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#### **A. Interpretation – the aff must defend an advocacy statement that is an example of the resolution – “USFG should” means that debate is solely about government policy**

**Ericson 3** (Jon M., Dean Emeritus of the College of Liberal Arts – California Polytechnic U., et al., The Debater’s Guide, Third Edition, p. 4)

The Proposition of Policy: Urging Future Action In policy propositions, each topic contains certain key elements, although they have slightly different functions from comparable elements of value-oriented propositions. 1. An agent doing the acting ---“The United States” in “The United States should adopt a policy of free trade.” Like the object of evaluation in a proposition of value, the agent is the subject of the sentence. 2. The verb should—the first part of a verb phrase that urges action. 3. An action verb to follow *should* in the *should*-verb combination. For example, should adopt here means to put a program or policy into action though governmental means. 4. A specification of directions or a limitation of the action desired. The phrase *free trade*, for example, gives direction and limits to the topic, which would, for example, eliminate consideration of increasing tariffs, discussing diplomatic recognition, or discussing interstate commerce. Propositions of policy deal with future action. Nothing has yet occurred. The entire debate is about whether something ought to occur. What you agree to do, then, when you accept the *affirmative side* in such a debate is to offer sufficient and compelling reasons for an audience to perform the future action that you propose.

#### **B. Vote neg –**

#### **1) Clash – topical limits tell the negative what they do and do not have to prepare for, forcing a debate outside the topic means the negative will always be less prepared because we can't guess in advance what the affirmative will discuss. This makes substantive victory impossible and expands our research burden – the affirmative only has to prepare 1 non topical case but we have to prepare for all of them meaning we will be spread too thin to compete or engage the substance meaningfully.**

#### **2) Vote for the BEST methodology SANS the permutation.**

#### **a) Permutations are illegitimate in this instance -**

#### **b) No predictable stable advocacy – there is no advocacy statement.**

#### **c) Reciprocity - No check on aff ground means there should be check on negative ground – the aff traditionally has had to be topical and the neg counterplan or counteradvocacy ground was checked by being competitive. This restores fairness.**

#### **d) Method focus makes competition impossible – methods can often be combined for multiple. Make the affirmative stake their ground and test their advocacy my testing with a different method.**

#### **e) Left against left debates are impossible in a world where the aff makes truth statements, leaving the negative to say privilege good or racism good, which is obviously morally reprehensible.**
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#### Text: The President of the United States should substantially increase lobbying and persuasion efforts, using available political resources, on behalf of Congressional enactment of Trade Promotion Authority.

#### An Obama push would ensure passage of TPA

Green and Goodman 4/1 Michael Green is senior vice president for Asia at the Center for Strategic and International Studies and a professor at Georgetown University and Matthew P. Goodman, a former member of the NSC staff in the Obama administration, is chair in political economy at CSIS, Why Obama and Abe should take lead on TPP, 4/1/14, http://globalpublicsquare.blogs.cnn.com/2014/04/01/why-obama-and-abe-should-take-lead-on-tpp/

Barack Obama has described himself as America’s first Pacific president. Prime Minister Shinzo Abe has pledged that Japan “is not now and will never be a tier-two country.” Before they meet in Tokyo this month, the two leaders have a unique opportunity to prove these words true by resolving their differences over the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP).¶ The 12 Asia-Pacific economies in the TPP negotiations are working toward a comprehensive, high-standard, “21st century” trade agreement. A TPP deal among a group of countries representing some 40 percent of the world economy would give a significant boost to global growth and jobs and help shape the rules of the international trading system for years to come.¶ The United States and Japan are by far the largest participants in TPP, accounting for three-quarters of the group’s economic heft. A TPP deal would effectively amount to a bilateral free trade agreement – a prize that has eluded the two countries for decades as they have sparred over trade and, more recently, pursued FTAs with other countries.¶ The stakes for both Japan and the United States could not be higher. First, the economic benefits of a successful TPP agreement would be substantial. The Peterson Institute for International Economics has estimated the annual income gains to the United States and Japan by 2025 at $76.6 billion and $104.6 billion, respectively.¶ Second, both countries have a shared interest in updating and upholding the rules of international trade and investment to meet 21st century realities. Washington and Tokyo have long been champions of intellectual property rights (IPR) protection, strong labor and environmental standards, and transparent regulatory practices. Through TPP, they have a chance not only to strengthen global rules in these areas, but also to create disciplines on new issues such as digital commerce and state-owned enterprises (SOEs).¶ Finally, TPP has enormous strategic significance for both countries. It would strengthen the U.S.-Japan alliance, embed the United States more deeply in the Asia-Pacific region, and underscore American and Japanese leadership in the region. By setting the gold standard for other major trade negotiations, including the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership, as well as multilateral talks in Geneva, it would also reinforce the two countries’ leadership on the global stage.¶ The TPP negotiations have been slow going, with over 20 rounds and several missed deadlines since the talks were launched four years ago. Substantial progress has been made across most of the agreement’s 29 chapters, but differences remain on IPR protection, state-owned enterprises disciplines, environmental standards, and market access. One of the biggest remaining issues – of importance to most countries in the room – is greater access to Japan’s protected agriculture market.¶ The domestic politics of TPP are difficult for all 12 participating countries, not least Japan and the United States. Abe faces a formidable agriculture lobby and an array of pressing policy challenges, from restarting nuclear power to carrying out structural reform under his program of “Abenomics,” each of which will cost substantial political capital.¶ For his part, President Obama faces a U.S. Congress where the leadership of his own party has made clear they aren’t yet willing to give him trade promotion authority to complete TPP and where relations with the Republican leadership are toxic. The president has been reluctant to push for TPA ahead of mid-term elections in November, when the Democratic majority in the Senate is on the line.¶ But despite the difficult politics, now is the time for the two leaders to spend some political capital on TPP. They should both renew their commitment to the deal and show the flexibility needed to close the remaining gaps in the negotiating room.¶ President Obama should signal publicly – ideally through a speech on U.S. soil before he travels to Asia in late April – that TPP is critical to his strategy of “rebalancing” to the Asia Pacific and that he’s willing to push Congress for TPA after the mid-terms. This would reassure those at home and in the region who doubt his commitment to the rebalance and to trade, and also give other TPP negotiating partners confidence that Washington will uphold its end of the bargain if they reveal their bottom line now.

**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.

#### Losses prevent Democratic coalitions

Loomis 7 Dr. Andrew J. Loomis is a Visiting Fellow at the Center for a New American Security, and Department of Government at Georgetown University, “Leveraging legitimacy in the crafting of U.S. foreign policy”, March 2, 2007, pg 36-37, http://citation.allacademic.com//meta/p\_mla\_apa\_research\_citation/1/7/9/4/8/pages179487/p179487-36.php

Declining political authority encourages defection. American political analyst Norman Ornstein writes of the domestic context, In a system where a President has limited formal power, perception matters. The reputation for success—the belief by other political actors that even when he looks down, a president will find a way to pull out a victory—is the most valuable resource a chief executive can have. Conversely, the widespread belief that the Oval Office occupant is on the defensive, on the wane or without the ability to win under adversity can lead to disaster, as individual lawmakers calculate who will be on the winning side and negotiate accordingly. In simple terms, winners win and losers lose more often than not. Failure begets failure. In short, a president experiencing declining amounts of political capital has diminished capacity to advance his goals. As a result, political allies perceive a decreasing benefit in publicly tying themselves to the president, and an increasing benefit in allying with rising centers of authority. A president’s incapacity and his record of success are interlocked and reinforce each other. Incapacity leads to political failure, which reinforces perceptions of incapacity. This feedback loop accelerates decay both in leadership capacity and defection by key allies. The central point of this review of the presidential literature is that the sources of presidential influence—and thus their prospects for enjoying success in pursuing preferred foreign policies—go beyond the structural factors imbued by the Constitution. Presidential authority is affected by ideational resources in the form of public perceptions of legitimacy. The public offers and rescinds its support in accordance with normative trends and historical patterns, non-material sources of power that affects the character of U.S. policy, foreign and domestic.

#### TPA key to TPP and the Asia Pivot

Miller and Nadeau 1/31 Scott Miller holds the Scholl Chair in International Business at the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington, D.C. and Paul Nadeau is program manager and research associate with the Scholl Chair at CSIS. 1-31-2014 http://csis.org/publication/tpp-more-trade-agreement

The White House needs TPA because the TPP is the “pivot to Asia.” The military realignment is important, but the repositioning is mostly relative, driven by drawdowns in Iraq and Afghanistan. The Pivot is a political and economic realignment that aims to improve cooperation and integration among the United States and East Asia. Then-secretary of state Hillary Clinton said this explicitly in her Foreign Policy article, “America’s Pacific Century,” when she wrote “[O]pen markets in Asia provide the United States with unprecedented opportunities for investment, trade, and access to cutting-edge technology. Our economic recovery at home will depend on exports and the ability of American firms to tap into the vast and growing consumer base of Asia.” Military presence was only one out of the six courses of action that Secretary Clinton used to define the Asia Pivot, while the TPP is arguably the key ingredient of three (deepening America's relationships with rising powers, including China; engaging with regional multilateral institutions; expanding trade and investment). If solving the financial crisis and passing health care reform were President Obama’s key domestic policy victories, then the Asia Pivot is primed to be the area where he beneficially changes the course of U.S. foreign policy (the discussions with Iran are still too nascent to determine how far reaching they will become).¶ Today, there are tensions among Asia’s large powers, and the United States is likely the single entity that can influence the situation. The United States and Asia need each other and TPP is the vehicle that can functionally, economically, and politically help bind them together. The Members of Congress and staff that have drafted the TPA bill have put admirable effort into legislation. Trade negotiators working on TPP have been equally tireless. But TPP, and Asia, cannot wait forever. Many in Asia are already concerned that the Pivot was only superficial and that United States is already moving on. If TPA and TPP remain framed as a trade issue, with all of the political baggage that comes with that, the Administration risks putting TPP on ice for 2014.¶ Alternatively, the Administration can influence perceptions by framing the TPP as a strategic goal that will be the cornerstone of the Asia Pivot. This would reassure U.S. partners in Asia and answer domestic critics who argue that the Pivot lacks substance. Moreover, it would give the President an achievable goal in advance of his April trip to Asia.

#### Solves nuclear conflict

Klingner 13 Bruce, senior research fellow for Northeast Asia at The Heritage Foundation, "The U.S. and Its Allies Need a Strong Defense," March-11, http://www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2013/03/11/will-south-korea-and-japan-take-the-nuclear-route/us-and-its-allies-need-strong-military-to-deter-north-korean-threat

So much for basketball diplomacy. Self-appointed ambassador Dennis Rodman’s trip to Pyongyang didn’t keep his new B.F.F., North Korean leader Kim Jong-un, from threatening a pre-emptive nuclear strike that would turn Washington into a “sea of flames.”¶ Rodman’s trip can be written off as narcissistic self-promotion. But Kim’s bombastic rhetoric shouldn’t be dismissed so easily. Pyongyang’s two deadly acts of war against South Korea in 2010 and its long history of terrorist acts show the regime often follows through on its threats.¶ A nuclear attack on the United States or full-scale invasion of South Korea remains highly unlikely, however, as either would ensure North Korea’s destruction. But it is only a matter of time before the regime launches another tactical-level attack on the South.¶ There is now a greater risk of miscalculation and escalation, due to new leaders in both Koreas. Kim Jong-un lacks experience and may stumble across red lines that his predecessors would have known not to cross. Moreover, he may be emboldened by North Korea’s new nuclear muscle and the knowledge that neither Washington nor Seoul ever responded to previous attacks.¶ Newly inaugurated South Korean President Park Geun-hye criticized her country’s past passivity and vowed to hit back hard and “exponentially” in case of another attack. The danger is that even a low-level retaliation could escalate into an all-out conflict. As a U.S. general on the peninsula warned, “Before you start even a limited response, you better be prepared to go all-in.”¶ Since repeated diplomatic efforts have failed to curb North Korea’s reckless behavior, the United States and its allies need strong military forces to protect themselves. Unfortunately, President Obama’s “Asia Pivot” was, itself, little more than rhetoric. Not a single unit will pivot from Afghanistan, Iraq or Europe into the Pacific. And massive defense budget cuts undermine U.S. military capabilities and credibility.

## 1NC

#### Interpretation – economic enagement is 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 are not government to government

#### **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.

#### Global movements against neoliberalism will be effective now---the plan’s U.S.-driven economic goals causes extinction

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

The world is in ecological and economic meltdown. Ecological limits and limits set by human dignity and human equality are being ruthlessly violated. Adjustment is an imperative. However, there are vital ways that differentiate the adjustment by the rich and powerful and the processes cc of adjustment demanded by the popular will of people everywhere. The rich would like to make the poor and working people pay for adjustment. People want the rich to pay through higher taxes, including the Tobin Tax on financial transactions, and through regulation for stopping the robbery of natural resources and public goods. The dominant economic model based on limitless growth on a limited planet is leading to an overshoot of the human use of the earth’s resources. This is leading to an ecological catastrophe. It is also leading to intense and violent resource grab of the remaining resources of the earth by the rich from the poor. The resource grab is an adjustment by the rich and powerful to a shrinking resource base – land, biodiversity, water – without adjusting the old resource intensive, limitless growth paradigm to the new reality. Its only outcome can be ecological scarcity for the poor in the short term, with deepening poverty and deprivation. In the long run it means the extinction of our species, as climate catastrophe and extinction of other species makes the planet un-inhabitable for human societies. Failure to make an ecological adjustment to planetary limits and ecological justice is a threat to human survival. The Green Economy being pushed at Rio+20 could well become the biggest resource grabs in human history with corporations appropriating the planet’s green wealth, the biodiversity, to become the green oil to make bio fuel, energy plastics, chemicals – everything that the petrochemical era based on fossil fuels gave us. Movements worldwide have started to say “No to the Green Economy of the one percent.” But an ecological adjustment is possible, and is happening. This ecological adjustment involves seeing ourselves as a part of the fragile ecological web, not outside and above it, immune from the ecological consequences of our actions. Ecological adjustment also implies that we see ourselves as members of the earth community, sharing the earth’s resources equitably with all species and within the human community. Ecological adjustment requires an end to resource grab, and the privatization of our land, bio diversity and seeds, water and atmosphere. Ecological adjustment is based on the recovery of the commons and the creation of Earth Democracy. The dominant economic model based on limitless growth on a limited planet is leading to an overshoot of the human use of the earth’s resources. This is leading to an ecological catastrophe. It is also leading to intense and violent resource grab of the remaining resources of the earth by the rich from the poor. The resource grab is an adjustment by the rich and powerful to a shrinking resource base – land, biodiversity, water – without adjusting the old resource intensive, limitless growth paradigm to the new reality. Its only outcome can be ecological scarcity for the poor in the short term, with deepening poverty and deprivation. In the long run it means the extinction of our species, as climate catastrophe and extinction of other species makes the planet un-inhabitable for human societies. Failure to make an ecological adjustment to planetary limits and ecological justice is a threat to human survival. The Green Economy being pushed at Rio +20 could well become the biggest resource grabs in human history with corporations appropriating the planet’s green wealth, the biodiversity, to become the green oil to make bio-fuel, energy plastics, chemicals – everything that the petrochemical era based on fossil fuels gave us. Movements worldwide have started to say “No to the Green Economy of the 1%”. But an ecological adjustment is possible, and is happening. This ecological adjustment involves seeing ourselves as a part of the fragile ecological web, not outside and above it, immune from the ecological consequences of our actions. Ecological adjustment also implies that we see ourselves as members of the earth community, sharing the earth’s resources equitably with all species and within the human community. Ecological adjustment requires an end to resource grab, and the privatization of our land, bio diversity and seeds, water and atmosphere. Ecological adjustment is based on the recovery of the commons and the creation of Earth Democracy. The dominant economic model based on resource monopolies and the rule of an oligarchy is not just in conflict with ecological limits of the planet. It is in conflict with the principles of democracy, and governance by the people, of the people, for the people. The adjustment from the oligarchy is to further strangle democracy and crush civil liberties and people’s freedom. Bharti Mittal’s statement that politics should not interfere with the economy reflects the mindset of the oligarchy that democracy can be done away with. This anti-democratic adjustment includes laws like homeland security in U.S., and multiple security laws in India. The calls for a democratic adjustment from below are witnessed worldwide in the rise of non-violent protests, from the Arab spring to the American autumn of “Occupy” and the Russian winter challenging the hijack of elections and electoral democracy. And these movements for democratic adjustment are also rising everywhere in response to the “austerity” programmes imposed by IMF, World Bank and financial institutions which created the financial crisis. The Third World had its structural Adjustment and Forced Austerity, through the 1980s and 1990s, leading to IMF riots. India’s structural adjustment of 1991 has given us the agrarian crisis with quarter million farmer suicides and food crisis pushing every 4th Indian to hunger and every 2nd Indian child to severe malnutrition; people are paying with their very lives for adjustment imposed by the World Bank/IMF. The trade liberalization reforms dismantled our food security system, based on universal PDS. It opened up the seed sector to seed MNCs. And now an attempt is being made through the Food Security Act to make our public feeding programmes a market for food MNCs. The forced austerity continues through imposition of so called reforms, such as Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) in retail, which would rob 50 million of their livelihoods in retail and millions more by changing the production system. Europe started having its forced austerity in 2010. And everywhere there are anti-austerity protests from U.K., to Italy, Greece, Spain, Ireland, Iceland, and Portugal. The banks which have created the crisis want society to adjust by destroying jobs and livelihoods, pensions and social security, public services and the commons. The people want financial systems to adjust to the limits set by nature, social justice and democracy. And the precariousness of the living conditions of the 99% has created a new class which Guy Standing calls the “Precariate”. If the Industrial Revolution gave us the industrial working class, the proletariat, globalization and the “free market” which is destroying the livelihoods of peasants in India and China through land grabs, or the chances of economic security for the young in what were the rich industrialized countries, has created a global class of the precarious. As Barbara Ehrenreich and John Ehrenreich have written in “The making of the American 99%”, this new class of the dispossessed and excluded include “middle class professional, factory workers, truck drivers, and nurses as well as the much poorer people who clean the houses, manicure the fingernails, and maintain the lawn of the affluent”. Forced austerity based on the old paradigm allows the 1% super rich, the oligarchs, to grab the planets resources while pushing out the 99% from access to resources, livelihoods, jobs and any form of freedom, democracy and economic security. It is often said that with increasing growth, India and China are replicating the resource intensive and wasteful lifestyles of the Western countries. The reality is that while a small 3 to 4% of India is joining the mad race for consuming the earth with more and more automobiles and air conditioners, the large majority of India is being pushed into “de-consumption” – losing their entitlements to basic needs of food and water because of resource and land grab, market grab, and destruction of livelihoods. The hunger and malnutrition crisis in India is an example of the “de-consumption” forced on the poor by the rich, through the imposed austerity built into the trade liberalization and “economic reform” policies. There is another paradigm emerging which is shared by Gandhi and the new movements of the 99%, the paradigm of voluntary simplicity of reducing one ecological foot print while increasing human well being for all. Instead of forced austerity that helps the rich become super rich, the powerful become totalitarian, chosen simplicity enables us all to adjust ecologically, to reduce over consumption of the planets resources, it allows us to adjust socially to enhance democracy and it creates a path for economic adjustment based on justice and equity. Forced austerity makes the poor and working families pay for the excesses of limitless greed and accumulation by the super rich. Chosen simplicity stops these excesses and allow us to flower into an Earth Democracy where the rights and freedoms of all species and all people are protected and respected.

#### The alternative is to 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.

## Case

#### Squo solves – travel restrictions are already decreasing, and the 1AC is already in the pipelines

Haven, 6/22 – Writer for the Associated Press and Associated Press bureau chief in Havana, Cuba. Previous Chief of Bureau/Spain and Portugal at The Associated Press, Chief of Bureau/Pakistan and Afghanistan at The Associated Press, Supervisory Editor of AP. Cornell University Graduate. (Paul, the Associates Press, “Cuba, U.S. take steps toward rapprochement,” 6/22/13, http://www.windsorstar.com/news/Cuba+take+steps+toward+rapprochement/8563980/story.html)//VP

They've hardly become allies, but Cuba and the U.S. have taken some baby steps toward rapprochement in recent weeks that have people on this island and in Washington wondering if a breakthrough in relations could be just over the horizon.¶ Skeptics caution that the Cold War enemies have been here many times before, only to fall back into old recriminations. But there are signs that views might be shifting on both sides of the Florida Straits.¶ In the past week, the two countries have held talks on resuming direct mail service, and announced a July 17 sit-down on migration issues. In May, a U.S. federal judge allowed a convicted Cuban intelligence agent to return to the island.¶ This month, Cuba informed the family of jailed U.S. government subcontractor Alan Gross that it would let an American doctor examine him, though the visit has apparently not yet happened. Castro has also ushered in a series of economic and social changes, including making it easier for Cubans to travel off the island.¶ Under the radar, diplomats on both sides describe a sea change in the tone of their dealings.¶ Only last year, Cuban state television was broadcasting grainy footage of American diplomats meeting with dissidents on Havana streets and publicly accusing them of being CIA frontmen. Today, U.S. diplomats in Havana and Cuban Foreign Ministry officials have easy contact, even sharing home phone numbers.¶ Josefina Vidal, Cuba's top diplomat for North American affairs, recently travelled to Washington and met twice with State Department officials - a visit that came right before the announcements of resumptions in the two sets of bilateral talks that had been suspended for more than two years. Washington has also granted visas to prominent Cuban officials, including the daughter of Cuba's president.¶ "These recent steps indicate a desire on both sides to try to move forward, but also a recognition on both sides of just how difficult it is to make real progress," said Robert Pastor, a professor of international relations at American University and former national security adviser on Latin America during the Carter administration.

#### Nuke war threat is real and o/w racism and invisible violence---their expansion of structural violence to an all-pervasive omnipresence makes preventing war impossible – also answers their value to life claim

**Boulding 78** - Ken is professor of economics and director, Center for Research on Conflict Resolution, University of Michigan, “Future Directions in Conflict and Peace Studies,” The Journal of Conflict Resolution, Vol. 22, No. 2 (Jun., 1978), pp. 342-354

Galtung is very legitimately interested in problems of world poverty and the failure of development of the really poor. He tried to amalga- mate this interest with the peace research interest in the more narrow sense. Unfortunately, he did this by downgrading the study of inter- national peace, labeling it "negative peace" (it should really have been labeled "negative war") and then developing the concept of "structural violence," which initially meant all those social structures and histories which produced an expectation of life less than that of the richest and longest-lived societies. He argued by analogy that if people died before the age, say, of 70 from avoidable causes, that this was a death in "war"' which could only be remedied by something called "positive peace." Unfortunately, the concept of structural violence was broadened, in the word of one slightly unfriendly critic, to include anything that Galtung did not like. Another factor in this situation was the feeling, certainly in the 1960s and early 1970s, that nuclear deterrence was actually succeeding as deterrence and that the problem of nuclear war had receded into the background. This it seems to me is a most danger- ous illusion and diverted conflict and peace research for ten years or more away from problems of disarmament and stable peace toward a grand, vague study of world developments, for which most of the peace researchers are not particularly well qualified. To my mind, at least, the quality of the research has suffered severely as a result.' The complex nature of the split within the peace research community is reflected in two international peace research organizations. The official one, the International Peace Research Association (IPRA), tends to be dominated by Europeans somewhat to the political left, is rather, hostile to the United States and to the multinational cor- porations, sympathetic to the New International Economic Order and thinks of itself as being interested in justice rather than in peace. The Peace Science Society (International), which used to be called the Peace Research Society (International), is mainly the creation of Walter Isard of the University of Pennsylvania. It conducts meetings all around the world and represents a more peace-oriented, quantitative, science- based enterprise, without much interest in ideology. COPRED, while officially the North American representative of IPRA, has very little active connection with it and contains within itself the same ideological split which, divides the peace research community in general. It has, however, been able to hold together and at least promote a certain amount of interaction between the two points of view. Again representing the "scientific" rather than the "ideological" point of view, we have SIPRI, the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, very generously (by the usual peace research stand- ards) financed by the Swedish government, which has performed an enormously useful service in the collection and publishing of data on such things as the war industry, technological developments, arma- ments, and the arms trade. The Institute is very largely the creation of Alva Myrdal. In spite of the remarkable work which it has done, how- ever, her last book on disarmament (1976) is almost a cry of despair over the folly and hypocrisy of international policies, the overwhelming power of the military, and the inability of mere information, however good, go change the course of events as we head toward ultimate ca- tastrophe. I do not wholly share her pessimism, but it is hard not to be a little disappointed with the results of this first generation of the peace research movement. Myrdal called attention very dramatically to the appalling danger in which Europe stands, as the major battleground between Europe, the United States, and the Soviet Union if war ever should break out. It may perhaps be a subconscious recognition-and psychological denial-of the sword of Damocles hanging over Europe that has made the European peace research movement retreat from the realities of the international system into what I must unkindly describe as fantasies of justice. But the American peace research community, likewise, has retreated into a somewhat niggling scientism, with sophisticated meth- odologies and not very many new ideas. I must confess that when I first became involved with the peace research enterprise 25 years ago I had hopes that it might produce some- thing like the Keynesian revolution in economics, which was the result of some rather simple ideas that had never really been thought out clearly before (though they had been anticipated by Malthus and others), coupled with a substantial improvement in the information system with the development of national income statistics which rein- forced this new theoretical framework. As a result, we have had in a single generation a very massive change in what might be called the "conventional wisdom" of economic policy, and even though this conventional wisdom is not wholly wise, there is a world of difference between Herbert Hoover and his total failure to deal with the Great Depression, simply because of everybody's ignorance, and the moder- ately skillful handling of the depression which followed the change in oil prices in 1-974, which, compared with the period 1929 to 1932, was little more than a bad cold compared with a galloping pneumonia. In the international system, however, there has been only glacial change in the conventional wisdom. There has been some improvement. Kissinger was an improvement on John Foster Dulles. We have had the beginnings of detente, and at least the possibility on the horizon of stable peace between the United States and the Soviet Union, indeed in the whole temperate zone-even though the tropics still remain uneasy and beset with arms races, wars, and revolutions which we cannot really afford. Nor can we pretend that peace around the temper- ate zone is stable enough so that we do not have to worry about it. The qualitative arms race goes on and could easily take us over the cliff. The record of peace research in the last generation, therefore, is one of very partial success. It has created a discipline and that is something of long-run consequence, most certainly for the good. It has made very little dent on the conventional wisdom of the policy makers anywhere in the world. It has not been able to prevent an arms race, any more, I suppose we might say, than the Keynesian economics has been able to prevent inflation. But whereas inflation is an inconvenience, the arms race may well be another catastrophe. Where, then, do we go from here? Can we see new horizons for peace and conflict research to get it out of the doldrums in which it has been now for almost ten years? The challenge is surely great enough. It still remains true that war, the breakdown of Galtung's "negative peace," remains the greatest clear and present danger to the human race, a danger to human survival far greater than poverty, or injustice, or oppression, desirable and necessary as it is to eliminate these things. Up to the present generation, war has been a cost and an inconven- ience to the human race, but it has rarely been fatal to the process of evolutionary development as a whole. It has probably not absorbed more than 5% of human time, effort, and resources. Even in the twenti- eth century, with its two world wars and innumerable smaller ones, it has probably not acounted for more than 5% of deaths, though of course a larger proportion of premature deaths. Now, however, ad- vancing technology is creating a situation where in the first place we are developing a single world system that does not have the redundancy of the many isolated systems of the past and in which therefore if any- thing goes wrong everything goes wrong. The Mayan civilization could collapse in 900 A.D., and collapse almost irretrievably without Europe or China even being aware of the fact. When we had a number of iso- lated systems, the catastrophe in one was ultimately recoverable by migration from the surviving systems. The one-world system, therefore, which science, transportation, and communication are rapidly giving us, is inherently more precarious than the many-world system of the past. It is all the more important, therefore, to make it internally robust and capable only of recoverable catastrophes. The necessity for stable peace, therefore, increases with every improvement in technology, either of war or of peacex

#### Consequences first

**Issac 02**.,( Jeffery C. Professor of political science at Indiana-Bloomington & Director of the Center for the Study of Democracy and Public Life. PhD Yale University. From “Ends, Means, and Politics.” Dissent Magazine. Volume 49. Issue # 2. Available online @ subscribing institutions using Proquest. Herm

As a result, the most important political questions are simply not asked. It is assumed that U.S. military intervention is an act of "aggression," but no consideration is given to the aggression to which intervention is a response. The status quo ante in Afghanistan is not, as peace activists would have it, peace, but rather terrorist violence abetted by a regime--the Taliban--that rose to power through brutality and repression. This requires us to ask a question that most "peace" activists would prefer not to ask: What should be done to respond to the violence of a Saddam Hussein, or a Milosevic, or a Taliban regime? What means are likely to stop violence and bring criminals to justice? Calls for diplomacyand international law are well intended and important; they implicate a decent and civilized ethic of global order. But they arealsovague and empty, because they are not accompanied by any account of how diplomacy or international law can work effectively to address the problem at hand. The campus left offers no such account. To do so would require it to contemplate tragic choices in which moral goodness is of limited utility. Here what matters is not purity of intention but the intelligent exercise of power. Power is not a dirty word or an unfortunate feature of the world. It is the core of politics. Power is the ability to effect outcomes in the world. Politics, in large part, involves contests over the distribution and use of power. To accomplish anything in the political world, one must attend to the means that are necessary to bring it about. And to develop such means is to develop, and to exercise, power. To say this is not to say that power is beyond morality. It is to say that power is not reducible to morality. As writers such as Niccolo Machiavelli, Max Weber, Reinhold Niebuhr, and Hannah Arendt have taught, an unyielding concern with moral goodness undercuts political responsibility.The concern may be morally laudable, reflecting a kind of personal integrity, but it suffers from three fatal flaws: (1) It fails to see that the purity of one's intention does not ensure the achievement of what one intends.Abjuring violence or refusing to make common cause with morally compromised parties may seem like the right thing; but if such tactics entail impotence, then it is hard to view them as serving any moral good beyond the clean conscience of their supporters; (2) it fails to see that in a world of real violence and injustice, moral purity is not simply a form of powerlessness; it is often a form of complicity in injustice. This is why, from the standpoint of politics--as opposed to religion--pacifism is always a potentially immoral stand.In categorically repudiating violence, it refuses in principle to oppose certain violent injustices with any effect; and (3) it fails to see that politics is as much about unintended consequences as it is about intentions; it is the effects of action, rather than the motives of action, that is most significant. Just as the alignment with "good" may engender impotence, it is often the pursuit of "good" that generates evil. This is the lesson of communism in the twentieth century: it is not enough that one's goals be sincere or idealistic; it is equally important, always, to ask about the effects of pursuing these goalsand to judge these effects in pragmatic and historically contextualized ways. Moral absolutism inhibits this judgment. It alienates those who are not true believers. It promotes arrogance. And it undermines political effectiveness.

#### Their root cause claims are false – no moncausality and goes the other way

**Goldstein 2**

Joshua S., Professor Emeritus of International Relations, American University (Washington, DC) Research Scholar, University of Massachusetts and Nonresident Sadat Senior Fellow, CIDCM, University of Maryland War and Gender , P. 412 2k2

First, peace activists face a dilemma in thinking about causes of war and working for peace. Many peace scholars and activists support the approach, “if you want peace, work for justice”. Then if one believes that sexism contributes to war, one can work for gender justice specifically (perhaps among others) in orde2r to pursue peace. Thisapproach brings strategic allies to the peace movement (women, labor, minorities), but rests on the assumption that injustices causewar. The evidence in this book suggests that causality runs at least as strongly the other way. War is not a product of capitalism, imperialism, gender, innate aggression, or any other single cause, although all of these influences wars’ outbreaks and outcomes. Rather, war has in part fueledand sustained these and other injustices.  So, “if you want peace, work for peace.” Indeed, if you want justice (gener and others), work for peace. Causality does not run just upward through the levels of analysis from types of individuals, societies, and governments up to war. It runs downward too. Enloe suggests that changes in attitudes toward war and the military may be the most important way to “reverse women’s oppression/” The dilemma is that peace work focused on justice brings to the peace movement energy, allies and moral grounding, yet, in light of this book’s evidence, the emphasis on injustice as the main cause of war seems to be empirically inadequate
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#### Their knowledge claims 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

#### a. empirics—the track record of US involvement in latin america proves that the way politics function now create worst forms of violence –history proves that the impact is serial policy failure – you must prioritize the invisible violence of neoliberalism

-market society normalizes spectacular violence globally and renders billions disposable—grinding structural inequality is 100% probable and turns the aff

**Scheper-Hughes and Bourgois, 04** (Prof of Anthropology @ Cal-Berkely; Prof of Anthropology @ UPenn)(Nancy and Philippe, Introduction: Making Sense of Violence, in Violence in War and Peace, pg. 19-22)//VP

This large and at first sight “messy” Part VII is central to this anthology’s thesis. It encompasses everything from the routinized, bureaucratized, and utterly banal violence of children dying of hunger and maternal despair in Northeast Brazil (Scheper-Hughes, Chapter 33) to elderly African Americans dying of heat stroke in Mayor Daly’s version of US apartheid in Chicago’s South Side (Klinenberg, Chapter 38) to the racialized class hatred expressed by British Victorians in their olfactory disgust of the “smelly” working classes (Orwell, Chapter 36). In these readings violence is located in the symbolic and social structures that overdetermine and allow the criminalized drug addictions, interpersonal bloodshed, and racially patterned incarcerations that characterize the US “inner city” to be normalized (Bourgois, Chapter 37 and Wacquant, Chapter 39). Violence also takes the form of class, racial, political self-hatred and adolescent self-destruction (Quesada, Chapter 35), as well as of useless (i.e. preventable), rawly embodied physical suffering, and death (Farmer, Chapter 34). Absolutely central to our approach is a blurring of categories and distinctions between wartime and peacetime violence. Close attention to the “little” violences produced in the structures, habituses, and mentalites of everyday life shifts our attention to pathologies of class, race, and gender inequalities. More important, it interrupts the voyeuristic tendencies of “violence studies” that risk publicly humiliating the powerless who are often forced into complicity with social and individual pathologies of power because suffering is often a solvent of human integrity and dignity. Thus, in this anthology we are positing a violence continuum comprised of a multitude of “small wars and invisible genocides” (see also Scheper- Hughes 1996; 1997; 2000b) conducted in the normative social spaces of public schools, clinics, emergency rooms, hospital wards, nursing homes, courtrooms, public registry offices, prisons, detention centers, and public morgues. The violence continuum also refers to the ease with which humans are capable of reducing the socially vulnerable into expendable nonpersons and assuming the license - even the duty - to kill, maim, or soul-murder. We realize that in referring to a violence and a genocide continuum we are flying in the face of a tradition of genocide studies that argues for the absolute uniqueness of the Jewish Holocaust and for vigilance with respect to restricted purist use of the term genocide itself (see Kuper 1985; Chaulk 1999; Fein 1990; Chorbajian 1999). But we hold an opposing and alternative view that, to the contrary, it is absolutely necessary to make just such existential leaps in purposefully linking violent acts in normal times to those of abnormal times. Hence the title of our volume: Violence in War and in Peace. If (as we concede) there is a moral risk in overextending the concept of “genocide” into spaces and corners of everyday life where we might not ordinarily think to find it (and there is), an even greater risk lies in failing to sensitize ourselves, in misrecognizing protogenocidal practices and sentiments daily enacted as normative behavior by “ordinary” good-enough citizens. Peacetime crimes, such as prison construction sold as economic development to impoverished communities in the mountains and deserts of California, or the evolution of the criminal industrial complex into the latest peculiar institution for managing race relations in the United States (Waquant, Chapter 39), constitute the “small wars and invisible genocides” to which we refer. This applies to African American and Latino youth mortality statistics in Oakland, California, Baltimore, Washington DC, and New York City. These are “invisible” genocides not because they are secreted away or hidden from view, but quite the opposite. As Wittgenstein observed, the things that are hardest to perceive are those which are right before our eyes and therefore taken for granted. In this regard, Bourdieu’s partial and unfinished theory of violence (see Chapters 32 and 42) as well as his concept of misrecognition is crucial to our task. By including the normative everyday forms of violence hidden in the minutiae of “normal” social practices - in the architecture of homes, in gender relations, in communal work, in the exchange of gifts, and so forth - Bourdieu forces us to reconsider the broader meanings and status of violence, especially the links between the violence of everyday life and explicit political terror and state repression, Similarly, Basaglia’s notion of “peacetime crimes” - crimini di pace - imagines a direct relationship between wartime and peacetime violence. Peacetime crimes suggests the possibility that war crimes are merely ordinary, everyday crimes of public consent applied systematically and dramatically in the extreme context of war. Consider the parallel uses of rape during peacetime and wartime, or the family resemblances between the legalized violence of US immigration and naturalization border raids on “illegal aliens” versus the US government- engineered genocide in 1938, known as the Cherokee “Trail of Tears.” Peacetime crimes suggests that everyday forms of state violence make a certain kind of domestic peace possible. Internal “stability” is purchased with the currency of peacetime crimes, many of which take the form of professionally applied “strangle-holds.” Everyday forms of state violence during peacetime make a certain kind of domestic “peace” possible. It is an easy-to-identify peacetime crime that is usually maintained as a public secret by the government and by a scared or apathetic populace. Most subtly, but no less politically or structurally, the phenomenal growth in the United States of a new military, postindustrial prison industrial complex has taken place in the absence of broad-based opposition, let alone collective acts of civil disobedience. The public consensus is based primarily on a new mobilization of an old fear of the mob, the mugger, the rapist, the Black man, the undeserving poor. How many public executions of mentally deficient prisoners in the United States are needed to make life feel more secure for the affluent? What can it possibly mean when incarceration becomes the “normative” socializing experience for ethnic minority youth in a society, i.e., over 33 percent of young African American men (Prison Watch 2002). In the end it is essential that we recognize the existence of a genocidal capacity among otherwise good-enough humans and that we need to exercise a defensive hypervigilance to the less dramatic, permitted, and even rewarded everyday acts of violence that render participation in genocidal acts and policies possible (under adverse political or economic conditions), perhaps more easily than we would like to recognize. Under the violence continuum we include, therefore, all expressions of radical social exclusion, dehumanization, depersonal- ization, pseudospeciation, and reification which normalize atrocious behavior and violence toward others. A constant self-mobilization for alarm, a state of constant hyperarousal is, perhaps, a reasonable response to Benjamin’s view of late modern history as a chronic “state of emergency” (Taussig, Chapter 31). We are trying to recover here the classic anagogic thinking that enabled Erving Goffman, Jules Henry, C. Wright Mills, and Franco Basaglia among other mid-twentieth-century radically critical thinkers, to perceive the symbolic and structural relations, i.e., between inmates and patients, between concentration camps, prisons, mental hospitals, nursing homes, and other “total institutions.” Making that decisive move to recognize the continuum of violence allows us to see the capacity and the willingness - if not enthusiasm - of ordinary people, the practical technicians of the social consensus, to enforce genocidal-like crimes against categories of rubbish people. There is no primary impulse out of which mass violence and genocide are born, it is ingrained in the common sense of everyday social life. The mad, the differently abled, the mentally vulnerable have often fallen into this category of the unworthy living, as have the very old and infirm, the sick-poor, and, of course, the despised racial, religious, sexual, and ethnic groups of the moment. Erik Erikson referred to “pseudo- speciation” as the human tendency to classify some individuals or social groups as less than fully human - a prerequisite to genocide and one that is carefully honed during the unremark- able peacetimes that precede the sudden, “seemingly unintelligible” outbreaks of mass violence. Collective denial and misrecognition are prerequisites for mass violence and genocide. But so are formal bureaucratic structures and professional roles. The practical technicians of everyday violence in the backlands of Northeast Brazil (Scheper-Hughes, Chapter 33), for example, include the clinic doctors who prescribe powerful tranquilizers to fretful and frightfully hungry babies, the Catholic priests who celebrate the death of “angel-babies,” and the municipal bureaucrats who dispense free baby coffins but no food to hungry families. Everyday violence encompasses the implicit, legitimate, and routinized forms of violence inherent in particular social, economic, and political formations. It is close to what Bourdieu (1977, 1996) means by “symbolic violence,” the violence that is often “nus-recognized” for something else, usually something good. Everyday violence is similar to what Taussig (1989) calls “terror as usual.” All these terms are meant to reveal a public secret - the hidden links between violence in war and violence in peace, and between war crimes and “peace-time crimes.” Bourdieu (1977) finds domination and violence in the least likely places - in courtship and marriage, in the exchange of gifts, in systems of classification, in style, art, and culinary taste- the various uses of culture. Violence, Bourdieu insists, is everywhere in social practice. It is misrecognized because its very everydayness and its familiarity render it invisible. Lacan identifies “rneconnaissance” as the prerequisite of the social. The exploitation of bachelor sons, robbing them of autonomy, independence, and progeny, within the structures of family farming in the European countryside that Bourdieu escaped is a case in point (Bourdieu, Chapter 42; see also Scheper-Hughes, 2000b; Favret-Saada, 1989). Following Gramsci, Foucault, Sartre, Arendt, and other modern theorists of power-vio- lence, Bourdieu treats direct aggression and physical violence as a crude, uneconomical mode of domination; it is less efficient and, according to Arendt (1969), it is certainly less legitimate. While power and symbolic domination are not to be equated with violence - and Arendt argues persuasively that violence is to be understood as a failure of power - violence, as we are presenting it here, is more than simply the expression of illegitimate physical force against a person or group of persons. Rather, we need to understand violence as encompassing all forms of “controlling processes” (Nader 1997b) that assault basic human freedoms and individual or collective survival. Our task is to recognize these gray zones of violence which are, by definition, not obvious. Once again, the point of bringing into the discourses on genocide everyday, normative experiences of reification, depersonalization, institutional confinement, and acceptable death is to help answer the question: What makes mass violence and genocide possible? In this volume we are suggesting that mass violence is part of a continuum, and that it is socially incremental and often experienced by perpetrators, collaborators, bystanders - and even by victims themselves - as expected, routine, even justified. The preparations for mass killing can be found in social sentiments and institutions from the family, to schools, churches, hospitals, and the military. They harbor the early “warning signs” (Charney 1991), the “priming” (as Hinton, ed., 2002 calls it), or the “genocidal continuum” (as we call it) that push social consensus toward devaluing certain forms of human life and lifeways from the refusal of social support and humane care to vulnerable “social parasites” (the nursing home elderly, “welfare queens,” undocumented immigrants, drug addicts) to the militarization of everyday life (super-maximum-security prisons, capital punishment; the technologies of heightened personal security, including the house gun and gated communities; and reversed feelings of victimization).

#### Neolib destroys value to life---treats as worthless anyone who can’t measure up to the ideology of competitiveness---locks in master-servant social relations

**Ackerman, 12** – Doctoral candidate in History at Cornell (Seth, “The Twinkie Defense, or What Does “Uncompetitive” Mean?,” http://jacobinmag.com/2012/11/the-twinkie-defense-or-what-does-uncompetitive-mean/#sthash.aM63fqng.dpuf)//VP

So let’s turn back to hapless Hostess. In a piece for Salon, Jake Blumgart quoted a bakery worker who had been at the company for 14 years. “In 2005, before concessions I made $48,000, last year I made $34,000…. I would make $25,000 in five years if I took their offer. It will be hard to replace the job I had, but it will be easy to replace the job they were trying to give me.” What we have here is a situation where a company offered a wage in the marketplace and couldn’t get any workers to accept it. Consequently, it went out of business. The word “competitive” gets thrown around a lot, often with the murkiest of meanings, but in this case there can be no doubt at all that a company, Hostess, was unable to pay a competitive wage. Ninety-two percent of its workers voted to walk out on their jobs rather than accept its wage, and they stayed out even after they were told it was the company’s final offer. By all the canons of competitiveness, it was the company that was deluded. Hey, it’s a tough labor market out there. Hostess just couldn’t compete. But the union got blamed instead, and that points to a fascinating aporia in neoliberalism. The competitiveness ideology keeps a double set of books. On the surface, it celebrates free individuals making voluntary agreements on a footing of formal equality. But look just a little deeper and it turns out to be a musty, medieval system of morality that venerates human hierarchy and inequality. If taken literally, an accusation of insufficient “competitiveness” would refer to a failure to buy or sell on the terms objectively demanded by the dispersed actors of the marketplace. But nine times out of ten, this literal meaning is just a facade for the real underlying meaning, which is all about policing the socially accepted rules concerning who is a worthy human being and who is not. Workers at an industrial bakery are losers. They need to take a pay cut — not so much to make the numbers add up (that’s a secondary consideration for all the commentators and columnists) but as a ritual affirmation of their debased social status. The refusal to take the cut was shocking and revolting — an act of lèse-majesté. It’s in that sense that the union was uncompetitive. The workers didn’t know their place. Corey Robin has often cited the political scientist Karen Orren, whose book Belated Feudalism revealed the feudal underside of the nineteenth century “unregulated” capitalist labor market. Here’s Corey’s summary: According to Orren, long after the Bill of Rights was ratified and slavery abolished – well into the 20th century, in fact – the American workplace remained a feudal institution. Not metaphorically, but legally. Workers were governed by statutes originating in the common law of medieval England, with precedents extending as far back as the year 500. Like their counterparts in feudal Britain, judges exclusively administered these statutes, treating workers as the literal property of their employers. Not until 1937, when the Supreme Court upheld the Wagner Act, giving workers the right to organize unions, did the judiciary relinquish political control over the workplace to Congress. Prior to the ’30s, Orren shows, American judges regularly applied the “law of master and servant” to quell the worker’s independent will. According to one jurist, that law recognized only ”the superiority and power” of the master, and the ”duty, subjection, and, as it were, allegiance” of the worker….As soon as workers entered the workplace, they became the property of their employers. Judges enforced the 13th-century rule of ”quicquid acquietur servo acquietur domino” (whatever is acquired by the servant is acquired by the master), mandating that employees give to their employers whatever they may have earned off the job – as if the employee, and not his labor, belonged to the employer. If an outside party injured an employee so that he couldn’t perform his duties, the employer could sue that party for damages, “as if the injury had been to his chattel or machines or buildings.” But if the outside party injured the employer so that he could not provide employment, the employee could not likewise sue. Why? Because, claimed one jurist, the ”inferior hath no kind of property in the company, care, or assistance of the superior, as the superior is held to have in those of the inferior.” ”Belated Feudalism” set off multiple explosions when it appeared in 1991, inflicting serious damage on the received wisdom of Harvard political scientist Louis Hartz. In his 1955 classic ”The Liberal Tradition in America,” still taught on many college campuses, Hartz argued that the United States was born free: Americans never knew feudalism; their country – with its Horatio Alger ethos of individual mobility, private property, free labor, and the sacred rights of contract – was modern and liberal from the start. For decades, liberals embraced Hartz’s argument as an explanation for why there was no – and could never be any – radicalism in the United States. Leftists, for their part, also accepted his account, pointing to the labor movement’s failure to create socialism as evidence of liberalism’s hegemony. But as Orren shows, American liberalism has never been the easy inheritance that Hartz and his complacent defenders assume. And the American labor movement may have achieved something far more difficult and profound than its leftist critics realize. Trade unions, Orren argues, made America liberal, laying slow but steady siege to an impregnable feudal fortress. The hypocrisy of the competitiveness ideology is a revival of this old double-bottomed tradition: a society of equals on the outside, master-and-servant deep down. Let the neoliberals howl: this Friday at Wal-Marts around the country, workers will be storming an archipelago of little Bastilles.

#### Neoliberalism is the root cause of violence against women – ensure extinction – star this card

**Shiva 13** – Ph.D Quantum Physics @ U of Western Ontario, M.A. Philosophy of Science @ U of Guelph, renown activist (Vandana, “Vandana Shiva: Our Violent Economy is Hurting Women “, 1/18/13, <http://www.yesmagazine.org/peace-justice/violent-economic-reforms-and-women>)//VP

Violence against women has taken on new and more vicious forms as traditional patriarchal structures have hybridized with the structures of capitalist patriarchy. We need to examine the connections between the violence of unjust, unsustainable economic systems and the growing frequency and brutality of violence against women. We need to see how the structures of traditional patriarchy merge with the emerging structures of capitalist patriarchy to intensify violence against women. Cyclones and hurricanes have always occurred. But as the Orissa Supercyclone, Cyclone Nargis, Cyclone Aila, Hurricane Katrina, and Hurricane Sandy show, the intensity and frequency of cyclones has increased with climate change. Our society has traditionally had a bias against the girl child. But the epidemic of female feticide and the disappearance of 30 million unborn girls has taken that bias to new levels of violence and new proportions. And it is into this context of the dynamics of more brutal and more vicious violence against women (and multiple, interconnected forms of violence) that the processes unleashed by neoliberalism are contributory factors. Firstly, the economic model focusing myopically on “growth” begins with violence against women by discounting their contribution to the economy. The more the government talks ad nauseum about “inclusive growth" and “financial inclusion,” the more it excludes the contributions of women to the economy and society. According to patriarchal economic models, production for sustenance is counted as "non-production." The transformation of value into disvalue, labour into non-labour, and knowledge into non-knowledge is achieved by the most powerful number that rules our lives, the patriarchal construct of GDP—Gross Domestic Product—which commentators have started to call the Gross Domestic Problem. National accounting systems which are used for calculating growth as GDP are based on the assumption that if producers consume what they produce, they do not in fact produce at all, because they fall outside the production boundary. The production boundary is a political creation that, in its workings, excludes regenerative and renewable production cycles from the area of production. Hence, all women who produce for their families, children, community, and society are treated as "non-productive" and "economically inactive." When economies are confined to the marketplace, economic self-sufficiency is perceived as economic deficiency. The devaluation of women’s work, and of work done in subsistence economies of the Global South, is the natural outcome of a production boundary constructed by capitalist patriarchy. **By restricting itself to the values of the market economy, as defined by capitalist patriarchy, the production boundary ignores economic value in the two vital economies which are necessary to ecological and human survival**. They are the areas of nature’s economy, and sustenance economy. In nature’s economy and the sustenance economy, economic value is a measure of how the earth’s life and human life are protected. Its currency is life-giving processes, not cash or market price. Secondly, a model of capitalist patriarchy which excludes women’s work and wealth creation in the mind, deepens the violence by displacing women from their livelihoods and alienating them from the natural resources on which their livelihoods depend—their land, their forests, their water, and their seeds and biodiversity. Economic reforms based on the idea of limitless growth in a limited world, can only be maintained by the powerful grabbing the resources of the vulnerable. The resource grab that is essential for “growth” creates a culture of rape—the rape of the earth, of local self-reliant economies, and of women. The only way in which this “growth” is “inclusive” is by its inclusion of ever larger numbers in its circle of violence. I have repeatedly stressed that **the rape of the Earth and rape of women are intimately linked**, both metaphorically in shaping worldviews, and materially in shaping women’s everyday lives. The deepening economic vulnerability of women makes them more vulnerable to all forms of violence—including sexual assault. Thirdly, economic reforms lead to the subversion of democracy and privatization of government. Economic systems influence political systems. The government talks of economic reforms as if it has nothing to do with politics and power. Leaders talk of keeping politics out of economics, even while they impose an economic model shaped by the politics of a particular gender and class. Neoliberal reforms work against democracy. We have seen this recently with the Indian government pushing through "reforms" to bring in Walmart through FDI in retail. Corporate-driven reforms create a convergence of economic and political power, a deepening of inequalities, and a growing separation of the political class from the will of the people they are supposed to represent. This is at the root of the disconnect between politicians and the public that we experienced during the protests that have grown throughout India since the Delhi gang rape. Worse, an alienated political class is afraid of its own citizens. This is what explains the increasing use of police to crush nonviolent citizen protests, as we have witnessed in Delhi. A privatized corporate state must rapidly become a police state. This is why the politicians must surround themselves with ever increasing VIP security, diverting the police from their important duties to protect women and ordinary citizens. Fourthly, the economic model shaped by capitalist patriarchy is based on the commodification of everything, including women. When we stopped the WTO in Seattle, our slogan was, “Our world is not for sale." **An economics unleashed by economic liberalization—**an economics of deregulation of commerce, of privatization and commodification of seeds and food, land and water, women and children—**degrades social values, deepens patriarchy, and intensifies violence against women**. Economic systems influence culture and social values. An economics of commodification creates a culture of commodification, where everything has a price, and nothing has value. The growing culture of rape is a social externality of economic reforms. We need to institutionalize social audits of the neoliberal policies which are a central instrument of patriarchy in our times. If there was a social audit of corporatizing our seed sector, 270,000 farmers would not have been pushed to suicide in India since the new economic policies were introduced. If there was a social audit of the corporatization of our food and agriculture, we would not have every fourth Indian hungry, every third woman malnourished, and every second child wasted and stunted due to severe malnutrition. India today would not be the Republic of Hunger that Dr. Utsa Patnaik has written about. The victim of the Delhi gang rape has triggered a social revolution. We must sustain it, deepen it, expand it. We must demand and get speedy and effective justice for women. We must call for fast-track courts to convict those responsible for crimes against women. We must make sure laws are changed so justice is not elusive for victims of sexual violence. We must continue the demand for blacklisting of politicians with criminal records. We must see the continuum of different forms of violence against women, from female feticide to economic exclusion and sexual assault. We need to continue the movement for the social reforms needed to guarantee safety, security, and equality for women, building on the foundations laid during India's independence movement and continued by the feminist movement over the last half-century. The agenda for social reforms, social justice, and equality has been derailed by the aganda of “economic reforms" set by capitalist patriarchy. And while we do all this we need to change the ruling paradigm that reduces society to economy, the economy to the market, and is imposed on us in the name of “growth." Society and economy are not insulated from each other . The processes of social reforms and economic reforms can no longer be separated. We need economic reforms based on the foundations of social reforms that correct the gender inequality in society, rather than aggravating all forms of injustice, inequality, and violence. Ending violence against women needs to also include moving beyond the violent economy to nonviolent, sustainable, peaceful, economies that give respect to women and the Earth.

#### **3) Neolib exacerbates wealth inequality and creates unsustainable debt that is the root cause of economic collapse – refuse their theoretical defenses of neolib because they are all contrary to fact**

Monbiot 13 (George, honorary doctorates from the University of St Andrews and the University of Essex, and an honorary fellowship from Cardiff University, has held visiting fellowships or professorships at the universities of Oxford (environmental policy), Bristol (philosophy), Keele (politics), Oxford Brookes (planning), and East London (environmental science), January 14, 2013, “Bang Goes the Theory”, http://www.monbiot.com/2013/01/14/bang-goes-the-theory/)

How they must bleed for us. In 2012, the world’s 100 richest people became $241 billion richer(1). They are now worth $1.9 trillion: just a little less than the GDP of the United Kingdom. This is not the result of chance. The rise in the fortunes of the super-rich is the direct result of policies. Here are a few: the reduction of tax rates and tax enforcement; governments’ refusal to recoup a decent share of revenues from minerals and land; the privatisation of public assets and the creation of a toll-booth economy; wage liberalisation and the destruction of collective bargaining. The policies which made the global monarchs so rich are the policies squeezing everyone else. This is not what the theory predicted. Friedrich Hayek, Milton Friedman and their disciples – in a thousand business schools, the IMF, the World Bank, the OECD and just about every modern government – have argued that the less governments tax the rich, defend workers and redistribute wealth, the more prosperous everyone will be. Any attempt to reduce inequality would damage the efficiency of the market, impeding the rising tide that lifts all boats(2). The apostles have conducted a 30-year global experiment and the results are now in. Total failure. Before I go on, I should point out that I don’t believe perpetual economic growth is either sustainable or desirable(3). But if growth is your aim – an aim to which every government claims to subscribe – you couldn’t make a bigger mess of it than by releasing the super-rich from the constraints of democracy. Last year’s annual report by the UN Conference on Trade and Development should have been an obituary for the neoliberal model developed by Hayek and Friedman and their disciples(4). It shows unequivocally that their policies have created the opposite outcomes to those they predicted. As neoliberal policies (cutting taxes for the rich, privatising state assets, deregulating labour, reducing social security) began to bite from the 1980s onwards, growth rates started to fall and unemployment to rise. The remarkable growth in the rich nations during the 1950s, 60s and 70s was made possible by the destruction of the wealth and power of the elite, as a result of the Depression and the second world war. Their embarrassment gave the other 99% an unprecedented chance to demand redistribution, state spending and social security, all of which stimulated demand. Neoliberalism was an attempt to turn back these reforms. Lavishly funded by millionaires, its advocates were amazingly successful: politically(5). Economically they flopped. Throughout the OECD countries, taxation has become more regressive: the rich pay less, the poor pay more(6). The result, the neoliberals claimed, would be that economic efficiency and investment would rise, enriching everyone. The opposite occurred. As taxes on the rich and on business diminished, the spending power of both the state and poorer people fell, and demand contracted. The result was that investment rates declined, in step with companies’ expectations of growth(7). The neoliberals also insisted that unrestrained inequality in incomes and flexible wages would reduce unemployment. But throughout the rich world both inequality and unemployment have soared(8). The recent jump in unemployment in most developed countries – worse than in any previous recession of the past three decades – was preceded by the lowest level of wages as a share of GDP since the second world war(9). Bang goes the theory. It failed for the same obvious reason: low wages suppress demand, which suppresses employment. As wages stagnated, people supplemented their incomes with debt. Rising debt fed the deregulated banks, with consequences of which we are all aware. The greater inequality becomes, the UN report finds, the less stable the economy and the lower its rates of growth. The policies with which neoliberal governments seek to reduce their deficits and stimulate their economies are counter-productive. The impending reduction of the UK’s top rate of income tax (from 50% to 45%) will not boost government revenue or private enterprise(10), but it will enrich the speculators who tanked the economy: Goldman Sachs and other banks are now thinking of delaying their bonus payments to take advantage of it(11). The welfare bill approved by parliament last week will not help to clear the deficit or stimulate employment: it will reduce demand, suppressing economic recovery. The same goes for the capping of public sector pay. “Relearning some old lessons about fairness and participation,” the UN says, “is the only way to eventually overcome the crisis and pursue a path of sustainable economic development.”(12) As I say, I have no dog in this race, except a belief that no one, in this sea of riches, should have to be poor. But staring dumbfounded at the lessons unlearned in Britain, Europe and the United States, it strikes me that the entire structure of neoliberal thought is a fraud. The demands of the ultra-rich have been dressed up as sophisticated economic theory and applied regardless of the outcome. The complete failure of this world-scale experiment is no impediment to its repetition. This has nothing to do with economics. It has everything to do with power.

#### 2) Reject the aff –we need to join Cuba in a rejection of the neoliberal system

Lambie, 10 – Ph.D., joint-editor of the International Journal of Cuban Studies, and Lecturer in Public Policy at De Montfort University (George Lambie, “The Cuban Revolution in the 21st Century”, Pluto Press, pg. 7)//eek

However, this book does not seek to present Cuba as an example to be copied, but rather aims to understand how the failure of neo-liberal globalisation is beginning to produce a counter-hegemony with which the Cuban socialist project can integrate. The Cuban Revolution, no matter how popular, or resilient, cannot survive globalisation alone; ‘socialism in one country’ is untenable in the long run, and in this its detractors are correct. But today there seems to be a growing synthesis between Cuba’s resistance to the dominant market-driven order and the anti-neoliberal movements that are emerging in Latin America. As noted, on one level this is a material process, as Cuba contributes to radical alternatives in the region by providing support in social welfare, intelligence and organisation, but it also represents a coincidence of consciousness as more people reject market solutions to their problems and seek to build something new. In this context, the survival of Cuban socialism is not simply a question of how long the Revolution can endure on the island, but how, through a symbiotic link with a wider process of change, it can influence and ultimately be absorbed into a growing popular resistance that is emerging from within the core of globalisation. In the author’s view, this is a far more important issue for the future of the Revolution than Cuba’s relations with the US. Many Cuba sympathisers were initially encouraged by the apparently progressive stance towards the island of the newly elected US President Barack Obama, but this hope seems to have faded as Washington’s policies have again hardened towards Havana. Besides, any significant rapprochement leading to an end of the embargo would serve to compromise Cuba and dilute its socialist objectives. It is only by being part of a counter-hegemony to global capitalism that the Revolution can follow its metier and its perceived destiny.

#### Cubans reject it – the aff fails

**Carmona, 2K** - Professor of Economics at the Universidad San Pablo. Spring (Antonio, “Cuba: Reforms and Adjustments Versus Transition,” International Journal of Political Economy. Vol 30.1, pp. 85. JSTOR)//SG

The difference among highly industrialized countries lies in the manner in which these elements are implemented and in their political capacity. Each country has developed its own variant mode ofproduction throughout its history. What makes Western Europe different from the rest of the world's capitalist economies is their welfare state, where the interests of workers are safeguarded in the legal and con- stitutional framework. The welfare state in Europe was consolidated after World War II.The benefits of the welfare state and its reforms were won after nearly a century of worker-based struggles and the efforts of unions, labor parties, and other emancipation groups. One cannot account for the high level ofproductivity experienced in Western Europe without taking into consideration the framework in which the state operates. In Cuba, most ofthe welfare-state attributes were brought into existence without the installation of an industrialization process, and in a relatively short period of time. In this manner, the overthrow ofthe FulgencioBatista regime andthe implementation ofthe so-called socialist project can be seen as revolutionary. The institutional and infrastructure capacity for productivity exists only through national state power, the very same power that guards the welfare reforms.Another reason for Cubans to reject neoliberalism is that Cuban workers are already accustomed to the benefits ofthe welfare state and the political space for expressing economic interests. Ultimately, what allows the Cuban government to enjoy stability and support frommostworkers isthe fact that Cuban workers are much more involved in production planningthan their counterparts in free-market econo- mies.Cubansare most likely to support Fidel Castro rather than allowmultina- tionalcompaniesto rule the countryand wipe away benefits that were implemented a generation ago. The logical step for Cuba to take is to maintain a high level of socialization ofproductivity and an increase in hard-currency profits

# 1NR

### CP

#### The net benefit outweighs and turns case – nuclear conflict is highly probable – small attacks are inevitable – new leaders make escalation and miscalculation likely in North Korea because they lack experience – strong military forces and the Asia Pivot are key to prevent conflict escalation

#### We control magnitude – goes nuclear –prioritize it in decision calculus

Hayes and Hamel-Green 10 Peter (Nautilus Institute) and Michael (Victoria University). “The Path Not Taken, the Way Still Open: Denuclearizing the Korean Peninsula and Northeast Asia”. 1/5/10. Online.

The consequences of failing to address the proliferation threat posed by the North Korea developments, and related political and economic issues, are serious, not only for the Northeast Asian region but for the whole international community. At worst, there is the possibility of nuclear attack1, whether by intention, miscalculation, or merely accident, leading to the resumption of Korean War hostilities. On the Korean Peninsula itself, key population centres are well within short or medium range missiles. The whole of Japan is likely to come within North Korean missile range. Pyongyang has a population of over 2 million, Seoul (close to the North Korean border) 11 million, and Tokyo over 20 million. Even a limited nuclear exchange would result in a holocaust of unprecedented proportions. But the catastrophe within the region would not be the only outcome. New research indicates that even a limited nuclear war in the region would rearrange our global climate far more quickly than global warming. Westberg draws attention to new studies modelling the effects of even a limited nuclear exchange involving approximately 100 Hiroshima-sized 15 kt bombs2 (by comparison it should be noted that the United States currently deploys warheads in the range 100 to 477 kt, that is, individual warheads equivalent in yield to a range of 6 to 32 Hiroshimas).The studies indicate that the soot from the fires produced would lead to a decrease in global temperature by 1.25 degrees Celsius for a period of 6-8 years.3 In Westberg’s view: That is not global winter, but the nuclear darkness will cause a deeper drop in temperature than at any time during the last 1000 years. The temperature over the continents would decrease substantially more than the global average. A decrease in rainfall over the continents would also follow…The period of nuclear darkness will cause much greater decrease in grain production than 5% and it will continue for many years...hundreds of millions of people will die from hunger…To make matters even worse, such amounts of smoke injected into the stratosphere would cause a huge reduction in the Earth’s protective ozone.4 These, of course, are not the only consequences. Reactors might also be targeted, causing further mayhem and downwind radiation effects, superimposed on a smoking, radiating ruin left by nuclear next-use. Millions of refugees would flee the affected regions. The direct impacts, and the follow-on impacts on the global economy via ecological and food insecurity, could make the present global financial crisis pale by comparison. How the great powers, especially the nuclear weapons states respond to such a crisis, and in particular, whether nuclear weapons are used in response to nuclear first-use, could make or break the global non proliferation and disarmament regimes. There could be many unanticipated impacts on regional and global security relationships5, with subsequent nuclear breakout and geopolitical turbulence, including possible loss-of-control over fissile material or warheads in the chaos of nuclear war, and aftermath chain-reaction affects involving other potential proliferant states. The Korean nuclear proliferation issue is not just a regional threat but a global one that warrants priority consideration from the international community.

#### Most likely scenario for great power war

Stares 9 Paul. General John W. Vessey Senior Fellow for Conflict Prevention and Director of the Center for Preventive Action. 2/3/9. <http://www.cfr.org/publication/18455/prepare_for_north_korean_instability.html?breadcrumb=%2Fregion%2F263%2Fasia>.

Why should we care? As a nuclear weapons state and exporter of ballistic missiles, North Korea has long been a proliferation headache for Washington. With one of the world's largest armies in possession of long-range artillery and rockets, it also can wreak havoc on South Korea and Japan -- America's most important Asian allies. And with neighboring China and Russia also engaged in the Korean peninsula, there are few other places where the interests of so many great powers intersect and potentially collide. So who governs North Korea is not a trivial concern. Were Kim to die suddenly or decide to relinquish power, one of his three sons could take over, as Kim did from his father. But given their young age or inexperience, a collective leadership made up of senior officials with perhaps one of the sons as a figurehead to promote regime legitimacy is widely considered more likely. It is by no means certain, however, that this would work or last very long.  Certain individuals or factions -- not least from the army or intelligence services -- might be tempted to seize power, resulting in a potentially disruptive and even violent leadership struggle that could put immense strain on the rest of the country. Totalitarian states have proved to be remarkably brittle when stressed by internal pressures, and North Korea may be no exception. Should North Korea begin to collapse, the world could face a host of challenges, including huge outflows of refugees, military provocations, a breakdown in public order and, most ominous, uncertainties about the safety and security of its nuclear arsenal.   All this would inevitably put pressure on neighboring states to intervene to stabilize the situation. Given their competing interests, the potential for misunderstanding and conflict because of unilateral or uncoordinated actions is considerable.

#### TPA solves warming

**Benson 13** - Intern at the Streit Council (Johann Benson (Master’s degree in public policy at the University of Minnesota’s Humphrey School of Public Affairs, “[Toward a Transatlantic Free Trade Agreement: What Impact on World Trade?](http://blog.streitcouncil.org/?p=1448),” Streit Talk, July 26, 2013 pg. http://blog.streitcouncil.org/?tag=ttip)//VP

With negotiations now officially underway, the proposed Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) is taking its first steps toward becoming reality. Questions remain, however; not only about what form the final agreement may take, but also what effect it could have on international trade.

In its [initial assessment of the TTIP](http://www.oecd.org/trade/TTIP.pdf), the OECD notes that while multilateral arrangements are preferable, bilateral and plurilateral agreements like the proposed TTIP “can be supportive of an effective multilateral trading system.” One of the primary ways in which these agreements can promote trade at the global level is by addressing issues that currently lie outside the scope of WTO regulations. Richard Baldwin, of the Graduate Institute in Geneva and the Centre for Economic Policy Research, has laid out the shortcomings of current WTO regulations and how post-2000 trade agreements are [fundamentally different](http://www.cepr.org/sites/default/files/policy_insights/PolicyInsight56.pdf) from those of the 1990s.

Baldwin argues that the rise of global supply chains has elevated the importance of removing non-tariff barriers, while tariffs (with some notable exceptions) have largely fallen by the wayside. Current WTO regulations (as well as agenda items of the stalled Doha Round) are not adequate for addressing the most pressing issues of international commerce and investment, such as competition (or antitrust) policy, the movement of capital, intellectual property rights (IPR), and investment assurances. These issues can and often have been addressed through recent bilateral trade and investment agreements. Critically, Baldwin also notes that there is a feedback effect from increased trade liberalization that makes future liberalization even more likely. It is for this reason, if no other, that an EU-U.S. free trade agreement is a step in the right direction.Economic gains from the TTIP would mainly come from the harmonization of regulations and the removal of other non-tariff barriers. While the agreement is expected to lead to trade diversion among EU members (in the case of an ambitious agreement, for example, total trade between the UK and Spain [would decrease by about 45%](http://www.euractiv.com/trade/transatlantic-free-trade-boon-ba-analysis-529218)), it is projected that the TTIP would benefit the struggling economies of southern Europe even more than the EU as a whole. It would also drive trade creation between the EU and the U.S., and between the transatlantic area and third parties. For example, if car safety standards are harmonized in the European and American markets, it lowers costs not only for U.S. and EU automakers, but also for [any other company that exports to both markets](http://www.cfr.org/eu/eu-ustransatlantic-trade-investment-partnership/p30766). In fact, the third parties with the largest expected gains from the TTIP are ASEAN countries, due to their [very high trade to GDP ratios](http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2013/march/tradoc_150737.pdf). Unfortunately, the fact that third parties often benefit from the removal of non-tariff barriers can also act as an obstacle to bilateral agreements. For instance, Jagdish Bhagwati has noted that [getting rid of production subsidies](http://werewolf.co.nz/2012/11/tpp-head-first-into-the-spaghetti-bowl/) requires a multilateral agreement because “you cannot – bilaterally – say that if the U.S. reduces or relaxes production subsidies, it will be only for New Zealand. Or only for Brazil.” This may, in some respects, limit the breadth and depth of the TTIP.

One of Bhagwati’s other worries about preferential trade agreements is that they create dispute settlement mechanisms that favor the stronger trading partner and undermine the WTO’s own dispute settlement mechanism. If the TTIP is eventually opened to newcomers on a take-it-or-leave-it basis, any country wishing to join the agreement – for which there would be strong incentives – would be strictly [a rule-taker](http://www.die-gdi.de/CMS-Homepage/openwebcms3_e.nsf/%28ynDK_contentByKey%29/MRUR-99EA5H?Open), with absolutely no say in the drafting of existing regulations. While numerous commentators argue that the primary objective of the TTIP is to ensure that “the United States and Europe remain [standard makers](http://www.cfr.org/trade/getting-yes-transatlantic-trade/p31077), rather than standard takers, in the global economy,” there is a risk that China and other emerging economies will attempt to erect trading blocs amongst themselves and create their own rules.

Completing the Doha Round may still be an uphill battle after the TTIP is concluded. The agreement is not likely to seriously threaten the multilateral trading system for the simple fact that bilateral deals – no matter how large – are themselves unable to address [a longer list](http://www.lowyinstitute.org/publications/saving-multilateralism-g20-wto-and-world-trade-0) of the world’s most pressing trade issues. Resource and food security, exchange rate policy, and efforts to limit carbon emissions all demand multilateral solutions. But the TTIP could provide a launching pad to address these and other issues.

#### Extinction

Don Flournoy 12, Citing Feng Hsu, PhD NASA Scientist @ the Goddard Space Flight Center and Don is a PhD and MA from UT, former Dean of the University College @ Ohio University, former Associate Dean at SUNY and Case Institute of Technology, Former Manager for University/Industry Experiments for the NASA ACTS Satellite, currently Professor of Telecommunications @ Scripps College of Communications, Ohio University, “Solar Power Satellites,” January 2012, Springer Briefs in Space Development, p. 10-11

In the Online Journal of Space Communication , Dr. Feng Hsu, a  NASA scientist at Goddard Space Flight Center, a research center in the forefront of science of space and Earth, writes, “The evidence of global warming is alarming,” noting the potential for a catastrophic planetary climate change is real and troubling (Hsu 2010 ) . Hsu and his NASA colleagues were engaged in monitoring and analyzing climate changes on a global scale, through which they received first-hand scientific information and data relating to global warming issues, including the dynamics of polar ice cap melting. After discussing this research with colleagues who were world experts on the subject, he wrote: I now have no doubt global temperatures are rising, and that global warming is a serious problem confronting all of humanity. No matter whether these trends are due to human interference or to the cosmic cycling of our solar system, there are two basic facts that are crystal clear: (a) there is overwhelming scientific evidence showing positive correlations between the level of CO2 concentrations in Earth’s atmosphere with respect to the historical fluctuations of global temperature changes; and (b) the overwhelming majority of the world’s scientific community is in agreement about the risks of a potential catastrophic global climate change. That is, if we humans continue to ignore this problem and do nothing, if we continue dumping huge quantities of greenhouse gases into Earth’s biosphere, humanity will be at dire risk (Hsu 2010 ) . As a technology risk assessment expert, Hsu says he can show with some confidence that the planet will face more risk doing nothing to curb its fossil-based energy addictions than it will in making a fundamental shift in its energy supply. “This,” he writes, “is because the risks of a catastrophic anthropogenic climate change can be potentially the extinction of human species, a risk that is simply too high for us to take any chances” (Hsu 2010).

#### TPP negotiations will succeed – it’s only a question of if Obama can get fast track

Chandler 4/9

Marc, Investing.com, Trade Agreement: Australia And Japan Can, US And Japan Can't, 4/9/14, http://www.investing.com/analysis/trade-agreement:-australia-and-japan-can,-us-and-japan-can't-209021

The TPP negotiations were struggling at the end of last year, when it was initially hoped that a deal could be finalized., but this often happens with such negotiations. The months, if not years, of hemming and hawing, are quickly resolved in a couple of weeks. This time it is proving elusive, not so much, we would argue, because of the tough negotiating position Japan took, especially in terms of protecting its agricultural sector, but because of doubts that the US was sufficiently serious. The inability of Obama to secure trade promotion authority just about dooms the TPP, almost regardless of the concessions from other countries, including Japan. ¶ The lack of Congressional support for Obama undermines the US negotiating position and makes other countries more reluctant to antagonize domestic constituencies without being able to show concessions by the US. By striking an agreement with Australia, even though it is not as ambitious as the US seeks, Japan sends a strong signal that it can compromise. ¶ Both houses of Japan's Diet had instructed negotiators to exclude beef, poultry, rice, wheat, sugar, and dairy from concessions. Yet in the bilateral agreement with Australia, Japan made some concessions in these areas. To be sure, they are not as dramatic as the US is pushing for, but they are in the right direction.

#### Cuban lobby group opposes travel reform – and has massive influence

Jilani 12 – former Communications and Outreach Coordinator for United Republic and the former Senior Reporter-Blogger for ThinkProgress. His work has also appeared in outlets including Salon and the Atlanta Journal-Constitution. He graduated from the University of Georgia in 2009. (Zaid Jilani, Republic Report, “It’s Not Just Ozzie Guillen: How The Cuba Lobby Paralyzes U.S. Policy,” 4/10/12, http://www.republicreport.org/2012/ozzie-guillen-cuba-lobby-paralyzes-us-policy/)//VP

This morning it was abruptly announced that Ozzie Guillen, the first-year manager of the Miami Marlins, would be suspended for five games following comments he made where he offered some mild praise for former Cuban leader Fidel Castro.¶ Guillen was forced to take the unpaid suspension after he came under intense verbal attack from area interest groups. The barrage that the Miami Marlins manager is an example of a powerful interest group that has virtually paralyzed US-Cuba relations in the nation’s capital.¶ Informally referred to by leading writers as the “Cuba Lobby,” this tight-knit group of Political Action Committees (PACs), social organizations, and the lawmakers allied to them have successfully maintained a failed diplomatic freeze, travel ban, and embargo between the United States and Cuba for decades.¶ By exerting its influence, this lobby forces Washington politicians to ignore American public opinion at large. A 2009 Gallup Poll found that 60 percent of Americans favor restoring full diplomatic relations with Cuba, and a majority of Americans wanted to see an end to the embargo as well. Figures and political groups with as varying politics as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Pope, and former president Jimmy Carter have all called for ending the unilateral sanctions.¶ The powerful Cuba lobby, based in the crucial political swing state of Florida, exerts its influence largely through being a powerful political spender. The U.S.-Cuba Democracy PAC, for example PAC spent a million dollars in 2008, and has already spent a quarter of a million dollars during this election cycle. In 2008 and 2010, the majority of the PAC’s funds went to Democrats, but during the 2012 cycle the organization is spending more heavily in favor of Republicans. It’s treasurer is Gus Machado, a Floridan wealthy auto dealer who regularly raises millions of dollars for charities in the area.¶ At a fancy gala in 2010, the organization brought together leading congressional Democrats and Republicans to support the US-Cuba embargo. “When it comes to the topic of Cuba, first comes Cuba and then comes the party,” said Sen. Bob Menendez (D-NJ), a leading embargo proponent, at the event. The PAC is the largest foreign policy-related PAC spender according to the Center for Responsive Politics.¶ Although it is frequently referred to as the “Cuba Lobby,” there is little evidence that the policies that the U.S.-Cuba Democracy PAC and related organizations and individuals help the Cuban people or advance U.S. interests in Cuba. Their hard line has not ended the Castro regime and its abuses, or helped advance the welfare of Cubans. Instead, through campaign donations and campaigns of intimidation, this lobby has effectively paralyzed U.S. policy.

#### Republicans oppose Jay-Z and Beyoncé prove

Tidsall 4/8 - assistant editor of the Guardian and a foreign affairs columnist (Simon, “Time for the U.S. and Cuba to Kiss and Make Up,” CNN, 8 April 2013, <http://www.cnn.com/2013/04/08/opinion/opinion-simon-tisdall-cuba>, accessed 25 June 2013

Right-wing U.S. Republicans are up in arms over Cuba again. Their ostensible cause for concern is last week's visit to the island by Beyoncé and Jay-Z, who were photographed in Havana, apparently celebrating their wedding anniversary.

#### Republicans won’t lift the travel embargo – plan will be a fight

ATE, 12 **–** All Things Expounded(WordPress, “The Republican Party Platform and the Cuban Embargo,” 7 October 2012, http://www.allthingsexpounded.com/2012/10/the-republican-party-platform-and-the-cuban-embargo/)//VP

The Republican Party’s 2012 Platform states that they will not lift “trade, travel, and financial sanctions” until Cuba’s government reflects “the principles codified in U.S. law“.

Perm can’t increase Obama’s political capital --- it’s a forced choice between either investing in the plan or the CP --- here’s ev to substantiate this.

**Stephenson, ’08** (Matthew C., Harvard Law Professor, Michigan Law Review, “Optimal political control of the bureaucracy,” 10-1-8, pg. 53(58) Vol. 107 No. 1, www.michiganlawreview.org/assets/pdfs/107/1/stephenson.pdf‎)//a-berg

The assumption of increasing marginal control costs is important to the subsequent results, so it is worth pausing to explain its justification. This assumption is premised on the notions that bureaucratic control costs are primarily opportunity costs--the diversion of time, effort, and political capital from other activities--and that the president tries to allocate these resources efficiently, sacrificing low-value activities before high-value activities. Imagine, for purposes of illustration, that the president has 100 units of political capital that she allocates to an array of tasks. If the president devotes a single unit of capital to influence a particular bureaucratic decision (so the president devotes 1 unit to bureaucratic control and 99 to other tasks), she will sacrifice whichever other activity was least valuable to her; to do otherwise would be irrational. The value of that foregone activity is the cost of devoting 1 unit of political capital to bureaucratic control. Now suppose the president devotes a second unit of political capital to bureaucratic control (so that she applies 2 units to bureaucratic control and 98 units to other tasks.) (67) Because the president has already foregone the lowest-valued of her original set of alternative activities, the opportunity cost of devoting this second unit of political capital to bureaucratic control will be higher than the opportunity cost of the first unit. Hence, the cost to the president of devoting 2 units of political capital to bureaucratic control is more than twice as great as the cost of devoting 1 unit to bureaucratic control. As long as the president rationally sacrifices low-value activities before high-value activities, then the marginal cost to the president of influencing the bureaucracy is increasing in the distance the president moves the bureaucracy's ideal point. (68)

#### **MAD doesn’t check**

Zutell 88 (NUCLEAR WINTER AND OTHER MYTHS OF SELF-DETERRENCE, Eugene G. Zutell, 06/19/88, Arizona Dept. of Emergency and Military Affairs, Division of Emergency Services, http://www.fortfreedom.org/s05.htm)phol

MAD as it is popularly called is actually based on mutual vulnerability. The theory is that if each side is vulnerable to it's opponents weapons, each side will be deterred from initiating a nuclear exchange because it, in turn, would suffer totally unacceptable damage. I hate to be a spoil; sport, but it just isn't working out that way. For Mutual Assured Destruction to work, both sides must play the game. The myth here is that the Soviets believe in and adhere to the MAD theory. Actually, they picked up their marbles and went home a long time ago. In fact, they never even started playing the game. They believe that with proper preparation, they can reduce the effects of a nuclear conflict to a level that is acceptable to them. The Soviet civil defense system is more than 50 years old and even now it is an on-going and expanding effort through which they are demonstrating that they at least believe a nuclear war to be survivable. MAD is a figment of U.S. imagination. The Soviets are notoriously unimaginative. They just look at the facts and proceed accordingly. None of these comments are in any way intended to denigrate the cataclysmic consequences of a nuclear conflict -- the worst conceivable disaster facing mankind -- they are meant instead to help avoid compounding the effects of that disaster by providing evidence against theories or myths which, through great publicity, have gained the status of half-truths and which tend to discourage people from taking even the simplest precautions to survive.

**Deterrence doesn’t check.**

**Krieger 2009 –** professor of politics (David, September 4th, “Still loving the Bomb After All these Years” Nuclear Age Peace Foundation <https://www.wagingpeace.org/articles/2009/09/04_krieger_newsweek_response.php?krieger>)

Tepperman builds upon Waltz’s logic, and concludes “that all states are rational,” even though their leaders may have a lot of bad qualities, including being “stupid, petty, venal, even evil….”  He asks us to trust that rationality will always prevail when there is a risk of nuclear retaliation, because these weapons make “the costs of war obvious, inevitable, and unacceptable.”  Actually, he is asking us to do more than trust in the rationality of leaders; he is asking us to gamble the future on this proposition.  “The iron logic of deterrence and mutually assured destruction is so compelling,” Tepperman argues, “it’s led to what’s known as the nuclear peace….”  But if this is a peace worthy of the name, which it isn’t, it certainly is not one on which to risk the future of civilization.  One irrational leader with control over a nuclear arsenal could start a nuclear conflagration, resulting in a global Hiroshima. Tepperman celebrates “the iron logic of deterrence,” but deterrence is a theory that is far from rooted in “iron logic.”  It is a theory based upon threats that must be effectively communicated and believed.  Leaders of Country A with nuclear weapons must communicate to other countries (B, C, etc.) the conditions under which A will retaliate with nuclear weapons.  The leaders of the other countries must understand and believe the threat from Country A will, in fact, be carried out.  The longer that nuclear weapons are not used, the more other countries may come to believe that they can challenge Country A with impunity from nuclear retaliation.  The more that Country A bullies other countries, the greater the incentive for these countries to develop their own nuclear arsenals.  Deterrence is unstable and therefore precarious. Most of the countries in the world reject the argument, made most prominently by Kenneth Waltz, that the spread of nuclear weapons makes the world safer.