### 1NC FW

#### A. Interpretation: The affirmative must present and defend a world where the United States federal government substantially increases its economic engagement towards Cuba, Mexico, or Venezuela.

#### “Resolved” proves the framework for the resolution is to enact a policy.

Words and Phrases 64 Permanent Edition

Definition of the word “resolve,” given by Webster is “to express an opinion or determination by resolution or vote; as ‘it was resolved by the legislature;” It is of similar force to the word “enact,” which is defined by Bouvier as meaning “to establish by law”.

#### The USFG is the government in Washington D.C.

Encarta Online Encyclopedia 2k <http://encarta.msn.com>

“The federal government of the United States is centered in Washington DC”

#### B. Violation: they don’t defend the hypothetical implementation of the plan

#### C. This interpretation is best –

#### 1. If we win this argument, the affirmative is not topical because they do not defend the resolution, that’s a voting issue to preserve competitive equity and jurisdictional integrity

#### 2. Fairness – if the affirmative does not defend the resolution, there are an infinite number of non-falsifiable, unpredictable, totalizing, and personal claims they can make – it is impossible to be negative

#### 3. Roleplaying creates a competitive space to imagine new ideas and translate them into practical, real world suggestions

ANDREWS 2006(Peter, Consulting Faculty Member at the IBM Executive Business Institute in Palisades, New York, Executive Technology Report, August, www-935.ibm.com/services/us/bcs/pdf/g510-6313-etr-unlearn-to-innovate.pdf)

High stakes innovation requires abandoning conventional wisdom, even actively unlearning things we “know

AND

for unexpected alternatives and find the vulnerabilities of a new idea or approach).

### 1NC T

#### A. Interpretation -“Engagement” requires increasing economic contacts – that’s distinct from appeasement --- this blurs the practice with any positive sanction and wrecks limits and precision

Resnick 1 – Dr. Evan Resnick, Ph.D. in Political Science from Columbia University, Assistant Professor of Political Science at Yeshiva University, “Defining Engagement”, Journal of International Affairs, Spring, 54(2), Ebsco

A REFINED DEFINITION OF ENGAGEMENT In order to establish a more effective framework for dealing

AND

the information necessary to better manage the rogue states of the 21st century.

#### B. Violation – they lift sanctions – that’s appeasement

#### C. Voting issue

#### 1. Limits – infinite amount of restrictions the aff can remove – explodes neg research burden

#### 2. Ground – Lose spending links based off of increases in funding

#### **D. The aff is extra topical; independent reason to vote neg because it means they can endorse anything which kills neg ground – it includes non-economic mandates**

Department of State, no date ("Overview of State-Sponsored Terrorism", www.state.gov/documents/organization/31944.pdf)

Designating countries that repeatedly support international terrorism (that is, placing a country on

AND

above $100,000 with companies controlled by terrorist-list states.

### 1NC K

#### The AFF assumes a gender neutral political subject that ignore violence against women

**Fraser 90** (Nancy Fraser. Rethinking the Public Sphere. Social Text. No 25/26.)

Now, let me juxtapose to this sketch of Habermas's account an alternative account that

AND

status distinctions are bracketed and neutralized is not sufficient to make it so.

#### The AFFs discussion of terrorism obfuscates everyday acts of violence against women. The 1AC only discusses meta-level violence and ignores domestic terrorism in the private sphere. The AFF framing of terrorism prolongs patriarchal power relations

**Sloan-Lynch in 2012**

Sloan-Lynch, Jay. “Domestic abuse as Terrorism.” Hypatia. Vol 27, no 4. Fall 2012.

Virginia Held suggests in a recent article that current usage of the term terrorism¶

AND

social arrangements by means of institutionalized methods of violence¶ and terror creation.¶

#### The AFFs understanding of war and peace rely on narrow definitions of violence that perpetrate violence against women. Patriarchy is the root of all violence and conflict.

**Ray in 1997**

A. E. Ray “The Shame of it: gender-based terrorism in the former Yugoslavia and the failureof international human rights law to comprehend the injuries.” The American University Law Review. Vol 46.

In order to reach all of the violence perpetrated against the women of the former

AND

] political struggle [over female subordination] is women's bodies." 7 2

#### The Alternative: Vote negative to reject the 1AC’s framing of terrorism in favor of gender conscious policy making. Breaking out of patriarchy requires a shift away from the master’s tools. Only the ALT reclaims politics to position violence against women at the center of policy discussion.

Bensimon and Marshall 03 (Estela, professor at the University of Southern California, Catherine, professor at the University of North Carolina, “Like It Or Not Feminist Critical Policy Analysis Matters”, The Journal of Higher Education, Volume 74, Issue 3, Project Muse)

Earlier we said that the master's preoccupation is how to absorb feminism into policy analysis

AND

challengers from the fringes, trying to get the hegemonic center to listen.

### 1NC CP

#### Text: The United States federal government should add every country to the list of countries governed by Section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act. The United States federal government should cease current and ban future projects of regime change, economic sanctions, military base expansion, military occupation, military assistance for strategic partners, isolation of disapproved political movements, and counterterrorism operations to countries governed by Section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act.

#### Counterplan solves the counterplan adds every country to the list of state sponsors of terrorism but says being on the list of state sponsors of terrorism prevents the US from being able to militarily or coercively intervene in that country’s affairs. Your author concludes the only reason the list is problematic is it allows neoconservative approaches towards those countries, but we solve that better

Jackson 07, Professor in International Politics at Aberystwyth University, 2007 [Richard, “Critical reflection on counter-sanctuary discourse”, In: M. Innes, ed. Denial of sanctuary: understanding terrorist safe havens, p. 30-33]

A related problem for the "terrorist sanctuaries" discourse is that it has always

AND

approaches to terrorism and the ongoing problem of civilian-directed state terror.

#### The net benefit is neoliberalism – removing Cuba from the terror list simply allows the US to get a foot in the door – we’ll increase ties with Cuba

The Boston Globe, 2013 (2/19/2013, “Cuba’s reforms pave way for new US policy, too”, The Boston Globe, http://www.bostonglobe.com/opinion/editorials/2013/02/09/cuba-reform-create-opportunity-drag-policy-into-century/xER2NTTXGsxdLej0miHwFM/story.html)

The Cuban-American population, which has historically opposed any loosening of US policy

AND

both. This would include boosts to US farm companies while helping Cubans.

#### The impact is environmental destruction and extinction

Richard A. Smith 07, Research Associate at the Institute for Policy Research & Development, UK; PhD in History from UCLA, June 2007, “The Eco-suicidal Economics of Adam Smith,” Capitalism Nature Socialism, Vol. 18, No. 2, p. 22-43

In the midst of the record-breaking heat wave in the summer of 2003

AND

"endless technical adjustments;" thus no further theoretical thought is required."27

### 1NC DA

#### Aff frees up resources to be used for the War on Terror

Levy 11 – Lecturer and Doctoral Candidate at the Josef Korbel School of International Affairs at the University of Denver, received the Leonard Marks Essay Award of the American Academy of Diplomacy, masters degree from Columbia in International Affairs. (Arturo Lopez-Levy, “A Call for Cuba’s Removal from the List of State Sponsers of Terrorism”, Center for International policy/Latin American Working Group, 12/1/11, [http://www.lawg.org/storage/documents/Cuba/lawg\_cip\_dec\_2011.pdf)//](http://www.lawg.org/storage/documents/Cuba/lawg_cip_dec_2011.pdf)/) EO

So, let me discuss the first issue, why including Cuba on the terrorist

AND

of its demobilization, making this a non issue, the presence of members

#### The turn is unique – War on Terror resources are being cutback now – only the aff reinscribes the spread of imperialism

Tourangbam 13 [Monish Tourangbam, Eurasia Review, 6/29/13 http://www.eurasiareview.com/29062013-rethinking-us-counter-terrorism-policy-analysis-2/]

Close to 12 years after the 9/11 attacks that led to the global

AND

risks involved and the negative repercussions it had for US-Pakistan relations.

#### Unlimited imperialist conquest inevitably results in extinction, every modern war has been a byproduct of the spread of imperialism

Harvey ‘06

[David Harvey, “Spaces of Global Capitalism: A Theory of Uneven Geographical Development”, May 17 2006, Chapter 13]

At times of savage devaluation, interregional rivalries typically degenerate into struggles over who is

AND

of the world, but by the destruction and death of global war.

### 1NC DA

#### Removing Cuba from SST rewards and strengthens the Castro regime—holding a strong hand will lead to the governments downfall in time

Poblete 13 - Federal Government Law & Strategy/Policy Analyst attorney [Jason, 6-23-13, DC Dispatches, “Edward Snowden May Be Cuba or Latin America Bound … Cuba Keeps Earning its Place on the State Sponsors of Terror List,” <http://jasonpoblete.com/2013/06/23/edward-snowden-may-be-cuba-bound-cuba-keeps-earning-its-place-on-the-state-sponsors-of-terror-list/>]

Interestingly, not once throughout the CSIS panel did any of the speakers discuss that

AND

but guarantee that Cuba is somehow lending a hand to make it so.

#### Cuba’s government is oppressing its people and restricting their freedom of speech

Gonzalez 11 - Heritage Foundation communications vice president [Mike, 7-26-11, The Foundry, “Media Fails to Report on Castro Regime’s Brutal Oppression,” <http://blog.heritage.org/2011/07/26/media-fails-to-report-on-castro-regimes-brutal-oppression/>]

Last week, just outside Cuba’s holiest Catholic shrine, government thugs attacked in plain

AND

to terrorize and drag a bunch of older women naked through the streets.

#### Oppression is really bad

Memmi 2k (Albert, Professor Emeritus of Sociology @ U of Paris, Naiteire, Racism, transl. Steve Martinot, p. 165)

Of course, this is debatable. There are those who think that if one

AND

. True, it is a wager, but the stakes are irresistible.

### 1NC Case

#### 1. Their ZINGALE AND HUMMEL evidence indicates that 9/11 ushered in a “new era” – this is flawed because carries with it a host of dangerous assumptions—it legitimates the war on terror – turns case

Kennedy-Pipe and Rengger 06 [CAROLINE KENNEDY-PIPE AND NICHOLAS RENGGER, 2006 (“Apocalypse now? Continuities or disjunctions in world politics after 9/11” International Affairs, vol. 82, 3, accessed via EBSCO)]

It is now a commonplace of political reflection that the attacks on New York and

AND

and the introduction of new legislation which might limit many traditional civil liberties.

#### 2. Taking Cuba off the list doesn’t solve other countries remain on the list – the federal government is still entrenched in policies that aren’t open to the Other – they have no warrant for spillover no reason why a rejection would be able to change U.S. policy

3. Cuba engages on acts of terrorism—needs to stay on list

Hudson 13 - Reporter on National Security for Foreign Policy (John, “Rubio: Cuba Belongs on the ‘state sponsors of terrorism’ list”, 6/3/13, The Foreign Policy, <http://thecable.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2013/06/03/rubio_cuba_belongs_on_the_state_sponsor_of_terror_list>)

In the face of mounting calls to remove Cuba from the State Department's list of

AND

. "This totalitarian state continues to have close ties to terrorist organizations."

1. Securitizing discourse doesn’t do anything; debaters have been making threats of nuclear war for the last 60 years and nothing has happened – empirically denied.

2. History proves that ignoring threats will lead to horrors like Nazi rule during WWII – we have to recognize that threats are real or they will spiral out of control

Mitchell 6 (Larry, 9-11-6, Is terror threat like WWII?, The Chicagoer, <http://www.chicoer.com/news/ci_4314873>) LE

"Remember Pearl Harbor!" "Remember Sept. 11!" Today, the status

AND

that before World War II may be convincing, but is it accurate?

4. Rejecting realism leads to war.

Snyder 1 (Glenn, Professor Emeritus of Political Science at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, “Mearsheimer’s World— Offensive Realism and the Struggle for Security,” International Security, 27(1), AD: 7-10-9) BL

Focusing the tools of offensive realism on Europe and Northeast Asia, Mearsheimer foresees greater

AND

“pacifer” and second by fostering change in the regional power structures.

5. Security discourse isn’t inherently bad—presenting it in debate allows the negative attributes to be avoided; we solve better

Williams 3 (Michael, Professor of International Politics at the University of Wales, “Words, Images, Enemies: Securitization and International Politics,” International Studies Quarterly, 47(4), AD: 7-10-9) BL

I have argued thus far that recognizing the roots of securitization theory within the legacy

AND

School is insulated from many of the most common criticisms leveled against it.

#### **4. Ethical confrontation with the enemy blurs the friend/enemy distinction – results in extermination**

Prozorov 06 (Sergei, Research Fellow at the Department of Political and Economic Studies at the University of Helsinki, “Liberal Enmity: The Figure of the Foe in the Political Ontology of Liberalism”, Millennium Journal of International Studies 35: 75)

What interests us in this modality of the friend–enemy distinction is the explicit

AND

, or, in Schmitt’s terms, an inimicus rather than a hostis.

#### 5. Reject the affirmative’s ethics of inclusion. Only endorsement of enmity lets us reaffirm the friend/enemy binary – that solves identity crisis.

**Odysseos 08** (Dr. Louiza Odysseos, University of Sussex Department of International Relations, “Against Ethics? Iconographies of Enmity and Acts of Obligation in Carl Schmitt’s Theory of the Partisan,” Practices of Ethics: Relating/Responding to Difference in International Politics Annual Convention, International Studies Association, 2008)

The paper ends with a discussion of obligation. Outlining the contours of a notion

AND

**but changeable structurations of the field of politics, of politics as pluriverse.**

#### **6. their inability to accept the friend/enemy duality means their knowledge is flawed because this duality is essential to our understanding of the world**

Prozorov 6 (Sergei, Research Fellow at the Department of Political and Economic Studies at the University of Helsinki “Liberal Enmity: The Figure of the Foe in the Political Ontology of Liberalism”, Millennium Journal of International Studies 35: 75)

In the interbellum of the 1990s, one frequently encountered discussions of who the new

AND

of an ontological critique of liberalism, hence the present importance of Schmitt.