on the threat of regime change and/ or involvement in external militarized conflicts. Many studies of diversionary conflict argue that lower rates of economic growth should heighten the risk of international conflict. Yet we know that militarized interstate conflicts, and especially wars, are generally rare events whereas lower rates of growth are not. Additionally, a growing body of literature shows that regime changes are also associated with lower rates of economic growth. The question then becomes which event, militarized interstate conflict or regime change, is the most likely to occur with domestic discord and lower rates of economic growth? Diversionary theory claims that leaders seek to divert attention away from domestic problems such as a bad economy or political scandals, or to garner increased support prior to elections. Leaders then supposedly externalize discontented domestic sentiments onto other nations, sometimes as scapegoats based on the similar in-group/out-group dynamic found in the research of Coser (1956) and Simmel (1955), where foreign countries are blamed for domestic problems. This process is said to involve a “rally-round-the-flag” effect, where a leader can expect a short-term boost in popularity with the threat or use of force (Blechman, Kaplan, and Hall 1978; Mueller 1973). Scholarship on diversionary conflict has focused most often on the American case1 but recent studies have sought to identify this possible behavior in other countries.2 The Falklands War is often a popular example of diversionary conflict (Levy and Vakili 1992). Argentina was reeling from hyperinflation and rampant unemployment associated with the Latin American debt crisis. It is plausible that a success in the Falklands War may have helped to rally support for the governing Galtieri regime, although Argentina lost the war and the ruling regime lost power. How many other attempts to use diversionary tactics, if they indeed occur, can be seen to generate a similar outcome? The goal of this article is to provide an assessment of the extent to which diversionary strategy is a threat to peace. Is this a colorful theory kept alive by academics that has little bearing upon real events, or is this a real problem that policy makers should be concerned with? If it is a strategy readily available to leaders, then it is important to know what domestic factors trigger this gambit. Moreover, to know that requires an understanding of the context in external conflict, which occurs relative to regime changes. Theories of diversionary conflict usually emphasize the potential benefits of diversionary tactics, although few pay equal attention to the prospective costs associated with such behavior. It is not contentious to claim that leaders typically seek to remain in office. However, whether they can successfully manipulate public opinion regularly during periods of domestic unpopularity through their states’ participation in foreign militarized conflicts—especially outside of the American case—is a question open for debate. Furthermore, there appears to be a logical disconnect between diversionary theories and extant studies of domestic conflict and regime change. Lower rates of economic growth are purported to increase the risk of both militarized interstate conflicts (and internal conflicts) as well as regime changes (Bloomberg and Hess 2002). This implies that if leaders do, in fact, undertake diversionary conflicts, many may still be thrown from the seat of power—especially if the outcome is defeat to a foreign enemy. Diversionary conflict would thus seem to be a risky gambit (Smith 1996). Scholars such as MacFie (1938) and Blainey (1988) have nevertheless questioned the validity of the diversionary thesis. As noted by Levy (1989), this perspective is rarely formulated as a cohesive and comprehensive theory, and there has been little or no knowledge cumulation. Later analyses do not necessarily build on past studies and the discrepancies between inquiries are often difficult to unravel. “Studies have used a variety of research designs, different dependent variables (uses of force, major uses of force, militarized disputes), different estimation techniques, and different data sets covering different time periods and different states” (Bennett and Nordstrom 2000, 39). To these problems, we should add a lack of theoretical precision and incomplete model specification. By a lack of theoretical precision, I am referring to the linkages between economic conditions and domestic strife that remain unclear in some studies (Miller 1995; Russett 1990). Consequently, extant studies are to a degree incommensurate; they offer a step in the right direction but do not provide robust cross-national explanations and tests of economic growth and interstate conflict. Yet a few studies have attempted to provide deductive explanations about when and how diversionary tactics might be employed. Using a Bayesian updating game, Richards and others (1993) theorize that while the use of force would appear to offer leaders a means to boost their popularity, a poorly performing economy acts as a signal to a leader’s constituents about his or her competence. Hence, attempts to use diversion are likely to fail either because incompetent leaders will likewise fail in foreign policy or people will recognize the gambit for what it is. Instead, these two models conclude that diversion is likely to be undertaken particularly by risk-acceptant leaders. This stress on a heightened risk of removal from office is also apparent in the work of Bueno de Mesquita and others (1999), and Downs and Rocke (1994), where leaders may “gamble for resurrection,” although the diversionary scenario in the former study is only a partial extension of their theory on selectorates, winning coalitions, and leader survival. Again, how often do leaders fail in the process or are removed from positions of power before they can even initiate diversionary tactics? A few studies focusing on leader tenure have examined the removal of leaders following war, although almost no study in the diversionary literature has looked at the effects of domestic problems on the relative risks of regime change, interstate conflict, or both events occurring in the same year.3

## Spills

#### Status quo solves any risk of spills –

#### 1) A deal will be finalized by the end of the year – Guzzo evidence indicates that this provides immediate response capabilities and facilitates annual practices between nations to be ready to respond effectively to a spill

#### 2) Resolves any long term risk of an oil spill – the deal is a long term deal to prevent immediate spills – that’s Guzzo – call for the card after the round – it’s the most recent card on the issue of spills
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you are not a policy-maker—pretending you are causes absolving of individual responsibility—ensures the aff’s impacts are inevitable and link turns their cede the political arguments.

Kappeler 1995 (Susanne, Associate Professor at the School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Al Akhawayn University, “The Will to Violence”, p. 10-11, MT)

We are the war' does not mean that the responsibility for a war is shared collectively and diffusely by an entire society which would be equivalent to exonerating warlords and politicians and profiteers or, as Ulrich Beck says, upholding the notion of `collective irresponsibility', where people are no longer held responsible for their actions, and where the conception of universal responsibility becomes the equival ent of a universal acquittal.' On the contrary, the object is precisely to analyse the specific and differential responsibility of everyone in their diverse situations. Decisions to unleash a war are indeed taken at particular levels of power by those in a position to make them and to command such collective action. We need to hold them clearly responsible for their decisions and actions without lessening theirs by any collective `assumption' of responsibility. Yet our habit of focusing on the stage where the major dramas of power take place tends to obscure our sight in relation to our own sphere of competence, our own power and our own responsibility leading to the well-known illusion of our apparent `powerlessness’ and its accompanying phe nomenon, our so-called political disillusionment. Single citizens even more so those of other nations have come to feel secure in their obvious non-responsibility for such large-scale political events as, say, the wars in Croatia and Bosnia-Hercegovina or Somalia since the decisions for such events are always made elsewhere. Yet our insight that indeed we are not responsible for the decisions of a Serbian general or a Croatian president tends to mislead us into thinking that therefore we have no responsibility at all, not even for forming our own judgement, and thus into underrating the responsibility we do have within our own sphere of action. In particular, it seems to absolve us from having to try to see any relation between our own actions and those events, or to recognize the connections between those political decisions and our own personal decisions. It not only shows that we participate in what Beck calls `organized irresponsibility', upholding the apparent lack of connection between bureaucratically, institutionally, nationally and also individually or ganized separate competences. It also proves the phenomenal and unquestioned alliance of our personal thinking with the thinking of the major powermongers: For we tend to think that we cannot `do' anything, say, about a war, because we deem ourselves to be in the wrong situation; because we are not where the major decisions are made. Which is why many of those not yet entirely disillusioned with politics tend to engage in a form of mental deputy politics, in the style of `What would I do if I were the general, the prime minister, the president, the foreign minister or the minister of defence?' Since we seem to regard their mega spheres of action as the only worthwhile and truly effective ones, and since our political analyses tend to dwell there first of all, any question of what I would do if I were indeed myself tends to peter out in the comparative insignificance of having what is perceived as `virtually no possibilities': what I could do seems petty and futile. For my own action I obviously desire the range of action of a general, a prime minister, or a General Secretary of the UN finding expression in ever more prevalent formulations like `I want to stop this war', `I want military intervention', `I want to stop this backlash', or `I want a moral revolution." 'We are this war', however, even if we do not command the troops or participate in so-called peace talks, namely as Drakulic says, in our `non-comprehension’: our willed refusal to feel responsible for our own thinking and for working out our own understanding, preferring innocently to drift along the ideological current of prefabricated arguments or less than innocently taking advantage of the advantages these offer. And we `are' the war in our `unconscious cruelty towards you', our tolerance of the `fact that you have a yellow form for refugees and I don't' our readiness, in other words, to build ident ities, one for ourselves and one for refugees, one of our own and one for the `others'. We share in the responsibility for this war and its violence in the way we let them grow inside us, that is, in the way we shape `our feelings, our relationships, our values' according to the structures and the values of war and violence. “destining” of revealing insofar as it “pushes” us in a certain direction. Heidegger does not regard destining as determination (he says it is not a “fate which compels”), but rather as the implicit project within the field of modern practices to subject all aspects of reality to the principles of order and efficiency, and to pursue reality down to the finest detail. Thus, insofar as modern technology aims to order and render calculable, the objectification of reality tends to take the form of an increasing classification, differentiation, and fragmentation of reality. The possibilities for how things appear are increasingly reduced to those that enhance calculative activities.  Heidegger perceives the real danger in the modern age to be that human beings will continue to regard technology as a mere instrument and fail to inquire into its essence. He fears that all revealing will become calculative and all relations technical, that the unthought horizon of revealing, namely the “concealed” background practices that make technological thinking possible, will be forgotten. He remarks:  The coming to presence of technology threatens revealing, threatens it with the possibility that all revealing will be consumed in ordering and that everything will present itself only in the unconcealedness of standing-reserve. *(QT,* 33) [10](http://www.questiaschool.com/read/108740194)  Therefore, it is not technology, or science, but rather the essence of technology as a way of revealing that constitutes the danger; for the essence of technology is existential*,* not technological. [11](http://www.questiaschool.com/read/108740194) It is a matter of how human beings are fundamentally oriented toward their world vis a vis their practices, skills, habits, customs, and so forth. Humanism contributes to this danger insofar as it fosters the illusion that technology is the result of a collective human choice and therefore subject to human control. [12](http://www.questiaschool.com/read/108740194)

**Their risk calculus is born out of neoliberal logic---uncertainty is a trick used to either promote or reject policy based on ideological predispositions**

**Pellizzoni 11**, Associate Professor of Environmental Sociology at the University of Trieste, Italy, April 2011, “Governing through disorder: Neoliberal environmental governance and social theory,” Global Environmental Change, Vol. 21, p. 795-803//VP

This article started out with two aims: ﬁrst, to identify at the deepest, ontological, level the underpinnings of widespread environmental policy approaches often associated with neoliberalism. Second, to show that different socio-environmental theoretical perspectives have had difﬁculty confronting these underpinnings, which affects their capacity to interpret the latter’s implications for the governance of the biophysical world. Neoliberalism draws on established traditions in political liberalism and market capitalism, yet is characterized by a novel understanding of the ontological quality of nature. ‘Nature’ is no longer conceived as an objectively given, though cognitively mediated, reality, but as a constitutively ﬂuid entity, a contingency purposefully produced and controlled for instrumental ends. Governance through uncertainty, instability or ‘disorder’ thus seems to be the distinguishing feature of the ‘neoliberalisation of nature’. This ideational core may be considered the ﬁrst reason for the sense of unity often felt when contemplating the array of sectors, approaches and cases characterizing current market-oriented environmental governance, and at the same time for the sense of uneasiness towards neoliberalism that environmental social theory conveys. Whatever the judgment, it is important to grasp what is at stake with neoliberal governance of nature. Browsing social science books and journals, one realizes that much critical energy has been focused on questioning the objectivist account of nature that allegedly dominates current policy narratives and practices. Only a discerning scholarship has begun to realize that objectivism and antiobjectivism are losing relevance as categories capable of distinguishing intellectual and stakeholder positions, and that they increasingly become claims usable in power games over the biophysical world. Attention, for example, has been recently paid to the instrumental use of uncertainty (Freudenburg et al., 2008; Jacques et al., 2008), which, depending on the circumstances, is used either to ask for policy-making (as with GMOs) or to call for policy-avoiding (as with ‘unwarranted’ restrictive measures related to climate change). The very possibility of appealing to ‘sound science’ either for evidence of no problems, or no evidence of problems indicates the fundamentally anti-objectivist attitude that characterizes present political and cultural frameworks. Policy promoters share this attitude with their opponents. Those who ask for ‘precaution’ use the same arguments in reverse, requiring action when and where there is no evidence of no problems. 11 This commonality entails that appeals to uncertainty are devoid of any strategic relevance in current controversies; rather, they play a tactical role. This is likely to represent a problem above all for counter-forces to neoliberalism, to the extent that in a tactical struggle the most advantaged are those provided with greater organizational, economic, cognitive and legal resources (to say nothing of military ones). In short, we are today in front of a refashioning of the symbolic order of society vis-a` -vis its biophysical underpinnings. In this change, neoliberal discourses, policies and practices are at the same time a powerful driver and a result. Disorder becomes order to the extent that uncertainty, contingency and instability are regarded not as disabling by-products of governance but as enabling ways of governing. In the public realm, this ends up constituting a sort of shared horizon of meaning: not only is no new ‘order’ (in the traditional sense) in sight, but anti-essentialism overﬂows from intellectual avant-gardes to become a widespread, albeit often implicit or negotiable, worldview.

**Neolib is used as political cover by politicians— you are not a policy maker – the case doesn't exist as something you can evaluate outside their project of modernity**

**Hay and Rosamund, PhDs, 2002** (Colin and Ben, Journal of European Public Policy Volume 9, Issue 2, 2002 p.6-8)//VP

The question of intentionality is here a key issue and a consistent theme of the paper. It is important, at the outset, that we differentiate between the internalisation of a discourse of globalisation as an accurate representation of the relevant ‘material’ constraints and the more intentional, reflexive and **strategic choice** of such a discourse as a convenient justification for policies pursued for altogether **different reasons.** In the first scenario ideas about globalisation might be held to be constitutive (in part) of the perceived interests of political actors; in the latter, they are more of an instrument device deployed in the promotion of a set of extant preferences and (perceived) interests.6 There is plenty of evidence, as we shall see, of actors deploying particular rhetorics of globalisation in the attempt to justify often unpalatable social and economic reform. Whether this should be interpreted as evidence for an unreflexive internalisation of a discourse of external economic constraint or as an exercise in responsibility-displacement is an interesting methodological conundrum to which we return presently. Returing to the example of tax competition, if we envisage a (purely hypothetical) scenario in which the hyperglobalisation thesis were accurate, the free mobility of capital would indeed serve to establish tax competition between fiscal authorities seeking to hold onto existing investment whilst enticing mobile foreign direct investors to relocate. The price of any attempt to buck the trend is immediate capital flight with consequent effects on budget revenue. In such a scenario any rational administration aware (or assuming itself to be aware) of the mobility of capital will cut corporate taxes with the effect that no exit will be observed (scenario 1 in Figure 2). Any administration foolish enough to discount or test the mobility of capital by retaining high levels of corporate taxation will be rudely awakened from its state of blissful ignorance by a rapid exodus of capital (scenario 2). In a world of perfect factor mobility, then, the learning curve is likely to prove very steep indeed. Yet this is to assume an entirely unreflexive and non-instrumental attitude towards the discourse of globalisation1. It is important that we also consider a modification of scenario 1 in which the administration in question does not regard globalisation as a significant external constraint but perceives strategic advantage from presenting it in such terms. The outcome would, of course, be the same — corporate tax cuts (pursued for whatever ends), no observed exit and a seeming confirmation of the hyperglobalisation thesis. Assume instead that we inhabit a world in which the mobility of capital is much exaggerated and in which capital has a clear vested interest in threatening exit even where that threat is scarcely credible, and the scenario unfolds rather differently. Here, fiscal authorities lulled into accepting the hyperglobalisation thesis by the (ultimately hollow) exit threats of capital, or disingenuously presenting globalisation as a convenient external economic constraint, will cut rates of corporate tax, (falsely) attributing the lack of capital flight to their competitive taxation regime (scenario 3). Yet, were they to resist this logic by calling capital’s bluff they might retain substantial taxation receipts without fear of capital flight (scenario 4). The crucial point is that if we observe reductions in net corporate taxation over time with minimal evidence of capital flight we are incapable, on the empirical evidence alone, of adjudicating between scenario 1 in which the effects of the globalisation thesis are indeed true and scenario 3 in which the globalisation thesis is a hegemonic delusion. We are also incapable of differentiating between the ingenuous and the disingenuous appeal to globalisation as an non-negotiable external economic constraint. This is but one example. What it, and others like it, suggest is that the discourse of globalisation may play a crucial independent role in the generation of the effects invariably attributed to globalisation and invariably held to indicate its logic of inevitability (Hay and Watson 1998; Hay, Watson and Wincott 1999).7 In a context in which direct corporate tax rates have fallen over time — and in which that process has been linked publicly to the constraints imposed by globalisation (Blair and Schröder 1999: 167; Schwanhold and Pfender 1998; 21-2; cf. Lafontaine 1998: 5) — this is a not insignificant point.8 This in turn suggests the importance of differentiating clearly between: (i) the effects of globalisation itself; (ii) the effects of having internalised popular constructions of globalisation; and, indeed, (iii) **the strategic and disingenuous appeal to globalisation as a convenient justification for unpalatable reforms.** All too frequently the second is mistaken for the first; the third discounted altogether. And it is easy to see why. For the effects of having internalised or deployed strategically assumptions about globalisation may, in time, become almost as entrenched as if they were produced by an inexorable globalising logic. The effects of tax competition are, after all, no less real if informed by assumptions about the mobility of capital which are demonstrably false. Moreover, once established, the momentum of a process such as tax competition may be difficult to halt. Does it matter, then, whether the effects frequently attributed to globalisation are direct products of the demonstrable ‘material reality’ of globalisation or of more or less accurate constructions of globalisation’s assumed imperatives or of an entirely duplicitous appeal to globalisation’s convenient exigencies? Whilst in one sense it may not (the immediate outcome, after all, is the same), in another the difference is extremely significant. In one account we identify an inexorable and fatalistic unfolding economic ‘logic of no alternative’ operating beyond the control or purview of political actors whom we might hold accountable for its consequences. In the other two we have an open-ended, contingent and — crucially — political dynamic to which potentially accountable agents might be linked (see also Hay 2000). Differentiating between the effects of globalisation on the one hand and the effects of dominant discourses of globalisation and the use made of such discourses on the other is, then, an integral aspect of restoring notions of political responsibility and accountability to contemporary political and economic dynamics. It is a prime motivation for much of what follows.

**discount affirmative knowledge claims—they are products of a flawed positivist epistemology**

**Smith** **97** Steve**,** professor at Aberystwyth, becoming Head of the Department of International Politics at the University of Wales BSc in Politics and International Studies in 1973, an MSc degree in International Studies in 1974 and a PhD degree in International Relations in 1978, all from the University of Southampton. Power and truth: a reply to William Wallace Review of International Studies (19), 23

My central claim is that Wallace has a very restricted notion of politics, such that it seems obvious to him just who are those who ‘have to struggle with the dilemmas of power’. For him the political arena is public and it refers to the formal political process, specifically involving the academic in ‘speaking truth to power’. I think that there are two fundamental problems with this view of politics. First, it is very narrow indeed, referring to the activities of elected politicians and policy-makers. It ignores the massive area of political activity that is not focused on the electoral and policy-making processes, and the host of ‘political’ activities that do not accord with the formal processes of politics. His is a very official and formal definition of politics, one that would omit a vast array of political activities. For Wallace, ‘political’ means having to do with the formal policy process, thereby restricting discussion of politics to a very small subset of what I would define as political. Therefore, Wallace would see detachment where I see engagement; hiding behind the walls of the monastery where I see deep enquiry into the possibilities of the political; and scholasticism where I see intellectual endeavour. Second, and for me more importantly, his view of politics is narrow because it confines itself to policy debates dealing with areas of disagreement between competing party positions. The trouble with this view is of course that it ignores the shared beliefs of any era, and so does not enquire into those things that are not problematic for policy-makers. By focusing on the policy debate, we restrict ourselves to the issues of the day, to the tip of the political iceberg. What politics seems to me to be crucially about is how and why some issues are made intelligible as political problems and how others are hidden below the surface (being defined as ‘economic’ or ‘cultural’ or ‘private’). In my own work I have become much more interested in this aspect of politics in the last few years. I spent a lot of time dealing with policy questions and can attest to the ‘buzz’ that this gave me both professionally and personally. But I became increasingly aware that the realm of the political that I was dealing with was in fact a very small part of what I would now see as political. I therefore spent many years working on epistemology, and in fact consider that my most political work. I am sure that William Wallace will regard this comment as proof of his central claim that I have become scholastic rather than scholarly, but I mean it absolutely. My current work enquires into how it is that we can make claims to knowledge, how it is that we ‘know’ things about the international political world. My main claim is that International Relations relies overwhelmingly on one answer to this question, namely, an empiricist epistemology allied to a positivistic methodology. This gives the academic analyst the great benefit of having a foundation for claims about what the world is like. It makes policy advice more saleable, especially when positivism’s commitment to naturalism means that the world can be presented as having certain furniture rather than other furniture. The problem is that in my view this is a flawed version of how we know things; indeed it is in fact a very political view of knowledge, born of the Enlightenment with an explicit political purpose. So much follows politically from being able to present the world in this way; crucially the normative assumptions of this move are hidden in a false and seductive mask of objectivity and by the very difference between statements of fact and statements of value that is implied in the call to ‘speak truth to power’. For these reasons, I think that the political is a far wider arena than does Wallace. This means that I think I am being very political when I lecture or write on epistemology. Maybe that does not seem political to those who define politics as the public arena of policy debate; but I believe that my work helps uncover the regimes of truth within which that more restricted definition of politics operates. In short, I think that Wallace’s view of politics ignores its most political aspect, namely, the production of discourses of truth which are the very processes that create the space for the narrower version of politics within which he works. My work enquires into how the current ‘politics’ get defined and what (political) interests benefit from that disarming division between the political and the non-political. In essence, how we know things determines what we see, and the public realm of politics is itself the result of a prior series of (political) epistemological moves which result in the political being seen as either natural or a matter of common sense. (508-9

#### Policy making isn’t grounded in objectivity but cherry picking. Means a residual link takes out the aff because the ideological underpinnings of their knowledge is inaccurate.

**Bristow, 05** – Cardiff University economic geographer senior lecturer (Gillian, “Everyone's a ‘winner’: problematising the discourse of regional competitiveness”, Journal of Economic Geography, June, oxford journals)//VP

This begs the question as to why a discourse with ostensibly confused, narrow and ill-defined content has become so salient in regional economic development policy and practice as to constitute ‘the only valid currency of argument’ (Schoenberger, 1998, 12). Whilst alternative discourses based around co-operation can be conceived (e.g. see Hines, 2000; Bunzl, 2001), they have as yet failed to make a significant impact on the dominant view that a particular, quantifiable form of output-related regional competitiveness is inevitable, inexorable and ultimately beneficial. The answer appears to lie within the policy process, which refers to all aspects involved in the provision of policy direction for the work of the public sector. This therefore includes ‘the ideas which inform policy conception, the talk and work which goes into providing the formulation of policy directions, and all the talk, work and collaboration which goes into translating these into practice’ (Yeatman, 1998; p. 9). A major debate exists in the policy studies literature about the scope and limitations of reason, analysis and intelligence in policy-making—a debate which has been re-ignited with the recent emphasis upon evidence-based policy-making (see Davies et al., 2000). Keynes is often cited as the main proponent of the importance of ideas in policy making, since he argued that policy-making should be informed by knowledge, truth, reason and facts (Keynes, 1971, vol. xxi, 289). However, Majone (1989) has significantly challenged the assumption that policy makers engage in a purely objective, rational, technical assessment of policy alternatives. He has argued that in practice, policy makers use theory, knowledge and evidence selectively to justify policy choices which are heavily based on value judgements. It is thus persuasion (through rhetoric, argument, advocacy and their institutionalisation) that is the key to the policy process, not the logical correctness or accuracy of theory or data. In other words, it is interests rather than ideas that shape policy making in practice. Ultimately, the language of competitiveness is the language of the business community. Thus, critical to understanding the power of the discourse is firstly, understanding the appeal and significance of the discourse to business interests and, secondly, exploring their role in influencing the ideas of regional and national policy elites.

Be skeptical of their evidence – the government pays off academics in order to wage epistemological war on those who challenge neoliberalism

Giroux 6/19 – Global TV Network Chair Professorship at McMaster University in the English and Cultural Studies Department (Henry, “Beyond the Politics of the Big Lie: The Education Deficit and the New Authoritarianism” June 6, 2012 <http://truth-out.org/opinion/item/9865-beyond-the-politics-of-the-big-lie-the-education-deficit-and-the-new-authoritarianism>)//VP

Anti-Public Intellectuals and the Conservative Re-Education Machine The conservative takeover of public pedagogy with its elite codifiers of neoliberal ideology has a long history extending from the work of the "Chicago Boys" at the University of Chicago to the various conservative think tanks that emerged after the publication of the Powell memo in the early seventies.[(16)](http://truth-out.org/opinion/item/9865-beyond-the-politics-of-the-big-lie-the-education-deficit-and-the-new-authoritarianism#a16) The Republican Party will more than likely win the next election and take full control over all aspects of policymaking in the United States. This is especially dangerous given that the Republican Party is now controlled by extremists. If they win the 2012 election, they will not only extend the Bush/Obama legacy of militarism abroad, but likely intensify the war at home as well. Political scientist Frances Fox Piven rightly argues that, "We've been at war for decades now - not just in Afghanistan or Iraq, but right here at home. Domestically, it's been a war [a]gainst the poor [and as] devastating as it has been, the war against the poor has gone largely unnoticed until now."[(17)](http://truth-out.org/opinion/item/9865-beyond-the-politics-of-the-big-lie-the-education-deficit-and-the-new-authoritarianism#a17) And the war at home now includes more than attacks on the poor, as campaigns are increasingly waged against the rights of women, students, workers, people of color and immigrants, especially Latino Americans. As the social state collapses, the punishing state expands its power and targets larger portions of the population. The war in Afghanistan is now mimicked in the war waged on peaceful student protesters at home. It is evident in the environmental racism that produces massive health problems for African-Americans. The domestic war is even waged on elementary school children, who now live in fear of the police handcuffing them in their classrooms and incarcerating them as if they were adult criminals.[(18)](http://truth-out.org/opinion/item/9865-beyond-the-politics-of-the-big-lie-the-education-deficit-and-the-new-authoritarianism#a18) It is waged on workers by taking away their pensions, bargaining rights and dignity. The spirit of militarism is also evident in the war waged on the welfare state and any form of social protection that benefits the poor, disabled, sick, elderly, and other groups now considered disposable, including children. The soft side of authoritarianism in the United States does not need to put soldiers in the streets, though it certainly follows that script. As it expands its control over the commanding institutions of government, the armed forces and civil society in general, it hires anti-public intellectuals and academics to provide ideological support for its gated communities, institutions and modes of education. As Yasha Levine points out, it puts thousands of dollars in the hands of corporate shills such as Malcolm Gladwell, who has become a "one man branding and distribution pipeline for valuable corporate messages, constructed on the public's gullibility in trusting his probity and intellectual honesty."[(19)](http://truth-out.org/opinion/item/9865-beyond-the-politics-of-the-big-lie-the-education-deficit-and-the-new-authoritarianism#a19) Gladwell (who is certainly not alone) functions as a bought-and-paid mouthpiece for "Big Tobacco Pharma and defend[s] Enron-style financial fraud ... earning hundreds of thousands of dollars as a corporate speaker, sometimes from the same companies and industries that he covers as a journalist."[(20)](http://truth-out.org/opinion/item/9865-beyond-the-politics-of-the-big-lie-the-education-deficit-and-the-new-authoritarianism#a20) Corporate power uses these "pay to play" academics, anti-public intellectuals, the mainstream media, and other educational apparatuses to discredit the very people that it simultaneously oppresses, while waging an overarching war on all things public. As Charles Ferguson has noted, an entire industry has been created that enables the "sale of academic expertise for the purpose of influencing government policy, the courts and public opinion [and] is now a multibillion-dollar business."[(21)](http://truth-out.org/opinion/item/9865-beyond-the-politics-of-the-big-lie-the-education-deficit-and-the-new-authoritarianism#a21) It gets worse, in that "Academic, legal, regulatory and policy consulting in economics, finance and regulation is dominated by a half dozen consulting firms, several speakers' bureaus and various industry lobbying groups that maintain large networks of academics for hire specifically for the purpose of advocating industry interests in policy and regulatory debates."[(22)](http://truth-out.org/opinion/item/9865-beyond-the-politics-of-the-big-lie-the-education-deficit-and-the-new-authoritarianism#a22) Such anti-public intellectuals create what William Black has called a "criminogenic environment" that spreads disease and fraud in the interest of bolstering the interests, profits and values of the super wealthy.[(23)](http://truth-out.org/opinion/item/9865-beyond-the-politics-of-the-big-lie-the-education-deficit-and-the-new-authoritarianism#a23) There is more at work here than carpet bombing the culture with lies, deceptions and euphemisms. Language in this case does more than obfuscate or promote propaganda. It creates framing mechanisms, cultural ecosystems and cultures of cruelty, while closing down the spaces for dialogue, critique and thoughtfulness. At its worst, it engages in the dual processes of demonization and distraction. The rhetoric of demonization takes many forms: for example, calling firefighters, teachers, and other public servants greedy because they want to hold onto their paltry benefits. It labels students as irresponsible because of the large debts they are forced to incur as states cut back funding to higher education (this, too, is part of a broader effort by conservatives to hollow out the social state). Poor people are insulted and humiliated because they are forced to live on food stamps, lack decent health care and collect unemployment benefits because there are no decent jobs available. Poor minorities are now subject to overt racism in the right-wing media and outright violence in the larger society.

#### US fails to understand oppressive impacts of capitalism on Cuban society

LaFeber, [Marie Underhill Noll](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Marie_Underhill_Noll&action=edit&redlink=1) [Professor Emeritus](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Professor_Emeritus) of History and a [Stephen H. Weiss](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Stephen_H._Weiss) Presidential Fellow in the [Department of History](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cornell_University_Department_of_History) at [Cornell University](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cornell_University), one of the United States' most distinguished historians 93 -- (Walter, “Inevitable Revolutions: The United States in Central America”, 1/17/93, <http://books.google.com/books/about/Inevitable_Revolutions.html?id=RqMp5TsWCqkC>)//AS

The need of Cubans and Central Americans to find different means for achieving their version of a just society arose in large part from their long experience with North American capitalism. This capitalism has had a Jekyll and Hyde personality. U.S. citizens see it as having given them the highest standard of living and most open society in the world. Many Central Americans have increasingly associated capitalism with a brutal oligarchy-military complex that has been supported by U.S. poli- cies-and armies. Capitalism, as they see it, has too often threatened the survival of many for the sake of freedom for a few. For example, Latin Americans bitterly observed that when the state moved its people for the sake of national policy (as in Cuba or Nicaragua),the United States condemned it as smacking of Communist tyranny. lf, however, an oligarchy forced hundreds of peasants off their land for the sake of his own profit, the United States accepted it as simply the way of the real world?

#### That outweighs – We have an obligation to reduce Latin American poverty – complacency represents acceptance

O’Donnell, 96 – (Guillermo, Helen Kellogg Professor of Government and International Studies, Academic Director of the Kellogg Institute for International Studies at the University of Notre Dame; “POVERTY AND INEQUALITY IN LATIN AMERICA: SOME POLITICAL REFLECTIONS,” <http://-www.rrojasdatabank.info/225odonnell.pdf)//VP>

Extensive poverty and deep social inequality are characteristics of Latin America that go back to the colonial period. We have not overcome these conditions; we have aggravated them. One may point out that some problems in some countries did not turn out so badly, especially among those that have registered high rates of economic growth in recent years; but even these countries’ present poverty and inequality data look bad indeed when compared with data from the 1960s and early 1970s. Or, as the dominant mood in the 1980s dictated, one may argue that the current increases in poverty and inequality are the unavoidable consequence of correcting past errors. Or one may simply ignore these trends, availing oneself of some of the many mechanisms that human beings invent for justifying their callousness toward others. One way or the other, these stances naturalize poverty and inequality: although different from arguments of centuries past, they still cast poverty and inequality as inevitable consequences of the natural ordering of things. From this point of view, while one may regret some of the visible manifestations of such ordering, it would be senseless, if not worse, to try to change it. Poverty-generated needs are so many and so vital that one is morally and professionally impelled to alleviate them. But these efforts, and the highly specialized knowledge required, should not detract from attempting to grasp the overall picture and forging alliances that are premised on broad agreements about a non-naturalized vision of what poverty and inequality are and what might done about them. Of course, remedial action should be praised: in terms of actual human beings it does make a lot of difference. Also praiseworthy is moral indignation leading to energetic condemnations of the situation and proposals for a much better world—but too often we are not told how to get from here to there, and in the meantime these invocations often include a disparaging tone toward ‘mere’ remedial actions. 2) Somewhere in the middle there are various policy prescriptions, typical of reports of various commissions and international organizations, with which in most cases I agree. These include improving tax collection and making the tax system less regressive; investing more resources in social policies and finding more creative means of cooperation between the state and NGOs, churches, and business; correctly targeting some social policies; promoting popular participation; and other good ideas that I need not detail here. Although some progress in some policy areas has been registered in some countries, an obvious question is why so little of so much good advice has been actually implemented. The third hard fact is that the poor are politically weak. Their permanent struggle for survival is not conducive, excepting very specific (and usually short-lived) situations and some remarkable individuals, to their organization and mobilization. Furthermore, this weakness opens ample opportunity for manifold tactics of cooptation, selective repression, and political isolation. Democracy makes a difference, in that the poor may use their votes to support parties that are seriously committed to improving their lot.

#### Neoliberal policies are the root cause of violence, oppression, warming, and instability– the price to pay is too high

**Greenberg, 12**, - Ph.D in Anthropology at University of Michigan (James B., Thomas Weaver (Ph.D. in Anthropology at University of California at Berkeley), Anne Browning-Aiken (Ph.D. in Anthropology at University of Arizona), William L. Alexander (Professor of Anthropology at University of Arizona), “The Neoliberal Transformation of Mexico,” *Neoliberalism and Commodity Production in Mexico,* University Press of Colorado, pp 334-335)//SG

Neoliberalism also underlies the growing problems of crime and violence affecting Mexico more broadly. The policies that ruined smallholder agriculture also made the country receptive to growing marijuana and poppies, thereby open- ing spaces into which drug cartels moved (see the chapter by Emanuel and chapter 9 by Weaver, this volume). The money from the drug trade has had a pernicious effect on Mexican society, creating extensive problems of corruption and increas- ing levels of violence (Campbell 2009).Neoliberal policies have driven millions of Mexicans into economic exile and helped turn Mexico into a major source of drugs. Both drugs and victims of structural violence spill across the border, as does the violence that too often accompanies them, reminding us that we live in a global society and thatneoliberalism in Mexico also has direct consequences for the United States.As we have seen with the near collapse of global financial mar- kets, problems are contagious in an increasingly integrated global economy. Just as the consequences of neoliberal policies in Mexico spill over into the United States, the impacts of US applications of neoliberalism reverberate in Mexico. As the popular saying goes, “When the United States catches a cold, Mexico catches pneumonia.” Tight credit affects commodity chains, so the consequences of the neoliberal debacle in US financial markets are felt strongly in Mexico. In sum, our major area of unease regarding neoliberalism is that, as an eco- nomic framework, the lopsided version of development it delivers comes at too high a price.While neoliberalism may further global capitalism’s frantic drive for expansion and increased profit, it has not resolved intra- and inter-nation prob- lems of inequality, environmental degradation, unequal distribution of resources and gains, global warming, lack of healthcare, instability of pension funds, cor- ruption, and clientelism. Instead, it has increased violence and oppression and generally worsened working and living conditions.

#### Changing the justifications for an action changes the action itself

Thomas E. Hill, Jr., Professor of Philosophy at the University of North Carolina, 1991 (“The Message of Affirmative Action,” *The Affirmative Action Debate (1995)*, edited by Steven M. Cahn, Published by Routledge, Reprinted from Social Philosophy & Policy, p. 169-170)

Actions, as the saying goes, often *speak* louder than words. There are times, too, when only actions can effectively communicate the message we want to convey, and times when giving a message is a central part of the purpose of action. What our actions say to others depends largely, though not entirely, upon our avowed reasons for acting; and this is a matter for reflective [end page 169] decision, not something we discover later by looking back at what we did and its effects. The decision is important because "the same act" can have very different consequences, depending upon how we choose to justify it. In a sense, acts done for different reasons are not "the same act" even if otherwise similar, and so not merely the consequences but also the moral nature of our acts depend in part on our decisions about the reasons for doing them. Unfortunately, the message actually conveyed by our actions does not depend only on our intentions and reasons, for our acts may have a meaning for others quite at odds with what we hoped to express. Others may misunderstand our intentions, doubt our sincerity, or discern a subtext that undermines the primary message. Even if sincere, well-intended, and successfully conveyed, the message of an act or policy does not by itself justify the means by which it is conveyed; it is almost always a relevant factor, however, in the moral assessment of the act or policy. These remarks may strike you as too obvious to be worth mentioning; for, even if we do not usually express the ideas so abstractly, we are all familiar with them in our daily interactions with our friends, families, and colleagues. Who, for example, does not know the importance of the message expressed in offering money to another person, as well as the dangers of misunderstanding? What is superficially "the same act" can be an offer to buy, an admission of guilt, an expression of gratitude, a contribution to a common cause, a condescending display of superiority, or an outrageous insult. Because all this is so familiar, the extent to which these elementary points are ignored in discussions of the *pros* and *cons* of social policies such as affirmative action is surprising. The usual presumption is that social policies can be settled entirely by debating the rights involved or by estimating the consequences, narrowly conceived apart from the messages that we want to give and the messages that are likely to be received.

#### The plan is an ideological smokescreen to extend neoliberal market hegemony to Cuba---shuts down alternative social models that they’ll pursue absent U.S. influence and control

**Sandels, 11** – former professor of history at Quinnipiac University in Connecticut (Robert, September 2011, “An Oil-Rich Cuba?,” http://monthlyreview.org/2011/09/01/an-oil-rich-cuba)//VP

Cuba is about to begin drilling for oil in the Gulf of Mexico. If it finds what it is looking for, oil wealth could snatch Cuba out of the century-old grasp of the United States before Obama leaves the White House. This possibility has brought out Miami’s congressional assault team led by the fanatical Representative Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (R-FL), who essentially wants to criminalize drilling in Cuba’s section of the Gulf. In 2005, tests by Canadian companies found high-quality oil in Cuba’s Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ), a section of the Gulf of Mexico allotted to Cuba in the 1997 Maritime Boundary Agreement with Mexico and the United States. The U.S. Geological Survey estimated the oil potential in the Cuban zone at 4.6 billion barrels and 9.8 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. Cuba’s state oil company Cubapetroleo (Cupet) says the reserves may be four or five times larger. Unable to purchase drilling equipment in the United States because of the blockade, Cuba contracted with an Italian company (which in turn contracted with a Chinese company) to build Scarabeo 9, a monster semi-submersible drilling platform. The rig is capable of drilling to 3,600 meters; it is expected to arrive sometime this summer, after which a consortium led by the Spanish firm Repsol-YPF will begin operations in one the EEZ’s fifty-nine blocks. A dozen or so other firms, including Petronas (Malaysia), Gazprom (Russia), CNPC (China), Petrobras (Brazil), Sonangol (Angola), Petrovietnam (Vietnam), and PDVSA (Venezuela) have contracts to explore in other blocks. Industry experts are not predicting a Cuban oil bonanza, but finding reserves even at the lower end of the estimates would make Cuba energy independent, and eventually a net exporter. This would have an incalculable impact on its economy, and would send the U.S. sanctions policy into the dustbin of imperial miscalculations. To prevent this from happening, there have been legislative efforts like the 2007 bill offered by former Senator Mel Martinez (R-FL). This would have required the State Department both to punish executives of foreign companies that cooperated with Cuba by withholding their visas, and also to fine foreign investors in Cuban oil.1 “Supporting the Castro regime in the development of its petroleum is detrimental to U.S. policy and our national security,” said Martinez in 2007. Earlier this year, Representative Vern Buchanan (R-FL) offered a similar bill, arguing that Cuba’s deepwater drilling would pose a threat to Florida’s tourism and environment. Spilled oil would reach the Florida coast in three days, said Buchanan.2 He also wants to go after Repsol, first by compelling the Interior Department to deny the company licenses to drill in U.S. waters, and then by urging Obama to force Repsol out of Cuba by pressuring the Spanish government. The Spanish gambit has gained more traction lately. The current government is predicted to fall in November’s elections, which will put José María Aznar’s conservative (and anti-Cuba) party back in power. Senator Bill Nelson (D-FL) has written to Secretary of State Hillary Clinton advising that by stalling until then, “Spain may have a government less inclined to tolerate investment in Cuba. Until such time as the elections, I urge you to do your utmost to prevent these drilling operations.”3 Nelson has also suggested that the United States unilaterally withdraw from the Maritime Boundary Agreement that set up the zones and then order Cuba to halt explorations. With Scarabeo 9 about to sail toward Cuba, the Nelson scenario raises images of conflict in the Gulf; perhaps he imagines an Oil Rig Crisis and a U.S. naval blockade. Representative Ros-Lehtinen recently introduced her third no-drill bill, the Caribbean Coral Reef Protection Act, which closely follows Buchanan’s bill. Despite the word “coral,” Ros-Lehtinen admits the aim of the bill is to cripple Cuba’s oil industry. “The U.S. must apply stronger pressure to prevent other companies from engaging commercially, and any other means, with this crooked and corrupt regime,” she said.4 Ros-Lehtinen has not been very active in fighting for tougher drilling regulations to save the reefs following the explosion of BP’s Deepwater Horizon platform last year. Her main concern has been getting BP to pay compensation to tourism businesses and the fishing industry in Florida, given that both have been hurt by the spill. Her advice to “file a claim” does not address the underlying risks of deepwater drilling.5 The justification offered for these efforts is fear that Cuba lacks the necessary technology to prevent oil spills, though the sponsors of these bills do not apply the argument against operations in U.S. waters. Repsol in Cuba waters is not safe; Repsol off the Louisiana coast is safe. Then there is Mexico—not mentioned either—whose Gulf operations are carried out by state-owned Pemex, which has a long history of leaks and blowouts on land, sea, and in the sewers of Guadalajara.6 In 1979, Pemex’s Ixtoc platform in the Bay of Campeche erupted for nine months, sending oil onto the beaches of Texas and Florida in what is still the biggest of all oil spills. BP had to pay compensation for its failures; Mexico paid nothing. The issue facing the United States is not just Cuba drilling close to the Florida Keys. Drilling operations are in place or planned all over the Gulf. Deepwater Horizon was just one of scores of platforms operating in U.S. Gulf waters. Prior to the BP blowout, there were fifty-seven Gulf platforms, and that number is likely to be exceeded soon. Also joining Cuba in the Gulf as early as next year is the Bahamas Petroleum Company (BPC), which plans to drill just north of Cuba’s eastern tip. The moratorium Obama placed on deepwater drilling after the BP explosion was lifted last October. Since then, the Interior Department has issued thirty-seven permits for deepwater exploration, some of which include the same foreign companies that are involved in the Cuba project. Then there is Pemex, which took delivery of a Korean-built platform in May and plans to drill to 5,000 meters. Meanwhile, BP has a request pending with the Interior Department to resume operations on its ten existing Gulf platforms and to install new ones. With foreign companies swarming all over the Gulf, the Miami watchdogs have unanimously settled on Repsol as the threat to coral formations and national security. They have sponsored no bill, however, demanding that Obama threaten Angola, the Bahamas, Brazil, China, Mexico, Norway, India, Malaysia, Russia, Vietnam, or Venezuela. The U.S. dilemma starts with the contradiction inherent in maintaining a blockade to destroy the same government which the United States now depends upon to help protect the Gulf and coastal states from another platform disaster. In 2006, the Bush administration ordered a Mexico City hotel to kick out Cubans attending a meeting with U.S. oil executives on environmental issues. But during the 2010 BP disaster, when it was a matter of U.S. interest, Cuban officials were invited to a conference in Florida on environmental protection in the Gulf. The sanctions themselves work against protecting the Gulf. Repsol, for example, had to turn to China for the rig because, under U.S. law, no one can sell anything to Cuba with more than 10 percent content that is made or patented in the United States. Ironically, the closest source for Scarabeo 9’s blowout protector (the part that failed on the Deepwater Horizon well) is the United States, but it is apparently in the interests of the United States to deny a license for its sale to Cuba. Signs of Cooperation and Indecision The White House response to all this is a kind of policy opacity where intentions are measured by degrees of inaction. Interior Secretary Ken Salazar would only say that the administration was monitoring the situation and that Cuba’s plans were “an issue of concern.”7 The administration also signaled that it did not want to act on Nelson’s suggestion of tearing up the 1977 agreement. National Security Adviser James Jones wrote Nelson that, “Although we share your concerns regarding the potential risks posed by the development of offshore oil drilling along the Cuban coast, withdrawal from the Maritime Boundary Agreement would be detrimental to U.S. national interests.”8 As for Nelson’s other big idea of muscling the Spanish government into forcing Repsol out, the administration has quietly let Secretary Salazar give Repsol his approval from Europe. Salazar met with Repsol representatives while attending an energy conference in Madrid. They assured him that the company would observe strict U.S. environmental rules, and would allow U.S. inspectors to observe. The U.S. Embassy said there was no pressure on the company and the United States had no objections to its Cuban operations.9 Stumbling on a Regional Energy Bloc The administration is surely aware that Cuban oil is not just another thing to squelch through sanctions. Cuba is part of Petrocaribe, a region-wide program of exploration, refining, and distribution backed by Venezuelan oil. PDVSA ships 200,000 barrels per day to Petrocaribe member states under a liberal payment plan with up to twenty-five years to pay. Petrocaribe benefits many Latin American and Caribbean countries that the United States has always sought to influence, control, and sometimes occupy. Petrocaribe began in 2005 as an oil-sharing plan that, instead of seeking absolute trade advantage over non-producing countries, sought to strengthen them, in order to create the basis for political and economic independence from the United States. This is in contrast to capitalism’s dealings with producing states in Africa and the Middle East that have historically been exploited and dependent. Whether or not Cuba becomes an oil exporter, it plays a geographically and operationally central role as Petrocaribe’s refining, storage, and shipping center. In a joint venture, PDVSA and Cupet have enlarged the Soviet-built refinery in Cienfuegos, while others are to be built in Santiago de Cuba and Matanzas. Matanzas will refine crude from the EEZ operations and ship it from an upgraded super-tanker facility at the Port of Matanzas. The Port of Mariel will be developed with Brazilian capital to serve as the base for EEZ drilling operations. This vertically integrated system is being planned to expand the energy bloc without U.S. participation.10 Petrocaribe also acts as an infrastructure development machine with capital investments in member countries, including a generating plant in Haiti, a refinery in Nicaragua, the expansion of a refinery in Jamaica, and various renewable energy projects. And where the oil goes, there also are projects in non-energy areas, such as tourism, health services, housing, and education. Cables released by WikiLeaks have exposed failed attempts by U.S. oil companies and the embassy in Haiti to prevent Venezuelan oil from getting to Haiti and saving it $100 million a year. The fact that in a powerless country like Haiti, then President René Préval could win the struggle against Exxon, Chevron, and the State Department suggests the problems that trying to take away cheap oil might create in the fifteen other countries that benefit from Petrocaribe.11 The Honduran coup of 2009 is another example of how regional independence, fired by affordable oil, allows states to choose between sticking with the United States and joining Latin America. With obvious U.S. support, right-wing elements removed Honduran President Manuel Zelaya in 2009. One of his alleged offenses was that he enrolled Honduras in Petrocaribe, placing Honduras under the influence of Venezuelan President Hugo Chávez. But Honduras’s exit from the energy alliance resulted in oil import costs skyrocketing. Now, prominent business leader and coup-backer Adolfo Facussé is asking President Porfirio Lobo to rejoin Petrocaribe because of the high cost of oil. During the coup, Facussé had warned that along with cheap oil from Venezuela came the importation of “neo-communism.”12
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#### We control time frame and magnitude – deal failure draws in global powers and goes nuclear within months

PressTV 11/13

Global nuclear conflict between US, Russia, China likely if Iran talks fail, 11/13/13, http://www.presstv.ir/detail/2013/11/13/334544/global-nuclear-war-likely-if-iran-talks-fail/

A global conflict between the US, Russia, and China is likely in the coming months should the world powers fail to reach a nuclear deal with Iran, an American analyst says.¶ “If the talks fail, if the agreements being pursued are not successfully carried forward and implemented, then there would be enormous international pressure to drive towards a conflict with Iran before [US President Barack] Obama leaves office and that’s a very great danger that no one can underestimate the importance of,” senior editor at the Executive Intelligence Review Jeff Steinberg told Press TV on Wednesday. ¶ “The United States could find itself on one side and Russia and China on the other and those are the kinds of conditions that can lead to miscalculation and general roar,” Steinberg said. ¶ “So the danger in this situation is that if these talks don’t go forward, we could be facing a global conflict in the coming months and years and that’s got to be avoided at all costs when you’ve got countries like the United States, Russia, and China with” their arsenals of “nuclear weapons,” he warned. ¶ The warning came one day after the White House told Congress not to impose new sanctions against Tehran because failure in talks with Iran could lead to war.

#### Negotiations are now or never – means the DA turns case before case turns the DA because waiting too long allows Iranian hardliners to scuttle negotiations

**Haass, 9/29/13** – president of the Council on Foreign Relations (Richard, “A Diplomatic Dance Will Be No Waltz for Either Iran or America” Financial Times,

<http://www.cfr.org/iran/diplomatic-dance-no-waltz-either-iran-america/p31517>)//VP

We will know soon enough. Both sides are in a hurry. The new Iranian leaders worry that time is against them. They fear that conservatives defeated in the June elections will rally, while the public will grow impatient if the sanctions-battered economy does not improve. Americans worry Iran is using time to get closer to creating an infrastructure able to produce fissile material, weaponise it and put warheads on missiles. Israeli officials do not hide their belief that under Mr Rouhani Iran will "smile its way to the bomb". All of which means this diplomatic dance will be no waltz. Sooner rather than later – certainly before next year is out – we should know if we will be toasting success or managing a crisis.

**The Cuba lobby will block the plan – it costs capital to get past it**

**LeoGrande, 13 -** professor in the department of government at American University's School of Public Affairs in Washington, D.C.(William, “The Cuba Lobby” Foreign Policy, 4/11,

<http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2013/04/11/the_cuba_lobby_jay_z>

Today, U.S. relations with Latin America are suffering from an equally irrational policy toward Cuba -- a policy designed in the 1960s to overthrow Fidel Castro's government and which, more than 50 years later, is no closer to success. Like U.S. policy toward China in the 1950s and 1960s, policy toward Cuba is frozen in place by a domestic political lobby, this one with roots in the electorally pivotal state of Florida. The Cuba Lobby combines the carrot of political money with the stick of political denunciation to keep wavering Congress members, government bureaucrats, and even presidents in line behind a policy that, as President Barack Obama himself admits, has failed for half a century and is supported by virtually no other countries. (The last time it came to a vote in the U.N. General Assembly, only Israel and the Pacific island of Palau sided with the United States.) Of course, the news at this point is not that a Cuba Lobby exists, but that it astonishingly lives on -- even during the presidency of Obama, who publicly vowed to pursue a new approach to Cuba, but whose policy has been stymied thus far. Like the China Lobby, the Cuba Lobby isn't one organization but a loose-knit conglomerate of exiles, sympathetic members of Congress, and nongovernmental organizations, some of which comprise a self-interested industry nourished by the flow of "democracy promotion" money from the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID). And like its Sino-obsessed predecessor, the Cuba Lobby was launched at the instigation of conservative Republicans in government who needed outside backers to advance their partisan policy aims. In the 1950s, they were Republican members of Congress battling New Dealers in the Truman administration over Asia policy. In the 1980s, they were officials in Ronald Reagan's administration battling congressional Democrats over Central America policy. At the Cuba Lobby's request, Reagan created Radio Martí, modeled on Radio Free Europe, to broadcast propaganda to Cuba. He named Jorge Mas Canosa, founder of the Cuban American National Foundation (CANF), to chair the radio's oversight board. President George H.W. Bush followed with TV Martí. Sen. Jesse Helms (R-N.C.) and Rep. Dan Burton (R-Ind.) authored the 1996 Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act, writing the economic embargo into law so no president could change it without congressional approval. Founded at the suggestion of Richard V. Allen, Reagan's first national security advisor, CANF became one of the most powerful ethnic foreign-policy organizations in the United States and was the linchpin of the Cuba Lobby until Mas Canosa's death in 1997. "No individual had more influence over United States policies toward Cuba over the past two decades than Jorge Mas Canosa," the New York Times editorialized. In Washington, CANF built its reputation by spreading campaign contributions to bolster friends and punish enemies. In 1988, CANF money helped Joe Lieberman defeat incumbent Sen. Lowell Weicker, whom Lieberman accused of being soft on Castro because he visited Cuba and advocated better relations. Weicker's defeat sent a chilling message to other members of Congress: challenge the Cuba Lobby at your peril. In 1992, according to Peter Stone's reporting in National Journal, New Jersey Democrat Sen. Robert Torricelli, seduced by the Cuba Lobby's political money, reversed his position on Havana and wrote the Cuban Democracy Act, tightening the embargo. Today, the political action arm of the Cuba Lobby is the U.S.-Cuba Democracy PAC, which hands out more campaign dollars than CANF's political action arm did even at its height -- more than $3 million in the last five national elections.

**Cuban lobby opposes cooperative drilling – wants to sanction businesses that participate**

**Matienzo, 11** - Correspondent for Radio Cubana (Fidel Redón, “The U.S., Beyond the fear of an oil spill off the Cuban coast, 6/28, <http://www.cubanradio.cu/index.php/feature-articles-about-radio/21-media-campaign-against-cuba/138-the-us-beyond-the-fear-of-an-oil-spill-off-the-cuban-coast>) //LA

A new campaign by the Miami Cuban American mafia, led by Rep. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen and David Rivera, is underway with the pretext of an alleged danger posed to the security of the Florida coasts, while their real intention is to prevent de advancement of Cuban economy. In a recent article posted on the online version of The Voice of Russia titled "Oil is more important than communism," the author Boris Volkhonsky stresses that the recent discovery of huge deposits of oil in the Cuban coast has triggered a wave of controversial reactions by the United States. "The oil reserve in deep waters (Gulf of Mexico) is estimated at between five and 20 million barrels which,  in any case, would  allow Cuba to stop being an oil importer to become an oil exporter," the article reads. Although this event could be encouraging for Cuba, there is no doubt that a new campaign against the Revolution is taking place now under the excuse that drilling operations would affect the security of the Florida, in the event of an oil spill like the one that occurred last year in the British Petroleum platform. As expected, the anti-Cuban mafia has reacted nervously, with congress people such as Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, president of the House Foreign Relations Committee, who has submitted three draft legislations against companies that do business with Havana to undertake the oil and gas exploration. As noted in a recent Round Table of the Cuban radio and television by commentator Reynaldo Taladrid, "these intentions would deny U.S. visas to  executives of these entities that would cooperate with Cuba, along with other arbitrary actions, though the real purpose is to continue hurting our economy. "For instance, Rep. David Rivera, co-sponsor of the draft legislations and a supporter of  the traditional anti-Cuban elements, alleged the dangers of oil spills in the drilling projects planned by island, and he even anticipates that under current U.S. blockade laws the United States would not provide assistance if any accident happens.In fact , as Boris Volkhonsky said  in his article, posted on The Voice of Russia, these legislators are concerned that when Cuban economy can develop with the project thus making it more difficult to put an end to what Washington calls "tyranny."The explorations will begin next September by Spain´s Repsol along with Norway´s Statoil and a unit from India´s ONGC by using a Chinese platform called Scarabeo 9. This means that U.S. companies will be overlooked by their direct competitors in Europe, China and India - as the very blockade imposed by the imperialist power on the Caribbean island prevents them from doing just any kind of business with Cuba.

**Political opposition outweighs the turn**

**Ratliff, 13 -** research fellow and former curator of the Americas Collection at the Hoover Institution. He is also a research fellow of the Independent Institute. An expert on Latin America, China, and US foreign policy, he has written extensively on how traditional cultures and institutions influence current conditions and on prospects for economic and political development in East/Southeast Asia and Latin America (William, “Cuba's Tortured Transition” 1/30,

<http://www.hoover.org/publications/defining-ideas/article/139281>

A New Policy to Cuba Since the early 1990s U.S. “proactive” policies have done more to stoke than reduce domestic tensions in Cuba, though we profess to seek a “peaceful transition.” Most U.S. legislators have supported pro-embargo Cuban-Americans even though Gallup polls have long shown that most Americans favor diplomatic relations with Havana and lifting the embargo. On balance, politicians don’t think Cuba policy is important enough to be worth stirring up the hornets in the still fairly militant and well-financed pro-embargo lobby. Not only have all presidential candidates including Obama supported the embargo, most have resisted even seriously discussing it.

**5) Any small action links – hardliners hate any engagement with Cuba**

**Laverty, 11** – former Senior Program Associate at The Center for Democracy in the Americas (Collin, “Cuba’s New Resolve Economic Reform and its Implications for U.S. Policy”, 2011, http://democracyinamericas.org/pdfs/CDA\_Cubas\_New\_Resolve.pdf)//eekg

In the interim, these recommendations could make an important difference. They would put the interests of the United States into alignment with the humanitarian interests of the Cuban people, send a long overdue message of encouragement to the advocates of reform on the island, and demonstrate that our country is finally ready to move beyond Cold War policies of the past and modernize our approach toward Cuba for the 21st Century. None of these actions would sit well with the hardest of the hardliners in the Cuban American community or their representatives in Washington. Their terms of surrender for Cuba, as Phil Peters pointed out in his Cuban Triangle Blog, are written into the statutes of the U.S. embargo. In Congress, legislators including Representatives Mario Díaz-Balart, David Rivera and others, are trying to reverse President Obama’s travel reforms, dialing back family travel and remittances to the levels imposed by President Bush.134 They will certainly fight actions that loosen restrictions to help push along Cuba’s economic reforms.