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A. Interpretation – “economic engagement” means the aff must be an exclusively economic action – it cannot encompass broader forms of engagement

Jakstaite, 10 - Doctoral Candidate Vytautas Magnus University Faculty of Political Sciences and Diplomacy (Lithuania) (Gerda, “Containment and Engagement as Middle-Range Theories” Baltic Journal of Law & Politics Volume 3, Number 2 (2010), DOI: 10.2478/V10076-010-0015-7)

The approach to engagement as economic engagement focuses exclusively on economic instruments of foreign policy with the main national interest being security. Economic engagement is a policy of the conscious development of economic relations with the adversary in order to change the target state‟s behaviour and to improve bilateral relations

That means trade and aid in the form of loans or grants

Resnick, 1 – Assistant Professor of Political Science at Yeshiva University (Evan, Journal of International Affairs, “Defining Engagement” Vol. 54 No. 2, Political Science Complete)

A REFINED DEFINITION OF ENGAGEMENT

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

DIPLOMATIC CONTACTS

Extension of diplomatic recognition; normalization of diplomatic relations

Promotion of target-state membership in international institutions and regimes

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

MILITARY CONTACTS

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

Arms transfers

Military aid and cooperation

Military exchange and training programs

Confidence and security-building measures

Intelligence sharing

ECONOMIC CONTACTS

Trade agreements and promotion

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

CULTURAL CONTACTS

Cultural treaties

Inauguration of travel and tourism links

Sport, artistic and academic exchanges(n25)

B. Violation – the affirmative removes sanctions on Cuba, which is not an exclusively economic instrument

C. Vote negative

1. Predictable limits – blurring the lines between economic and other forms of engagement makes any positive interaction with another country topical – becomes impossible for the neg to predict or prepare

2. Equitable ground – the economic limit is vital to critiques of economics, trade disads, and non-economic counterplans

## 2

#### Utilizing the state to combat neoliberalism expresses a desire for mastery that reinforces state power – turns the aff

**Anker 12** – Assistant Professor of American Studies at The George Washington University

(Elisabeth, “Heroic Identifications: Or, ‘You Can Love Me Too – I am so Like the State’”, Theory & Event Vol 15, Issue 1 2012, dml)

The post-9/11 desire for mastery derives from the juxtaposition between a desire for freedom and generalized conditions of political powerlessness in contemporary life. It stems from the ways in which formally free individuals are not only materially constrained by multiple and interweaving modes of social power, but are shaped by contemporary global crises such as empire, occupation, and imperialism across broad international populations; from the broadening control of the state and economy over aspects of social life previously ascribed to the “private” realm, such as education, child-rearing, and welfare; from neoliberal capital, terrorism, ethnic wars, racism, sexism, entrenched and broadening levels of poverty, environmental destruction, security privatization, and resource scarcity. Under these conditions, citizens are **excluded from national politics** and made into consumers **rather than active players** in the operations of collective decision-making; multinational corporate powers promote vast levels of exploitation while evading accountability and visibility; jobs and families are uprooted, severed, and micromanaged as a politics of fear pervades work and home life; systems of support from state, family, and community structures are financially broken and systematically destroyed; the nexus of capitalism and state governance pushes the goals of efficiency, subjugation, and flexibility to organize the terms of collective governance and individual citizenship at the expense of notions of justice, freedom, or the good; mediated information exposes various horrors and subjugations from around the world, yet at the same time insists that nothing can be done to change them; no viable political collectivity offers significant societal-wide change, as significant change does not seem probable. Under these conditions, individuals seem **unable to experience freedom or effect change in the world**. They are conditioned by the impinging effects of global capital and global interdependence, as well as **the inability to master or singularly control the powers that generate them**. Affecting individuals to significantly varying degrees depending upon their locations within structures of power and privilege, these conditions also shape ordinary and lived experiences of powerlessness across populations. Experiences of powerlessness are not only frightening but also confusing, as their causes are often difficult to discern. The modes of power that produce them are often nonagentic and spatially unlocatable – global yet micropolitical, impinging yet intangible, faceless yet moving, and replicating with alacrity. They create a widespread and constant sense of precariousness and constraint that is not so much explicitly expressed as experienced as nagging, unarticulated affects of impotence, anxiety, constriction, and anger. Identification with the state aims to address these experiences **by heroically overcoming them**. Identification with state action is also, in part, an effect of a specific type of liberal individualism that valorizes **expectations of mastery over and autonomy from the social world**. American political subjects, often shaped by individualism’s expectations of individual sovereignty and self-determinism, struggle with the continual process of power’s regulatory capacity as well as lived experiences of dependence. Both demonstrate their failure to live up to individualism’s ideal image: to be, in Etienne Balibar’s words, the “subject without subjection,” to be self-reliant, to master power, to pull oneself up by one’s bootstraps, to actively and unilaterally determine the course of one’s existence.13 Awash in the tenets of liberal individualism, freedom here means **autonomy from others and from power**, and is experienced through a type of self-determinism that implies the capacity to control historical and political uncertainty. It is understood to be both the lived experience of mastery and the absence of power over the self. Interdependence **of any sort** is considered unfreedom, so that freedom is sustained through **an aggressive stance toward other individuals**, nations, and even nature.14 To subjects who want yet are unable to live up to this model of agency, bold and unilateral state actions can seem to be one place where **a strong autonomy is still possible**. State action seems to harbor the possibility of unrestrained power over the contingencies of the world, where the ability to control others and the world still gains credence.

#### Reliance on the state guarantees mass violence and destroys value to life

**Shaffer** **7** (Butler teaches at the Southwestern University School of Law. B.S., Law, 1958, University of Nebraska, Lincoln; B.A., Political Science, 1959, and J.D., 1961, University of Chicago; Member, Colorado and Nebraska State Bars. “Identifying With the State” June 29th 2007. http://www.lewrockwell.com/shaffer/shaffer159.html, MT)

One of the deadliest practices we engage in is that of identifying ourselves with a collective entity. Whether it be the state, a nationality, our race or gender, or any other abstraction, we introduce division – hence, conflict – into our lives as we separate ourselves from those who identify with other groupings. If one observes the state of our world today, this is the pattern that underlies our deadly and destructive social behavior. This mindset was no better articulated than when George W. Bush declared “you’re either with us, or against us.” Through years of careful conditioning, we learn to think of ourselves in terms of agencies and/or abstractions **external to our independent being**. Or, to express the point more clearly, we have learned to **internalize these external forces;** to **conform our thinking** and behavior to the purposes and interests of such entities. We adorn ourselves with flags, mouth shibboleths, and decorate our cars with bumper-stickers, in order to communicate to others our sense of “who we are.” In such ways does our being become indistinguishable from our chosen collective. In this way are institutions born. We discover a particular form of organization through which we are able to cooperate with others for our mutual benefit. Over time, the advantages derived from this system have a sufficient consistency to lead us to the conclusion that our well-being is dependent upon it. Those who manage the organization find it in their self-interests to propagate this belief so that we will become dependent upon its permanency. Like a sculptor working with clay, institutions take over the direction of our minds, twisting, squeezing, and pounding upon them until we have embraced a mindset conducive to their interests. Once this has been accomplished, we find it easy to subvert our will and sense of purpose to the collective. The organization ceases being a mere tool of mutual convenience, and becomes an end in itself. Our lives become “institutionalized,” and we regard it as fanciful to imagine ourselves living in any other way than as constituent parts of a machine that transcends our individual sense. **Once we identify ourselves with the state**, that collective entity does more than represent who we are; **it is who we are**. To the politicized mind, **the idea that “we are the government” has real meaning**, not in the sense of being able to control such an agency, but **in the psychological sense**. The successes and failures of the state become the subject’s successes and failures; insults or other attacks upon their abstract sense of being – such as the burning of “their” flag – become assaults upon their very personhood. Shortcomings on the part of the state become our failures of character. This is why so many Americans who have belatedly come to criticize the war against Iraq are inclined to treat it as only a “mistake” or the product of “mismanagement,” not as a moral wrong. Our egos can more easily admit to the making of a mistake than to moral transgressions. Such an attitude also helps to explain why, as Milton Mayer wrote in his revealing post-World War II book, They Thought They Were Free, most Germans were unable to admit that the Nazi regime had been tyrannical. It is this dynamic that makes it easy for political **officials to generate wars, a process that reinforces the sense of identity and attachment people have for “their” state**. It also helps to explain why most Americans – though tiring of the war against Iraq – refuse to condemn government leaders for the lies, forgeries, and deceit employed to get the war started: to acknowledge the dishonesty of the system through which they identify themselves is to admit to the dishonest base of their being. The truthfulness of the state’s rationale for war is irrelevant to most of its subjects. It is sufficient that they believe the abstraction with which their lives are intertwined will be benefited in some way by war. Against whom and upon what claim does not matter – except as a factor in assessing the likelihood of success. That most Americans have pipped nary a squeak of protest over Bush administration plans to attack Iran – with nuclear weapons if deemed useful to its ends – reflects the point I am making. Bush could undertake a full-fledged war against Lapland, and most Americans would trot out their flags and bumper-stickers of approval. The “rightness” or “wrongness” of any form of collective behavior becomes interpreted by the standard of whose actions are being considered. During World War II, for example, Japanese kamikaze pilots were regarded as crazed fanatics for crashing their planes into American battleships. At the same time, American war movies (see, e.g., Flying Tigers) extolled the heroism of American pilots who did the same thing. One sees this same double-standard in responding to “conspiracy theories.” “Do you think a conspiracy was behind the 9/11 attacks?” It certainly seems so to me, unless one is prepared to treat the disappearance of the World Trade Center buildings as the consequence of a couple pilots having bad navigational experiences! The question that should be asked is: whose conspiracy was it? To those whose identities coincide with the state, such a question is easily answered: others conspire, we do not. It is not the symbiotic relationship between war and the expansion of state power, nor the realization of corporate benefits that could not be obtained in a free market, that mobilize the machinery of war. Without most of us standing behind “our” system, and cheering on “our” troops, and defending “our” leaders, none of this would be possible. What would be your likely response if your neighbor prevailed upon you to join him in a violent attack upon a local convenience store, on the grounds that it hired “illegal aliens?” Your sense of identity would not be implicated in his efforts, and you would likely dismiss him as a lunatic. Only when our ego-identities become wrapped up with some institutional abstraction – such as the state – can we be persuaded to **invest** our **lives** and the lives of our children **in** the **collective** **madness** of state action. We do not have such attitudes toward organizations with which we have more transitory relationships. If we find an accounting error in our bank statement, we would not find satisfaction in the proposition “the First National Bank, right or wrong.” Neither would we be inclined to wear a T-shirt that read “Disneyland: love it or leave it.” One of the many adverse consequences of identifying with and attaching ourselves to collective abstractions is our loss of control over not only the **meaning** and direction **in our lives, but** of the manner in which we can be efficacious in **our efforts to pursue the purposes that have become central to us**.We become dependent upon the performance of “our” group; “our” reputation rises or falls on the basis of what institutional leaders do or fail to do. If “our” nation-state loses respect in the world – such as by the use of torture or killing innocent people - we consider ourselves no longer respectable, and scurry to find plausible excuses to redeem our egos. When these expectations are not met, we go in search of new leaders or organizational reforms we believe will restore our sense of purpose and pride that we have allowed abstract entities to personify for us. As the costs and failures of the state become increasingly evident, there is a growing tendency to blame this system. But to do so is to continue playing the same game into which we have allowed ourselves to become conditioned. One of the practices employed by the state to get us to mobilize our “dark side” energies in opposition to the endless recycling of enemies it has chosen for us, is that of psychological projection. Whether we care to acknowledge it or not – and most of us do not – each of us has an unconscious capacity for attitudes or conduct that our conscious minds reject. We fear that, sufficiently provoked, we might engage in violence – even deadly – against others; or that inducements might cause us to become dishonest. We might harbor racist or other bigoted sentiments, or consider ourselves lazy or irresponsible. Though we are unlikely to act upon such inner fears, their presence within us can generate discomforting self-directed feelings of guilt, anger, or unworthiness that we would like to eliminate. The most common way in which humanity has tried to bring about such an exorcism is by subconsciously projecting these traits onto others (i.e., “scapegoats”) and punishing them for what are really our own shortcomings. The **state** has **trained** **us** to behave this way, in order that we may be counted upon to invest our lives, resources, and other energies **in** **pursuit** **of** the **enemy** du jour. It is somewhat ironic, therefore, that most of us resort to the same practice in our criticism of political systems. After years of mouthing the high-school civics class mantra about the necessity for government – and the bigger the government the better – we begin to experience the unexpected consequences of politicization. Tax burdens continue to escalate; or the state takes our home to make way for a proposed shopping center; or ever-more details of our lives are micromanaged by ever-burgeoning state bureaucracies. Having grown weary of the costs – including the loss of control over our lives – we blame the state for what has befallen us. We condemn the Bush administration for the parade of lies that precipitated the war against Iraq, rather than indicting ourselves for ever believing anything the state tells us. We fault the politicians for the skyrocketing costs of governmental programs, conveniently ignoring our insistence upon this or that benefit whose costs we would prefer having others pay. The statists have helped us accept a world view that conflates our incompetence to manage our own lives with their omniscience to manage the lives of billions of people – along with the planet upon which we live! – and we are now experiencing the costs generated by our own gullibility. We have acted like country bumpkins at the state fair with the egg money who, having been fleeced by a bunch of carnival sharpies, look everywhere for someone to blame other than ourselves. We have been euchred out of our very lives because of our eagerness to believe that benefits can be enjoyed without incurring costs; that the freedom to control one’s life can be separated from the responsibilities for one’s actions; and that two plus two does not have to add up to four if a sizeable public opinion can be amassed against the proposition. By identifying ourselves with any abstraction (such as the state) we give up the integrated life, the sense of wholeness that can be found only within each of us. While the state has manipulated, cajoled, and threatened us to identify ourselves with it, the responsibility for our acceding to its pressures lies within each of us. The statists have – as was their vicious purpose – simply taken over the territory we have abandoned. **Our politico-centric pain and suffering has been brought about by our having allowed external forces to move in and occupy the vacuum we created at the center of our being**. The only way out of our dilemma involves a retracing of the route that brought us to where we are. **We require nothing so much right now as the development of a sense of “who we are” that transcends our institutionalized identities, and returns us** – without division and conflict – **to a centered, self-directed integrity in our lives.**

#### State power is only as inevitable as we think it is – vote negative to withdraw support from the state in favor of a grassroots struggle against neoliberalism

Martin 90 – research associate in the Dept. of Mathematics, Faculty of Science, Australian National University

(Brian, “The State”, from *Uprooting War*, <http://www.bmartin.cc/pubs/90uw/uw07.html>, dml)

What should be done to help transform the state system in the direction of self-reliance and self-management? The problem can seem overwhelming. What difference can the actions of an individual or small group make? Actually, quite a lot. The state system is strong because the actions of many people and groups support it. Most social activists see state intervention as a solution, often the solution, to social problems. What can be done about poverty? More state welfare. What about racial discrimination? Laws and enforcement to stop it. What about environmental degradation? State regulation. What about sexual discrimination? Anti-discrimination legislation. What about corporate irresponsibility or excess profits? Added government controls and taxation, or nationalisation. What about unemployment? state regulation of the economy: investment incentives, job creation schemes, tariffs. What about crime? More police, more prisons, more counsellors. What about enemy attack? More military spending. What about too much military spending? Convince or pressure the government to cut back. The obvious point is that most social activists look constantly to the state for solutions to social problems. This point bears labouring, because the orientation of most social action groups tends to reinforce state power. This applies to most antiwar action too. Many of the goals and methods of peace movements have been oriented around action by the state, such as appealing to state elites and advocating neutralism and unilateralism. Indeed, peace movements spend a lot of effort debating which demand to make on the state: nuclear freeze, unilateral or multilateral disarmament, nuclear-free zones, or removal of military bases. By appealing to the state, activists indirectly strengthen the roots of many social problems, the problem of war in particular. To help transform the state system, action groups need to develop strategies which, at a minimum, do not reinforce state power. This means ending the incessant appeals for state intervention, and promoting solutions to social problems which strengthen local self-reliance and initiative. What can be done about poverty? Promote worker and community control over economic resources, and local self-reliance in skills and resources. What about racial discrimination? Promote discussion, interaction and nonviolent action at a grassroots level. What about environmental degradation? Encourage local communities to re-examine their own activities and to confront damaging practices. What about sexual discrimination? Build grassroots campaigns against rape and the gender division of labour, and mount challenges to hierarchical structures which help sustain patriarchy. What about corporate irresponsibility or excess profits? Promote worker and community control over production. What about unemployment? Promote community control of community resources for equitable distribution of work and the economic product, and develop worker cooperatives as an alternative to jobs as gifts of employers. What about crime? Work against unequal power and privilege, and for meaningful ways of living, to undercut the motivation for crime, and promote local community solidarity as a defence against crime. What about enemy attack? Social defence. What about too much military spending? Build local alternatives to the state, use these alternatives to withdraw support from the state and undermine the economic foundation of military spending. These grassroots, self-managing solutions to social problems are in many cases no more than suggestive directions. Detailed grassroots strategies in most cases have not been developed, partly because so little attention has been devoted to them compared to strategies relying on state intervention. But the direction should be clear: in developing strategies to address social problems, aim at building local self-reliance and withdrawing support from the state rather than appealing for state intervention and thereby reinforcing state power.

## 3

#### TPA spurs growth and trade leadership---political capital generates momentum for bill passage

Mark Kennedy and Mack McLarty 2/12/14, “Expand trade, improve economy: Column,” http://www.usatoday.com/story/opinion/2014/02/12/trade-promotion-authority-obama-economic-growth-column/5340989/

After struggling with anemic growth for the last six years, the nation now finds itself with an opportunity to renew its vitality through the most powerful economic elixir: expanded trade. This benefit cannot be achieved without giving our partners the confidence that the United States is negotiating in good faith, free from last minute changes and additions. This requires giving President Obama Trade Promotion Authority (commonly known as TPA or "fast track") to present trade agreements for an up or down vote in Congress. Passing TPA is distasteful to both Republicans who do not the trust the president and Democrats who believe the benefits of free trade are overstated. Yet before they added cherry flavors, many medicines with powerful cures had a bitter flavor. For the sake of America's economic health, Congress must come together in a bipartisan fashion to give President Obama fast track authority, a power granted to every chief executive since 1974. The Obama Administration, led ably by United States Trade Representative (USTR) Michael Froman, has engaged the European Union and nations in the Pacific in serious negotiations for high standard trade agreements. These two accords would increase ties with historic allies, make us more competitive, increase job opportunities, enhance incomes and allow American businesses to effectively sell to the fast growing Asian region. Critics would have you believe that somehow these agreements would weaken environmental and labor standards, but most partner countries in question are already high-income nations that embrace strong worker and environmental protections. Ambassador Froman attempted to assuage those fears saying, "We have made clear that we're committed to negotiating a high-standard, ambitious comprehensive deal." The TPA bill introduced by Sens. Max Baucus, D-Mont., and Orrin Hatch, R-Utah, already incorporates new protections to ensure that all partner countries meet rigorous guidelines. As President Clinton's chief of staff when the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) was passed and one of the deciding votes the last time Congress granted Fast Track authority, we know how hard it is to move a significant trade accord. We also know how the dire predictions of skeptics are often shown to be illusory. The only sucking sound induced by NAFTA was the gasps of trade skeptics whose economic chimeras failed to materialize. NAFTA has instead exceeded expectations. It launched Mexico on a path to strengthen its democratic institutions and progressively open its economy. A more democratic and competitive Mexico, along with a more tightly integrated supply chain between the three North American economies, makes each member of the NAFTA trio more competitive in world markets. Similar benefits await if we proceed with the proposed Asian and European accords. Passing TPA will require significant attention and effort from President Obama and Congress. Over 500 advocacy groups have written to lawmakers urging a vote against it. To date, 49 more House Democrats are on record opposing fast track than supported NAFTA in 1994. Advocating for free trade will require the president to stand up to members of his own party to further his economic agenda. It will take courage to forcefully advocate for an issue that splits one's party, but the benefits to the nation will far outweigh any intra-party strife. That is what presidential leadership is all about. There has never been an economic golden age without trade. It has been the driving force behind new innovation. Its expansion has allowed countless people the chance to achieve financial prosperity and advance civilization. Trade has a wonderful history, but we believe its best days are still ahead. Every trade liberalization advance has enhanced the well being of mankind. The United States has arrived at a monumental opportunity to craft landmark trade agreements with the world. Let us not fail to build accords that will spark economic growth, create a better future for our children and launch a new golden era of trade.

#### The plan gets drawn into the most divisive embargo debates---it’s perceived as throwing the Cuban government a lifeline

Nerurkar & Sullivan 10 – Neelesh Nerurkar, Specialist in Energy Policy at the Congressional Research Service, and Mark P. Sullivan, Specialist in Latin American Affairs at the Congressional Research Service, November 29, 2010, “Cuba’s Offshore Oil Development: Background and U.S. Policy Considerations,” online: http://assets.opencrs.com/rpts/R41522\_20101129.pdf

On the opposite side of the policy debate, a number of policy groups and members of Congress oppose engagement with Cuba, including U.S. investment in Cuba’s offshore energy development. A legislative initiative introduced in the 111th Congress, H.R. 5620, would go further and impose visa restrictions and economic sanctions on foreign companies and its executives who help facilitate the development of Cuba’s petroleum resources. The bill asserts that offshore drilling by or under the authorization of the Cuban government poses a “serious economic and environmental threat to the United States” because of the damage that an oil spill could cause. Opponents of U.S. support for Cuba’s offshore oil development also argue that such involvement would provide an economic lifeline to the Cuban government and thus prolong the continuation of the communist regime. They maintain that if Cuba reaped substantial economic benefits from offshore oil development, it could reduce societal pressure on Cuba to enact market-oriented economic reforms. Some who oppose U.S. involvement in Cuba’s energy development contend that while Cuba might have substantial amounts of oil offshore, it will take years to develop. They maintain that the Cuban government is using the enticement of potential oil profits to break down the U.S. economic embargo on Cuba.59

#### Free trade prevents multiple scenarios for world war and WMD Terrorism

Panzner-New York Institute of Finance-8

Michael, faculty at the New York Institute of Finance, 25-year veteran of the global stock, bond, and currency markets who has worked in New York and London for HSBC, Soros Funds, ABN Amro, Dresdner Bank, and JPMorgan Chase “Financial Armageddon: Protect Your Future from Economic Collapse,” pg. 136-138

Continuing calls for curbs on the flow of finance and trade will inspire the United States and other nations to spew forth protectionist legislation like the notorious Smoot-Hawley bill. Introduced at the start of the Great Depression, it triggered a series of tit-for-tat economic responses, which many commentators believe helped turn a serious economic downturn into a prolonged and devastating global disaster. But if history is any guide, those lessons will have been long forgotten during the next collapse. Eventually, fed by a mood of desperation and growing public anger, restrictions on trade, finance, investment, and immigration will almost certainly intensify. Authorities and ordinary citizens will likely scrutinize the cross-border movement of Americans and outsiders alike, and lawmakers may even call for a general crackdown on nonessential travel. Meanwhile, many nations will make transporting or sending funds to other countries exceedingly difficult. As desperate officials try to limit the fallout from decades of ill-conceived, corrupt, and reckless policies, they will introduce controls on foreign exchange. Foreign individuals and companies seeking to acquire certain American infrastructure assets, or trying to buy property and other assets on the cheap thanks to a rapidly depreciating dollar, will be stymied by limits on investment by noncitizens. Those efforts will cause spasms to ripple across economies and markets, disrupting global payment, settlement, and clearing mechanisms. All of this will, of course, continue to undermine business confidence and consumer spending. In a world of lockouts and lockdowns, any link that transmits systemic financial pressures across markets through arbitrage or portfolio-based risk management, or that allows diseases to be easily spread from one country to the next by tourists and wildlife, or that otherwise facilitates unwelcome exchanges of any kind will be viewed with suspicion and dealt with accordingly. The rise in isolationism and protectionism will bring about ever more heated arguments and dangerous confrontations over shared sources of oil, gas, and other key commodities as well as factors of production that must, out of necessity, be acquired from less-than-friendly nations. Whether involving raw materials used in strategic industries or basic necessities such as food, water, and energy, efforts to secure adequate supplies will take increasing precedence in a world where demand seems constantly out of kilter with supply. Disputes over the misuse, overuse, and pollution of the environment and natural resources will become more commonplace. Around the world, such tensions will give rise to full-scale military encounters, often with minimal provocation. In some instances, economic conditions will serve as a convenient pretext for conflicts that stem from cultural and religious differences. Alternatively, nations may look to divert attention away from domestic problems by channeling frustration and populist sentiment toward other countries and cultures. Enabled by cheap technology and the waning threat of American retribution, terrorist groups will likely boost the frequency and scale of their horrifying attacks, bringing the threat of random violence to a whole new level. Turbulent conditions will encourage aggressive saber rattling and interdictions by rogue nations running amok. Age-old clashes will also take on a new, more heated sense of urgency. China will likely assume an increasingly belligerent posture toward Taiwan, while Iran may embark on overt colonization of its neighbors in the Mideast. Israel, for its part, may look to draw a dwindling list of allies from around the world into a growing number of conflicts. Some observers, like John Mearsheimer, a political scientist at the University of Chicago, have even speculated that an “intense confrontation” between the United States and China is “inevitable” at some point. More than a few disputes will turn out to be almost wholly ideological. Growing cultural and religious differences will be transformed from wars of words to battles soaked in blood. Long-simmering resentments could also degenerate quickly, spurring the basest of human instincts and triggering genocidal acts. Terrorists employing biological or nuclear weapons will vie with conventional forces using jets, cruise missiles, and bunker-busting bombs to cause widespread destruction. Many will interpret stepped-up conflicts between Muslims and Western societies as the beginnings of a new world war.

## Case

#### Evaluate consequences – allowing violence for the sake of moral purity is evil—moral absolutism undermines political effectiveness

Isaac 2 (Jeffrey C., Professor of Political Science – Indiana-Bloomington, Director – Center for the Study of Democracy and Public Life, Ph.D. – Yale, Dissent Magazine, 49(2), “Ends, Means, and Politics”, Spring, Proquest)

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 goals and 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.

#### 2. In a nuclear world we have to weigh consequences.

Sissela **Bok** (Professor of Philosophy) 19**98** Applied Ethics and Ethical Theory, Ed. David Rosenthal and Fudlou Shehadi

The same argument can be made for Kant’s other formulations of the Categorical Imperative: “So act as to use humanity, both in your own person and in the person of every other, always at the same time as an end, never simply as a means”; and “So act as if you were always through actions a law-making member in a universal Kingdom of Ends.” No one with a concern for humanity could consistently will to risk eliminating humanity in the person of himself and every other or to risk the death of all members in a universal Kingdom of Ends for the sake of justice. To risk their collective death for the sake of following one’s conscience would be, as Rawls said, “irrational, crazy.” And to say that one did not intend such a catastrophe, but that one merely failed to stop other persons from bringing it about would be beside the point when the end of the world was at stake. For although it is true that we cannot be held responsible for most of the wrongs that others commit, the Latin maxim presents a case where we would have to take such a responsibility seriously—perhaps to the point of deceiving, bribing, even killing an innocent person, in order that the world not perish.

#### 4. Policymakers must be utilitarian—incomplete information

#### Goodin 95 (Professor of Philosophy at the Research School of the Social Sciences at the Australian National University (Robert E., Cambridge University Press, “Utilitarianism As a Public Philosophy” pg 63)

My larger argument turns on the proposition that there is something special about the situation of public officials that makes utilitarianism more plausible for them (or, more precisely, makes them adopt a form of utilitarianism that we would find more acceptable) than private individuals. Before proceeding with that larger argument, I must therefore say what it is that is so special about public officials and their situations that makes it both more necessary and more desirable for them to adopt a more credible form of utilitarianism

. Consider, first the argument from necessity. Public officials are obliged to make their choices under uncertainty, and uncertainty of a very special sort at that. All choices-public and private alike- are made under some degree of uncertainty, of course. But in the nature of things, private individuals will usually have more complete information on the peculiarities of their own circumstances and on the ramifications that alternative possible choices might have for them. Public officials, in contrast, are relatively poorly informed as to the effects that their choices will have on individuals, one by one. What they typically do know are generalities: averages and aggregates. They know what will happen most often to most people as a result of their various possible choices. But that is all. That is enough to allow public policy makers to use the utilitarian calculus – if they want to use it at all – to choose general rules of conduct. Knowing aggregates and averages, they can proceed to calculate the utility payoffs from adopting each alternative possible general rule. But they cannot be sure what the payoff will be to any given individual or on any particular occasion. Their knowledge of generalities, aggregates and averages is just not sufficiently fine-grained for that. Furthermore, the argument from necessity would continue, the instruments available to public policy-makers are relatively blunt. They can influence general tendencies, making rather more people behave in certain sorts of ways rather more often. But perfect compliance is unrealistic. And (building on the previous point) not knowing particular circumstances of particular individuals, rules and regulations must necessarily be relatively general in form. They must treat more people more nearly alike than ideally they should, had we perfect information. The combined effect of these two factors is to preclude public policy-makers from fine-tuning policies very well at all. They must, of necessity, deal with people in aggregate, imposing upon them rules that are general in form. Nothing in any of this necessarily forces them to be utilitarian in their public policy-making, of course. What it does do, however, is force them- if they are inclined to be utilitarian at all-away from direct (act) utilitarianism. The circumstances surrounding the selection and implementation of public policies simply do not permit the more precise calculations required by any decision rule more tailored to peculiarities of individuals or situations.

#### Calculation is inevitable and their ethical stance recreates the worst atrocities

Jacques **Derrida 92** “The Force of Law: The ‘Mystical Foundation of Authority’”, Deconstruction and the Possibility of Justice, ed: Cornell, Rosenfeld, and Carlson, p. 28-29

That justice exceeds law and calculation, that the unpresentable exceeds the determinable cannot and should not serve as an alibi for staying out of juridico-political battles, within an institution or state or between institutions or states and others. Left to itself, the incalculable and giving idea of justice is always very close to the bad, even to the worst for it can always be reapportioned by the most perverse calculation. It’s always possible. And so incalculable justice requires us to calculate. And first, closest to what we associate with justice, namely law, the juridicial field that one cannot isolate within sure frontiers, but also in all the fields from which we cannot separate it, which intervene in it and are no longer simply fields: ethics, politics, economics, psycho-sociology, philosophy, literature, etc. Not only must we calculate, negotiate the relation between the calculable and incalculable, and negotiate without the sort of tule that wouldn’t have to reinvented there where we are cast, there where we find ourselves; but we must take it as far as possible, beyond the place where we find ourselves and beyond the already identifiable zones of morality or politics or law, beyond the distinction between national and international, public and private, and so on. This requirement doesn’t properly belong to either justice or law. It only belongs to either of those two domains by exceeding each one in the direction of the other. Politicization, for example, is interminable even if it cannot and should not ever be total. To keep this from being a truism or a triviality, we must recognize in it the following consequence: each advancement in politicization obliges one to reconsider, and so reinterpret, the very foundations of law such as they had been previously calculated or delimited. This was true for example in the Declaration of the Rights of Man, in the abolition of slavery, in all emanicipatory battles that remain and will have to remain in progress, everywhere in the world, for men and for women.

**Cuban health care is rapidly improving - easing the embargo hurts Cuban health care industry – brain drain and medical tourism**

**Garrett** Senior Fellow for Global Health at the Council on Foreign Relations **2010** Laurie “Castrocare in Crisis Will Lifting the Embargo Make Things Worse?” Foreign Affairs July/August http://terpconnect.umd.edu/~kmcm/Articles/Castrocare%20in%20Crisis.pdf

Cuba is a Third World country that aspires to First World medicine and health. Its health-care system is not only a national public good but also a vital export commodity. **Under the Castro brothers' rule, Cubans' average life expectancy has increased from 58 years** (in 1950) **to 77 years** (in 2009), giving Cuba the world's 55th-highest life expectancy ranking, only six places behind the United States. According to the World Health Organization (WHO), **Cuba has the second-lowest child mortality rate in the Americas** (the United States places third) **and the lowest per capita HIV/AIDS prevalence.** Fifty years ago, the major causes of disease and death in Cuba were tropical and mosquito-borne microbes. Today, Cuba's major health challenges mirror those of the United States: cancer, cardiovascular disease, obesity, diabetes, and other chronic ailments related to aging, tobacco use, and excessive fat consumption. By any measure, these achievements are laudable. But they have come at tremendous financial and social cost. The Cuban government's 2008 budget of $46.2 billion allotted $7.2 billion (about 16 percent) to direct health-care spending. Only Cuba's expenditures for education exceeded those for health, and Cuba's health costs are soaring as its aging population requires increasingly expensive chronic care. Cuba's economic situation has been dire since 1989, when the country lost its Soviet benefactors and its economy experienced a 35 percent contraction. Today, Cuba's major industries -- tourism, nickel mining, tobacco and rum production, and health care -- are fragile. Cubans blame the long-standing U.S. trade embargo for some of these strains and are wildly optimistic about the transformations that will come once the embargo is lifted. Overlooked in these dreamy discussions of lifestyle improvements, however, is that **Cuba's health-care industry will likely be radically affected by any** serious **easing in trade and travel restrictions between the U**nited **S**tates **and Cuba.** **If policymakers** on both sides of the Florida Straits **do not take great care, the tiny Caribbean nation could swiftly be robbed of its greatest triumph.** First, **its public health network could be devastated by an exodus of thousands of well-trained Cuban physicians and nurses.** Second, **for-profit U.S. companies could transform the remaining health-care system into a prime destination for medical tourism from abroad.** **The very strategies that the Cuban government has employed to develop its system into a major success story have rendered it ripe for the plucking by the U.S. medical industry and by foreigners eager for affordable, elective surgeries in a sunny climate.** In short, **although the U.S. embargo strains Cuba's health-care system and its overall economy, it may be the better of two bad options.**

**Cuba is a key model for global health care – key to disease prevention**

**Monthly Review** 7/12/**2012** “Why Is Cuba's Health Care System the Best Model for Poor Countries?” http://mrzine.monthlyreview.org/2012/fitz071212.html

Furious though it may be, the current debate over **health care in the US is** largely **irrelevant to charting a path for poor countries** of Africa, Latin America, Asia, and the Pacific Islands. That is because the US squanders perhaps 10 to 20 times what is needed for a good, affordable medical system. The waste is far more than 30% overhead by private insurance companies. It includes an enormous amount of over-treatment, creation of illnesses, exposure to contagion through over-hospitalization, disease-focused instead of prevention-focused research, and making the poor sicker by refusing them treatment.1

**Poor countries simply cannot afford such a health system. Well over 100 countries are looking to the example of Cuba,** which has the same 78-year life expectancy of the US while spending 4% per person annually of what the US does.2

The most revolutionary idea of the Cuban system is doctors living in the neighborhoods they serve. A doctor-nurse team are part of the community and know their patients well because they live at (or near) the consultorio (doctor's office) where they work. Consultorios are backed up by policlínicos which provide services during off-hours and offer a wide variety of specialists. Policlínicos coordinate community health delivery and link nationally-designed health initiatives with their local implementation.

**Cubans** call their system medicina general integral (MGI, comprehensive general medicine). Its **programs focus on preventing people from getting diseases and treating them as rapidly as possible.**

**This has made Cuba extremely effective in control of** everyday **health issues.** Having doctors' offices in every neighborhood has brought the Cuban infant mortality rate below that of the US and less than half that of US Blacks.3 **Cuba has a record unmatched in dealing with chronic and infectious diseases with amazingly limited resources.** These include (with date eradicated): polio (1962), malaria (1967), neonatal tetanus (1972), diphtheria (1979), congenital rubella syndrome (1989), post-mumps meningitis (1989), measles (1993), rubella (1995), and TB meningitis (1997).4

The MGI integration of neighborhood doctors' offices with area clinics and a national hospital system also means the country responds well to emergencies. It has the ability to evacuate entire cities during a hurricane largely because consultorio staff know everyone in their neighborhood and know who to call for help getting disabled residents out of harm's way. **At the time when New York** City **(roughly the same population as Cuba) had 43,000 cases of AIDS, Cuba had 200 AIDS patients**.5 More recent emergencies such as **outbreaks** of dengue fever **are quickly followed by national mobilizations.**6

**Disease 🡺 extinction**

**Ryan 97** (Frank, fellow of The Royal College of Physicians, Virus X, p. 366, JT)

How might **the human race** appear to such an aggressively emerging virus? That teeming, globally intrusive species, **with its transcontinental air travel, massively congested cities, sexual promiscuity, and** in the less affluent regions — where the virus is most likely to first emerge — **a vulnerable lack of hygiene with regard to food and water supplies and hospitality to biting insects' The virus is best seen,** in John Hollands excellent analogy, **as a swarm of competing mutations, with each individual strain subjected to furious forces of natural selection for the strain, or strains, most likely to amplify and evolve in the new ecological habitat.3** With such a promising new opportunity in the invaded species, natural selection must eventually come to dominate viral behavior. In time the dynamics of infection will select for a more resistant human population. Such a coevolution takes rather longer in "human" time — too long, given the ease of spread within the global village. **A rapidly lethal and quickly spreading virus simply would not have time to switch from aggression to coevolution. And there lies the danger.** Joshua Lederbergs prediction can now be seen to be an altogether logical one. Pandemics are inevitable. Our incredibly rapid human evolution, our overwhelming global needs, the advances of our complex industrial society, all have moved the natural goalposts. **The advance of society,** the very science of change, **has greatly augmented the potential for the emergence of a pandemic strain.** It is hardly surprising that Avrion Mitchison, scientific director of Deutsches Rheuma Forschungszentrum in Berlin, asks the question: "Will we survive!” We have invaded every biome on earth and we continue to destroy other species so very rapidly that one eminent scientist foresees the day when no life exists on earth apart from the human monoculture and the small volume of species useful to it. **An increasing multitude of disturbed viral-host symbiotic cycles are provoked into self-protective counterattacks. This is a dangerous situation**. And we have seen in the previous chapter how ill-prepared the world is to cope with it. **It begs the most frightening question of all: could such a pandemic virus cause the extinction of the human species?**

#### The AFF has it backwards: opposing the embargo means supporting the regime – turns the 1AC

Suchlicki ‘13 (Jaime, Emilio Bacardi Moreau Distinguished Professor and Director, Institute for Cuban and Cuban-American Studies, University of Miami, What If…the U.S. Ended the Cuba Travel Ban and the Embargo? 2/26/13, http://interamericansecuritywatch.com/what-if-the-u-s-ended-the-cuba-travel-ban-and-the-embargo/)

Lifting the ban for U.S. tourists to travel to Cuba would be a major concession totally out of proportion to recent changes in the island. If the U.S. were to lift the travel ban without major reforms in Cuba, there would be significant implications:

Money from American tourists would flow into businesses owned by the Castro government thus strengthening state enterprises. The tourist industry is controlled by the military and General Raul Castro, Fidel’s brother. American tourists will have limited contact with Cubans. Most Cuban resorts are built in isolated areas, are off limits to the average Cuban, and are controlled by Cuba’s efficient security apparatus. Most Americans don’t speak Spanish, have but limited contact with ordinary Cubans, and are not interested in visiting the island to subvert its regime. Law 88 enacted in 1999 prohibits Cubans from receiving publications from tourists. Penalties include jail terms. While providing the Castro government with much needed dollars, the economic impact of tourism on the Cuban population would be limited. Dollars will trickle down to the Cuban poor in only small quantities, while state and foreign enterprises will benefit most. Tourist dollars would be spent on products, i.e., rum, tobacco, etc., produced by state enterprises, and tourists would stay in hotels owned partially or wholly by the Cuban government. The principal airline shuffling tourists around the island, Gaviota, is owned and operated by the Cuban military. The assumption that the Cuban leadership would allow U.S. tourists or businesses to subvert the revolution and influence internal developments is at best naïve. As we have seen in other circumstances, U.S. travelers to Cuba could be subject to harassment and imprisonment. Over the past decades hundred of thousands of Canadian, European and Latin American tourists have visited the island. Cuba is not more democratic today. If anything, Cuba is more totalitarian, with the state and its control apparatus having been strengthened as a result of the influx of tourist dollars. As occurred in the mid-1990s, an infusion of American tourist dollars will provide the regime with a further disincentive to adopt deeper economic reforms. Cuba’s limited economic reforms were enacted in the early 1990s, when the island’s economic contraction was at its worst. Once the economy began to stabilize by 1996 as a result of foreign tourism and investments, and exile remittances, the earlier reforms were halted or rescinded by Castro. Lifting the travel ban without major concessions from Cuba would send the wrong message “to the enemies of the United States”: that a foreign leader can seize U.S. properties without compensation; allow the use of his territory for the introduction of nuclear missiles aimed at the United States; espouse terrorism and anti-U.S. causes throughout the world; and eventually the United States will “forget and forgive,” and reward him with tourism, investments and economic aid. Since the Ford/Carter era, U.S. policy toward Latin America has emphasized democracy, human rights and constitutional government. Under President Reagan the U.S. intervened in Grenada, under President Bush, Sr. the U.S. intervened in Panama and under President Clinton the U.S. landed marines in Haiti, all to restore democracy to those countries. The U.S. has prevented military coups in the region and supported the will of the people in free elections. U.S. policy has not been uniformly applied throughout the world, yet it is U.S. policy in the region. Cuba is part of Latin America. While no one is advocating military intervention, normalization of relations with a military dictatorship in Cuba will send the wrong message to the rest of the continent. Once American tourists begin to visit Cuba, Castro would probably restrict travel by Cuban-Americans. For the Castro regime, Cuban-Americans represent a far more subversive group because of their ability to speak to friends and relatives on the island, and to influence their views on the Castro regime and on the United States. Indeed, the return of Cuban exiles in 1979-80 precipitated the mass exodus of Cubans from Mariel in 1980. A large influx of American tourists into Cuba would have a dislocating effect on the economies of smaller Caribbean islands such as Jamaica, the Dominican Republic, the Bahamas, Puerto Rico, and even Florida, highly dependent on tourism for their well-being. Careful planning must take place, lest we create significant hardships and social problems in these countries. If the embargo is lifted, limited trade with, and investments in Cuba would develop. Yet there are significant implications.

#### No human rights abuses or oppression—it’s all a story created by Americans

Roberts, 2k former English professor and political activist (Glen Roberts, 2000, “Misconceptions about Cuba”, <http://www.iammyownreporter.com/misconceptions.htm)//EM>

2. Cubans eat only one meal a day. Wrong! This is an example of typical Miami warp. Because Cuba guarantees every child up to 7 a healthy ration of milk, no matter how tough times are, the "exiles" claim 8-year-old kids aren't "allowed" to drink milk. In fact, free meals are served in schools and on the job, and Cubans get at least enough subsidized food on the ration for one meal a day at home. This can easily be doubled for 20 pesos a month or tripled for 40. This system ensures people can eat enough (I personally get fat on one meal a day; how about you?) and lets them decide what 1/3 to 2/3 of their food will be (it's virtually a saying in Cuba that Cubans eat 3 times a day). They also eat lots of ice cream and cheese, there's plenty of powdered and canned milk, and as the number of dairy cows grows and new breeds are added, there is more milk every year. 3. Cubans live in miserable slums. Wrong! In fact, the only slum in Cuba is Old Havana, foolishly (in my opinion) kept for the tourists. Most Cubans who once lived in shanties now live in institutional apartment buildings, just like most Spaniards. A substantial number live in old houses considered substandard by the government and scheduled to be replaced. But very few of those have dirt floors. Far more live in 50's era homes that are perfectly alright. More and more are living in new apartments and casitas that put the Russian concept Cuba accepted for too long to shame. The only dirt floored shanty towns (actually some small clusters) I have seen in Cuba are the unnecessary, non-systemic result of a minority of refuseniks who abandon good houses in their home towns to come to Havana or Santiago to hustle dollars. One of their scams is to show off their artificial poverty to foolish tourists for donations. Most small cities in Cuba are nice to beautiful places where there's nothing that looks like a slum. 4. The embargo causes intense suffering and many deaths. Wrong! In fact, almost no other country observes the embargo. Certainly, it causes problems, because America should be a closer and cheaper source of many things Cuba, which is an island of limited resources, regularly buys. But Mexico is just as close. Venezuela, a major oil producer, is now very friendly. Cuba makes most of its own medicines; I ask in every pharmacy I pass and they always tell me they fill virtually all prescriptions; and when I went to the Ministry of Health and asked for a list of actually critical medical needs, I got a very short list. Most importantly, the absence of any general suffering in Cuba is dramatically visible to the naked eye. 5. Cuba is guilty of gross human rights abuses. Wrong! Punch up human rights and Cuba on your Computer and read stories in the New York Times about how the U.N. Human Rights Commission, Amnesty International, and the Red Cross all rated Cuba's justice system as normal, i.e. no better or worse than ours. That was before the Bush administration. In the last 4 years, Cuba has been way above the U.S. in the area of human rights. While Cuba was being criticized for executing 3 terrorists and for jailing 75 people proven to be working for and in the pay of a foreign power self proclaimed to be Cuba's enemy for the purpose of sabotaging the Cuban system, the Bush administration was being criticized and protested by millions of people all over the world for killing, maiming, and crippling thousands of people for no acceptable reason, and for jailing nobody even knows how many people for no known reason. Did I make that up?

#### No solvency—the Cuban government will impose its own restrictions even if the embargo is lifted—only gradualism can solve

Oracle 12(U.S. should approach Cuban embargo with caution <http://www.usforacle.com/u-s-should-approach-cuban-embargo-with-caution-1.2796443#.Uei9WdLOu0c> Novermber 21, nkj)

Since the embargo took effect in 1962, debate over its ramifications on the Cuban government and the potential good that lifting the sanctions could do for Cuban citizens has been a major ethical issue in American foreign affairs. Speculation arises that Cuba may be less tentative to allow American business interests in the country, as it would allow Cuban citizens and businesses to prosper and take control and capital away from the government.

The U.S. should move cautiously toward lifting the embargo and engaging in this type of economic partnership with Cuba, as it runs the risk of benefitting only the Cuban government’s agenda, rather than for the good of the people.

Currently, only a small amount of humanitarian aid, such as medical supplies and food, can cross the Cuban border and reach the Cuban population. Beyond that, Fidel and Raul Castro have shown little to no signs of giving in on their stance to remain self-sustaining. Cuba has proven that there is little wisdom in this philosophy, as much of the country lives in poverty.

The dilemma revolves around whether American engagement in Cuba would actually go to help its economy or just be pilfered by Castro’s regime. Rep. Ileana Ros-Lethinen (R-Fla.), chairwoman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, told the New York Times that “we should not buy into the facade the dictatorship is trying to create by announcing ‘reforms’ while, in reality, it’s tightening its grip on its people,” suggesting that the embargo should not only be left in place but also that its restrictions should be magnified.

Lifting the embargo, in theory, seems like it would open up a new era of investment in Cuba, allowing U.S. and Cuban businesses to work together and create economic capital for the state — and this is the ideal goal. Yet the risk of government corruption is too great, and the U.S. should work slowly to make changes to its policies, lest its actions end up supporting a regime it has fought so hard to suppress.

Despite how relentless American political discourse can get, the oppression that Cubans face from their government is daunting enough. While the Cuban embargo is unlikely to let up until their government is willing to lessen the totalitarian control over its people, America should be working proactively to end the embargo in a manner that pushes Cuba toward democracy and a free-market.

#### Failure to confront the values and assumptions of neoliberal market rationality fortifies a socio-political structure founded on racism, sexism, classism, and anthropocentrism that makes planetary destruction and violence inevitable

Darder, 2k10[Antonia Darker, Professor of Education at the University of Illinois, Preface Author, Kahn, Richard, and Richard V. Kahn. Critical pedagogy, ecoliteracy, & planetary crisis: The ecopedagogy movement. Vol. 359. Peter Lang Pub Incorporated, 2010]

Darder—unless we confront the values and assumptions of neoliberal market rationality, a sociopolitical structure premised on racism, sexism, classism, and anthropocentrism makes planetary destruction and violence inevitable--

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

### at: state key

#### Their “state key” warrants turn the aff – it reinforces neoliberalism and bad statism

**Anker 12** – Assistant Professor of American Studies at The George Washington University

(Elisabeth, “Heroic Identifications: Or, ‘You Can Love Me Too – I am so Like the State’”, Theory & Event Vol 15, Issue 1 2012, dml)

**Identification with the state enables destruction of individual agency which shapes interps of state agency, identification loses their freedom and since the governmentality of the current state directly support neoliberalism and state expansion. Also indicates that identification creates uncritical support of the state and thinking it’s always good which isn’t what their state good authors assume. Their authors assume state can be malleable but even if they win that, their identification makes it impossible to recognize and change the state.**

Identification with state action created an equivalence between the state and the individual, which worked in part because the state continues to be the primary source of accountable public power. Even in a deterritorialized era of globalization – as multinational regulatory bodies and neoliberal corporate power might seem to make state capacities increasingly irrelevant to the flow of people, goods, and power – the state remains the discursive locus of power, the conferrant of rights and political recognition in public life. Paul Passavant refers to this as the “strong neoliberal state” in order to highlight how contemporary neoliberal governmentality contributes to, rather than weakens, state expansion and regulatory power in the twenty-first century.22 Brown similarly argues that the state continues to be the primary power visible, and responsible, as political power. 23 This is certainly not to say that state functions are the only source of political power, but that they are the primary ones that are formally accountably and publicly verifiable. State functions are aggregated as a key nodal point for political identity, knowledge, power and influence. They seem to embody and employ instruments of protection and strength – military power, juridical authority, legal legitimacy – that wield power visibly and on a large scale. Within political life, the state is the most obvious symbol of autonomous power. Identification with state power is also enabled because the categories that define individual agency also often shape American interpretations of state agency. The state is figured as a singular, self-reliant individual, its actions an expression of a sovereign subject. Various governmental agencies and actions are discursively consolidated into a unilateral, personified force that conquers its external enemies and services the domestic population. Combined, they signify the type of power recognized and understood within the possessive individualism of mainstream liberal discourses: an autonomous power that is self-governing, and that is ontologically capable of self-emancipation in situations of duress or heteronomy.24 In the later 20th century, the discourse of individualism has increasingly described and personified American state power. As Sheldon Wolin and Michael Rogin have suggested, the post-isolationist, global superpower reconfiguration of America after WWII drew in part from individualism’s norms for mastery and power.25 Historians Steven Ambrose and Gary Wills argue that during the Cold War it seemed to many political officials, and eventually the public, that as long as America married a nationwide self-reliance to political and military might, it could control world events; for many policymakers and citizens, world problems would only exist if America couldn’t muster the will it needed to solve its problems effectively.26 The norms of American individualism thus seemed to shape the possibilities for various modes of state power. Individualism was nationalized in the political discourses that postulated that international politics could be controlled and molded to America’s needs.27 Failure to do so demonstrated only a lack of desire, not lack of capacity. Individualism narrated political crisis by categorizing America qua individual; it articulated a personified notion of state action and state capacity through the concept of the heroic, self-reliant individual. Identification with state action relies not only on the mimetic constitution of self and state but also on America’s democratic promise that individuals author the state, as electoral accountability and the people-as-the-origin-of-political-power claim enable the fantasy that state action can be one’s own. Identification with the state relies upon the formal structure of America’s representative democracy, which promises that state power originates in its citizens. It is as longstanding as America’s founding moments – what Alexander Hamilton referred to as the constitutional premise that the people are the “fountain” of all political power.28 State power is, uneasily, both an extension of the civic self and source of potential domination. The American state is seen to be created by laws formally authorized by all, electorally accountable to the people, steered toward their vision of the good life, and an expression of the might of the nation. It is also a likely tyrant that citizens are wary of, that threatens their freedom at every turn, yet one that they tame and steer through electoral accountability and civic participation. It produces what Murray Edelman once diagnosed as the continuous slippage in referents to the state as both “us” and “them.”29 Foreign policy provides the arena for demonstrating autonomous state power vis-à-vis other entities, and the democratic, state-as-civic-self model of governance yokes the individual to state power’s operations. In other words, liberal individualism has not been necessarily opposed to the state but has also mapped on to, and directed, the very notion of state agency. Individualism leads to the state, not only to a distrust of state power but also to its uncritical support. America’s historically recent iterations of national individualism are therefore not exclusively anti-statist, as the trope of individualism generally is; in many ways, it is a heroic, self-making individualism realized most fully at the state level. It paves the way for how the national identifications arising out of 9/11 involved identifying not only with other fellow-Americans or with a larger sense of patriotic nationhood, but also with the very governing mechanisms of the federal state. The individual identification with state power was, of course, experienced only as a vicarious form of heroism. The immediate source of blame for 9/11 was already dead (the hijackers); or hidden (bin Laden); or a complicated configuration of foreign affairs too convoluted to be singularly defined or bound as a national entity. Yet blame was categorized in tidy and monological terms – through singular causes (terrorists); national boundaries (Afghanistan, then Iraq); and moral binaries (America versus the Axis of Evil). Identification draws from the impulse to overcome what has caused individuals to “lose” their freedom, a loss, I have been suggesting, that is perhaps constitutive of this contemporary political subject. Because the target for the hero’s display of mastery – terrorism – was not the only cause of powerlessness, nor were efforts to personify its tactical nature successful, the experience of constraint remained unchallenged and even intensified. Surely this is why the killing of Osama bin Laden did not provide any real sense of national relief to a population continually beset by glaring examples of their own political unfreedom and economic powerlessness, daily experiences that have nothing to do with terrorism – from the housing crisis and endless political corruption scandals to massive levels of unemployment and the Citizens United decision. Throughout the last decade, the expectation was that the killing of bin Laden would finally satisfy the long-delayed gratification of the “Mission Accomplished” triumphalism over terror. Yet aside from the few students whose late-night cheers at the White House on the night of bin Laden’s death saturated media coverage and stood in for American sentiment writ large, there has been no substantial nationwide, long-term sense of satisfaction or freedom out of that moment. Lived experiences of political and economic helplessness overcame any sense of heroism or mastery seemingly generated out of his death. In a nation in which the might of the global superpower is continually weakened by transnational flows and geopolitical shifts, and in which the reigning value of individualism suffers crippling blows, identification with state action aims to restore the fantasy of unbound freedom to both the individual and the state. It attempts to sustain the moribund promise of individualism by imagining its revivification at the state level, so that unilateral sovereign state power could be imagined as an extension of each American citizen’s sovereignty. Yet heroism as state action creates only a vicarious way of experiencing individualism. It highlights the paradox that the recuperation of individual mastery entailed the legitimation of policies that engender individual surveillance, the abrogation of civil liberties, increased regulation, and brutal violence. The “solution” for recapturing freedom becomes state and corporate organized War on Terror. In legitimating policies and powers that explicitly target the American citizens employing them to challenge their unfreedom, identification entrenches the experiences of powerlessness it was employed to relieve, inflicting greater unfreedom upon the subject as well as greater violence throughout the global order. This post-9/11 political subject who sanctions state power does not so much desire its own subjection as unintentionally re-route its desire for freedom into a deeper condition of dependence and constraint.