### 2AC EE C/I

#### Counter interpretation economic engagement is influencing the political behavior of a state through economic means

**Resnik, 1** – Assistant Professor of Political Science at Yeshiva University (Evan, Journal of International Affairs, “Defining Engagement” v54, n2, 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- 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) Engagement is an iterated process in which the sender and target state develop a relationship of increasing interdependence, culminating in the endpoint of "normalized relations" characterized by a high level of interactions across multiple domains. Engagement is a quintessential exchange relationship: the target state wants the prestige and material resources that would accrue to it from increased contacts with the sender state, while the sender state seeks to modify the domestic and/or foreign policy behavior of the target state. This deductive logic could adopt a number of different forms or strategies when deployed in practice.(n26) For instance, individual contacts can be established by the sender state at either a low or a high level of conditionality.(n27) Additionally, the sender state can achieve its objectives using engagement through any one of the following causal processes: by directly modifying the behavior of the target regime; by manipulating or reinforcing the target states' domestic balance of political power between competing factions that advocate divergent policies; or by shifting preferences at the grassroots level in the hope that this will precipitate political change from below within the target state.This definition implies that three necessary conditions must hold for engagement to constitute an effective foreign policy instrument. First, the overall magnitude of contacts between the sender and target states must initially be low. If two states are already bound by dense contacts in multiple domains (i.e., are already in a highly interdependent relationship), engagement loses its impact as an effective policy tool. Hence, one could not reasonably invoke the possibility of the US engaging Canada or Japan in order to effect a change in either country's political behavior. Second, the material or prestige needs of the target state must be significant, as engagement derives its power from the promise that it can fulfill those needs. The greater the needs of the target state, the more amenable to engagement it is likely to be. For example, North Korea's receptivity to engagement by the US dramatically increased in the wake of the demise of its chief patron, the Soviet Union, and the near-total collapse of its national economy.(n28) Third, the target state must perceive the engager and the international order it represents as a potential source of the material or prestige resources it desires. This means that autarkic, revolutionary and unlimited regimes which eschew the norms and institutions of the prevailing order, such as Stalin's Soviet Union or Hitler's Germany, will not be seduced by the potential benefits of engagement. This reformulated conceptualization avoids the pitfalls of prevailing scholarly conceptions of engagement. It considers the policy as a set of means rather than ends, does not delimit the types of states that can either engage or be engaged, explicitly encompasses contacts in multiple issue-areas, allows for the existence of multiple objectives in any given instance of engagement and, as will be shown below, permits the elucidation of multiple types of positive sanctions.

#### Plan is economic means – promotes trade and investment

State Department (“Science and Technology Cooperation”, http://www.state.gov/e/oes/stc/)

Thirty U.S. S&T Agreements worldwide establish bilateral frameworks to facilitate the exchange of scientific results, provide for protection and allocation of intellectual property rights and benefit sharing, facilitate access for researchers, address taxation issues, and respond to the complex set of issues associated with economic development, domestic security and regional stability. S&T cooperation supports the establishment of science-based industries, encourages investment in national science infrastructure, education and the application of scientific standards, promotes international trade and dialogue on issues of direct import to global security, such as protection of the environment and management of natural resources. S&T collaboration assists USG agencies to establish partnerships with counterpart institutions abroad. These relationships enable them to fulfill their individual responsibilities by providing all parties with access to new resources, materials, information, and research. High priority areas include such areas as agricultural and industrial biotechnology research (including research on microorganisms, plant and animal genetic materials, both aquatic and terrestrial), health sciences, marine research, natural products chemistry, environment and energy research.

Limits – means based definitions are more predictable than end based, their interp allows effectually topical affs

Neg Ground – they have sufficient ground and get access to K’s of economics, trade disads and non economic cp’s

#### Aff ground – Discussing science diplomacy is key to policy analysis

Cathy Campbell, 2010, President and chief executive officer of CRDF Global - an independent nonprofit organization that promotes international scientific and technical collaboration, “Send in the Scientists: Why Mobilizing America’s Researchers Makes Sense for Diplomacy”
http://scienceprogress.org/2010/10/send\_scientists/

What is needed for science diplomacy to succeed? First, we must continue to educate the international research community, policymakers, and the public about the importance of science diplomacy. Earlier this year, CRDF Global joined with the Partnership for a Secure America and the American Association for the Advancement of Science to highlight the importance of science diplomacy.

Default to exclusive definitions they provide the best brightline

Their def arbitrarily excludes the aff – voting issue because the neg will always win

Lit checks - we have lit contextually defining econ engagement including our aff

Potential abuse is not a voter

#### Reasonability – competing interpretations is infinitely regressive – they’ll always move the goal post

**CICEP, 13** (The Commission on Innovation, Competitiveness and Economic Prosperity (CICEP) is a working group of the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU). Through regular workshops and meetings, the Commission works on building tools, resources, and standards of practice that universities can use to make the most effective contributions to innovation and economic growth, and to communicate their value in these areas. Members of CICEP include representatives from APLU institution's offices of: academic affairs; research and graduate administration; public and governmental affairs; business and engineering departments; outreach and economic development; technology transfer; and entrepreneurship programs; <http://www.aplu.org/document.doc?id=4431>) KD

I just javaed the date still camp ev

A university conducts its economic development work in a geographic footprint. Sometimes we refer to this geographic footprint as community or region, or we modify it with words like local, state, national, or international to help clarify the geographic area being served. This document will use the word ‘community’ to define the geographic area being served, recognizing that the service area specified for or assumed by the institution (i.e., the city, county, region, state(s), nation, or world) varies by institution and by the specific program or economic development activity. Similarly, the term “economic engagement” has various interpretations across the higher education community. Its use in this tool is meant to help guide campus conversations, not prescribe a particular view of how an institution defines its contributions to its community.

### Regime da

#### Disad is inevitable

Qiang 13(Hou Qiang; 2013-05-18; “Cuba seeks greater economic cooperation with Russia”; <http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/business/2013-05/18/c_132390893.htm>; kdub)

Lazo suggested that besides its investment in Cuba's oil sector, Russia should also increase investment on the island in the spheres of nickel production, tourism and agriculture.¶ Havana and Moscow were close allies during the Cold War era, but after the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, the relations cooled off until 2005 when both governments started to relaunch their traditional bonds with an exchange of visits of national leaders in the next few years.

#### International pressures force an inevitable change in Cuba policy

Suver 4/24/12 (Roman, research associate at the Council on Hemispheric Affairs, Looking back on the Cuba distraction at Cartagena and the Failure of the US Latin America Policy”, [www.coha.org/looking-back-on-the-cuba-distraction-at-cartagena-and-the-failure-of-the-u-s-latin-america-policy/](http://www.coha.org/looking-back-on-the-cuba-distraction-at-cartagena-and-the-failure-of-the-u-s-latin-america-policy/); KDUB)

This pronouncement and the U.S.’ opposition to Cuba’s future involvement in OAS-related hemispheric gatherings effectively acted as a unilateral veto, as Canada was the only other summit attendee to oppose Cuba’s reintegration, though Prime Minister Stephen Harper reportedly considered supporting the majority position on Cuba’s unconditional readmittance. This stubborn and clearly ideologically-based U.S. move served to do nothing but further alienate the U.S. from the region at a time when it is actively attempting to build both economic and political alliances. Furthermore, by exacerbating the divide between traditional U.S. pan-American policy and the Latin American position through his comments, Obama ensured that the topic of Cuba would continue to dominate the discussion throughout the summit, instead of allowing for a unified hemispheric discourse on other important and pressing regional matters to command media attention. Not surprisingly, amidst the polarizing environment in Cartagena, the Sixth Summit of the Americas concluded without a joint declaration on the agenda’s subjects, further accentuating the dysfunctional nature of current hemispheric politics.¶ Ahead of the Summit, Ecuador’s President, Rafael Correa, wrote a letter to the summit’s host, Colombian President Juan Manuel Santos, in which he declared his intention to boycott the meeting in protest of Cuba’s ongoing exile. He further pledged that Ecuador would boycott any future gatherings that excluded Cuba as long as he remains in office, and urged fellow ALBA members to do the same. While it appeared last week that no other nation would take similar steps, Nicaraguan President Daniel Ortega abstained from attending at the last minute, boycotting the event on the same grounds as Correa, despite his government’s presence in Cartagena.¶ There had been speculation prior to the meeting that some Latin American countries, especially those with memberships in ALBA, would decline to join Ecuador in boycotting the event in hopes that the U.S. would soften its position on Cuba during the weekend’s meeting, making a gesture that could worsen trade relations with the U.S. unnecessary. However, after Obama’s steadfast reiteration of the U.S.’ stance, all eight ALBA members moved swiftly to decry the Cuban situation, vowing to boycott all subsequent Summits of the Americas if Cuba is not granted unconditional participation. Perhaps not so surprisingly, this same sentiment was echoed by some of South America’s most influential nations, including Mercosur members Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, and Uruguay.¶ The increasingly vocal and adamant calls for Cuba’s inclusion by Latin America, and the growing number of provocative comments being made by Latin American leaders about ending North American hegemony in the region, are ominous signs for the abiding strength of the U.S.’ influence in the region. With the prospect of the majority of the next Summit’s attendees boycotting the event under the current status quo, the future of the OAS and North American participation in Latin American affairs appears noticeably bleak. There are already a number of regional organizations which exclude the U.S. and Canada, CELAC and UNASUR among them, and their increasing relevance to international cooperation in the Americas does not bode well for North America. If the U.S. continues to persistently adhere to its current stance on Cuba through to the 2015 Seventh Summit of the Americas in Panama, there is a distinct possibility that the OAS could lose all legitimacy as well as its influence as exasperated Latin American countries refuse to participate. This could lead to both a rethinking of U.S. policy towards Cuba, and greater cooperation and concessions by the U.S., pursuant to a more unified and egalitarian Western Hemisphere dynamic. Conversely, if the U.S. continues its archaic and neo-imperialistic stance, bodies like CELAC would stand to gain considerable influence, and could perhaps even replace the OAS as the hemisphere’s primary pan-American body and standard-bearer for regional cooperation.¶ In either scenario, the inescapable reality becomes quite clear; no matter how U.S. policy towards Latin America evolves in the near future, the U.S.’ longstanding and powerful influence in Central and South America is beginning to wane. Newly developing export markets and swift economic growth in Latin America are bolstering the region’s ability to function independently of more developed powers like the U.S., and the more the region continues to develop, the stronger its thirst for self-determinism will become. As Central and South America continue to modernize in their quest to join the ranks of developed world powers, the U.S. will continue to watch its previously formidable regional will diminish. The more Washington is willing to proactively amend its foreign policy towards Latin America to promote a more respectful and reciprocal partnership arrangement, the better its prospects will become in forging long-term amicable alliances and beneficial economic partnerships with a rapidly upsurging region.

### 2ac appeasement

We don’t abandon defenses in cuba

Also we pulled out of Afghanistan that’s disproven

#### US credibility is in question – engagement is key to sustain soft power

Brimmers, ’11—Assistant Secretary of State for International Organizations, Bureau of International Organization Affairs [Esther Brimmer has a PHD in IR from Oxford, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organizations, Bureau of International Organization Affairs September 7th 2011 Remarks at the U.S. Institute of Peace, Sustaining America’s Global Leadership: U.S. Priorities at the United Nations http://www.state.gov/p/io/rm/2011/171747.htm]//KDUB

So amid these calls for U.S. retrenchment, our allies and partners are wondering whether robust U.S. engagement at the UN will be sustained. They are asking themselves whether, in this era of intense global interconnectedness, the United States will abandon our unique position as a beacon of freedom and democracy, and cede our global leadership role, by restricting our engagement with the United Nations. Let me be clear: we must not, and we will not. As the President stated in March, “American leadership is not simply a matter of going it alone and bearing all the burden ourselves. Real leadership creates conditions and coalitions for others to step up as well, to work with allies and partners so that they bear their share of the burden and pay their share of the costs, and to see that the principles of justice and human dignity are upheld by all.” With those words, President Obama honors a long and bipartisan tradition of U.S. multilateral leadership, one that is as important today as it was in 1945. On this, my predecessor had simple words in 1961, words that have lost none of their force in the intervening half-century. He knew then, as we know now, that U.S. engagement at the United Nations must be robust if it is to succeed. “The luxury of sitting out every second dance,” he said, “is not for the leaders.” As I have highlighted today, too many U.S. interests require strong multilateral engagement across the UN system for us to simply walk away and cede U.S. leadership at the United Nations. Too many of our most pressing foreign policy challenges require shared multilateral solutions for us to undercut our global influence by withholding our UN dues. On the eve of the 66th UN General Assembly, there remains much work to be done to help the United Nations adapt structures built in 1945 to better address the challenges of 2011 and beyond. The world has changed faster than the United Nations has. But if we are to protect our security against transnational threats, advance our values as an alternative to extremism, and promote the international stability and interaction we need in order to advance our economy, U.S. engagement in the United Nations is more essential than it has ever been.

#### Specifically science diplomacy is empirically key to DOS credibility and soft power

Hormats 12 - served as the U.S. Under Secretary of State for Economic Growth, Energy, and

the Environment since 2009. (Robert, “Science Diplomacy and Twenty-First Century Statecraft”, March 2012, http://www.sciencediplomacy.org/files/science\_diplomacy\_and\_twenty-first\_century\_statecraft\_science\_\_diplomacy.pdf, HW)

While the scientific partnerships that the United States builds with other nations, and international ties among universities and research labs, are a means to address shared challenges, they also contribute to broadening and strengthening our diplomatic relationships. Scientific partnerships are based on disciplines and values that transcend politics, languages, borders, and cultures. Processes that define the scientific community—such as merit review, critical thinking, diversity of thought, and transparency—are fundamental values from which the global community can reap benefits. History provides many examples of how scientific cooperation can bolster diplomatic ties and cultural exchange. American scientists collaborated with Russian and Chinese counterparts for decades, even as other aspects of our relationship proved more challenging. Similarly, the science and technology behind the agricultural “Green Revolution” of the 1960s and ‘70s was the product of American, Mexican, and Indian researchers working toward a common goal. Today, the United States has formal science and technology agreements with over fifty countries. We are committed to finding new ways to work with other countries in science and technology, to conduct mutually beneficial joint research activities, and to advance the interests of the U.S. science and technology community. Twenty-first century statecraft also requires that we build greater people-to people relationships. Science and technology cooperation makes that possible. For example, through the Science Envoy program, announced by President Obama in 2009 in Cairo, Egypt, eminent U.S. scientists have met with counterparts throughout Asia, Africa, and the Middle East to build relationships and identify opportunities for sustained cooperation. With over half of the world’s population under the age of thirty, we are developing new ways to inspire the next generation of science and technology leaders. Over the past five years, the Department of State’s International Fulbright Science & Technology Award has brought more than two hundred exceptional students from seventy-three different countries to the United States to pursue graduate studies. Through the Global Innovation through Science and Technology Initiative, the United States recently invited young innovators from North Africa, the Middle East, and Asia to post YouTube videos describing solutions to problems they face at home. The top submissions will receive financial support, business mentorship, and networking opportunities. Advancing the rights of women and girls is a central focus of U.S. foreign policy and science diplomacy. As we work to empower women and girls worldwide, we must ensure that they have access to science education and are able to participate and contribute fully during every stage of their lives. Recently, we partnered with Google, Intel, Microsoft, and many other high-tech businesses to launch TechWomen, a program that brings promising women leaders from the Middle East to Silicon Valley to meet industry thought-leaders, share knowledge and experiences, and bolster cultural understanding. Science diplomacy is not new. It is, however, broader, deeper, and more visible than ever before and its importance will continue to grow. The Department of State’s first Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review highlights that “science, engineering, technology, and innovation are the engines of modern society and a dominant force in globalization and international economic development.” These interrelated issues are priorities for the United States and, increasingly, the world. The Department of State is committed to utilizing our capabilities in Washington, DC, and throughout the world to connect with scientists, entrepreneurs, and innovators for the mutual benefit of all of our people. In addition to Environment, Science and Technology, and Health Officers stationed at U.S. embassies, almost fifty doctoral-level scientists and engineers work at the Department of State through the AAAS Diplomacy Fellows program and the Jefferson Science Fellows program. Through this cadre of science and foreign policy experts, the Department of State will continue to advance policies that bolster the global repertoire of scientific knowledge and further enable technological innovation.

**Obama appeasing Cuba now**

**Diaz-Balart ‘12** (Rep. Mario Diaz-Balart represents the 21st congressional district in South Florida; August 21, 2012; “Mario Diaz-Balart: Obama has Pursued Policy Appeasement”; Fox News Latino; http://latino.foxnews.com/latino/politics/2012/08/21/mario-diaz-balart-obama-has-pursued-policy-appeasement-toward-castro-regime/)

These compliments – and the fact that they were not disavowed by the White House – come as no surprise, given President Obama’s appeasing stance regarding anti-American totalitarian regimes. Since he took office in January 2009, **President Obama has pursued a policy of appeasement toward** the totalitarian **Cuban dictatorship**. **Despite the Castro brothers’ harboring of international terrorists and their increasingly relentless oppression of the Cuban people**, President **Obama weakened** U.S. **sanctions and** has **increased** the **flow of dollars** **to** the **dictatorship**. In response, the **Castro** brothers **amped up** **their repression of** **the Cuban people and imprisoned American humanitarian aid worker Alan Gross** for the “crime” of taking humanitarian aide to Cuba’s small Jewish community. Clearly, President **Obama** is not concerned about the threat posed by the Cuban dictatorship, nor has he manifested genuine solidarity with the pro-democracy aspirations of the Cuban people. - U.S. Rep. Mario Diaz-Balart, R-Fla. **The Cuban people are protesting in the streets and demanding freedom.** But rather than supporting the growing, courageous pro-democracy movement, President Obama instead has chosen to appease their oppressors. While President Obama claims that his policies aim to assist the oppressed Cuban people, his actions betray that he is not on their side. **You cannot credibly claim to care about the oppressed while working out side deals with their oppressors and welcoming the oppressors’ elite into the United States with open arms. And you cannot claim to support political prisoners while increasing the flow of dollars to their jailers.** The failures of the Obama administration in Cuba are not an isolated foreign policy failure. Around the world, President Obama has taken an approach of appeasement when it comes to some of our most virulent enemies. In addition to Cuba, from Iran to Syria to Venezuela, President Obama has shown an unwillingness to stand firm when anti-American forces threaten our interests, and his weakness has emboldened America’s enemies. If we are going to reassert our position in the world, we need a change at the top.

No link the plan is only removing a portion of the embargo targeting scientists that’s uniquely different – scientists are perceived differently in the international community as others, plan won’t be seen as appeasement

**Appeasing Cuba would re-establish US Credibility**

**St. Louis Post-Dispatch ’13** (“U.S. trade embargo with Cuba needs to change”. Distributed by Creators Syndicate, Inc. Reprinted from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. 2013, <http://www.creators.com/opinion/daily-editorials/u-s-trade-embargo-with-cuba-needs-to-change.html>)

About 35 percent of the Cubans in South Florida broke ranks with the Republican party to vote for Obama, a Democrat. His support was especially strong among younger Cuban-American voters, many of whom don't share the animosities of their fathers and mothers.¶ **Lifting the embargo would be in the best interests of the United States in several ways**:¶ — Economic. Although Cuba is just a blip on the global economic radar, it is a mere 90 miles from Florida and offers new markets to U.S. farmers and businesses.¶ — Strategic. **Lifting the embargo would re-establish U.S. credibility throughout the Caribbean, Central and South America. It would deflect Cuba's public flirtations with Russia, China and Venezuela.**¶— Brainpower. Cubans are poor but well-educated and literate at levels above other developing Latin American countries. It offers a trove of doctors and teachers, as well as a population hungry for access to the democratizing effects of the Internet, cell phones and personal technology.¶ — Humanitarian. Two generations of families in both countries have been tormented and divided. Families should be reunited, and Americans should be allowed to enjoy the ecological and cultural splendor of the island.

**Containment policies towards Cuba undermines US credibility in Europe – that outweighs the disad comparative ev**

**Haass and O’Sullivan 2K--** \*Formerly a senior aide to President George Bush; Vice President and

Director of Foreign Policy Studies at the Brookings Institution, Washington DC; author of The Reluctant Sheriff: The United States After the Cold War AND \*\*Fellow with the Foreign Policy Studies Program at the Brookings Institution (Richard N., Meghan L, “Terms of Engagement: Alternatives to Punitive Policies” Brookings Institution, Surivival, volume 42, no. 2, Summer 2000, pg. 15, http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/articles/2000/6/summer%20haass/2000survival.pdf)//BJ

Although the peaceful transition of Cuba to a democratic, market-oriented country remains the ultimate goal of the US, the context in which this aim can be pursued has altered significantly. **When stringent US sanctions were placed on Cuba in 1962, Cuba posed a threat to the US as an outpost of communism in the Western hemisphere and an ardent exporter of revolution to its neighbours. However, almost 40 years later and in the wake of the Cold War, Cuba’s importance has dwindled and its ability to promote radical politics among its democratising neighbours has evaporated almost entirely.** Not only has much of the rationale for isolating Cuba collapsed, but **US policy towards the country – in particular the imposition of ‘secondary sanctions’ – has created tensions with America’s European allies that outweigh Cuba’s importance.** **Finally, America’s sanctions-dominated policy towards Cuba demands re-evaluation because it is warping the message that the United States sends to potentially moderating ‘rogue’ regimes elsewhere. Cuba remains on the ‘terrorism list’ (a grouping of countries designated by the US as state sponsors of terrorism), even in the absence of a Cuban-sponsored terrorist act for many years. This discrepancy signals to others on the terrorism list that their renouncement of terrorism will not necessarily free them from the designation or from the many sanctions associated with it.** Despite the many good reasons to reassess US policy towards Cuba today, formidable obstacles have thus far prevented the sort of policy overhaul needed. Most importantly, sections of the Cuban-American community have vehemently opposed any policy changes which would confer legitimacy on Castro or possibly prolong his rule. Nevertheless, recent generational changes have opened possibilities for moderates to gain prominence in this community. In addition, the growing number of American farmers and businessmen expressing interest in doing business in Cuba indicates the existence of at least one influential domestic US constituency favouring engagement. **Rather than maintaining the status quo, the US should simultaneously pursue two forms of engagement with Cuba. First, it should actively seek out Castro’s willingness to engage in a conditional relationship and to chart a course towards more satisfactory relations. It should attempt to strike a dialogue with Castro in which reasonable benefits are offered to him in return for reasonable changes. Rather than accentuating the desire for a regime change or immediate democratic elections, US policy-makers should make lesser goals the focus of their policy, as the more ambitious the demands, the less likely Castro is to enter into a process of engagement. For instance, the release of political prisoners and the legitimisation of political parties might be offered in exchange**

#### EU relations solve great power war

O’Sullivan 4 – vice president of the Mission Critical Networks business area, which includes all FAA programs, as well as the Alaska Flight Services Modernization and OASIS programs [March 31, 2004, John O'Sullivan, “Europe and the Establishment,” The National Interest, <http://nationalinterest.org/article/europe-and-the-establishment-2608>] KDUB

The report's starting point -- that U.S.-European relations are extremely important -- is undeniable. A united Western alliance would shape world institutions in line with values and practices rooted in liberty and democracy and coax rising powers such as India and China into going along with this international status quo for the foreseeable future. Indeed, this is already happening as China accepts liberal economic rules at home in order to enter institutions such as the G7 and the World Trade Organization.¶ By contrast, a disunited West would tempt such powers to play off Europe and America against each other and foster a global jockeying for power not unlike the maneuvering between a half-dozen great powers that led to 1914.

**US hardline policies worsen anti-US sentiment across Latin America—engagement is key to increased US credibility**

**Griffin 13**-- a Crimson editorial writer (John A., “Engage with Venezuela”, The Harvard Crimson, 4/3, http://www.thecrimson.com/article/2013/4/3/Harvard-Venezuela-Chavez-death/)//BJ

When Venezuelan President Hugo Chávez [died](http://www.theinternational.org/articles/370-the-rocky-us-venezuela-relationship-wh) in early February, his country was thrown into a period of national mourning as the political equilibrium in Latin America hung in the balance.

**As Venezuela chooses its next president, Washington should seek to reverse the current trend of acrid relations between the two nations and engage with the Venezuelan government in Caracas toward stability and prosperity in the Western hemisphere. While it might seem likely that relations between the United States and Venezuela would naturally improve after the death of the combative Chávez, the opposite now seems more** [**likely**](http://www.albanyherald.com/news/2013/mar/06/chavez-death-unlikely-improve-us-venezuela-relatio/). Before passing away, Chávez had handpicked a successor in Nicholas Maduro, who has assumed power in the interim before the presidential election in April. As Chávez’s handpicked successor, Maduro has already continued with his mentor’s trend of using anti-American rhetoric to bring popularity to his government, even [declaring](http://www.albanyherald.com/news/2013/mar/06/chavez-death-unlikely-improve-us-venezuela-relatio/) that American agents may have infected Chávez with the cancer that killed him. While Washington has officially [declared](http://www.theinternational.org/articles/370-the-rocky-us-venezuela-relationship-wh) that it is committed to a more functional relationship with Venezuela, its actions have not been consistent with this idea: The United States offered no official condolences for Chávez’s death, and both nations have started [expelling](http://www.cnn.com/2013/03/11/us/venezuela-diplomats-expelled) diplomats from the other. Neither nation, it seems, is steering toward more congenial relations with the other. Admittedly, the United States has good reason to be less than enthused about more Chávez-style governance in Venezuela. [Calling](http://www.nytimes.com/2005/10/30/international/americas/30venezuela.html?_r=0) himself a 21st-century socialist, Chávez [nationalized](http://www.nytimes.com/2009/05/09/world/americas/09venez.html) the lucrative oil industry, developed strong trade and diplomatic relationships with [Iran](http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/01/07/us-venezuela-iran-idUSTRE8060DO20120107) and [Cuba](http://www.nytimes.com/2010/06/15/world/americas/15venez.html?pagewanted=all), [repeatedly](http://www.cnn.com/2006/WORLD/americas/09/20/chavez.un/index.html) [decried](http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2011/dec/20/hugo-chavez-barack-obama-clown) the United States as an imperialist force, and [cooperated](http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/01/07/us-venezuela-iran-idUSTRE8060DO20120107) with the Iranians in developing nuclear technology. Engaging in petty diplomat-expulsion spats, however, is no way to deal with any of these problems, and it in fact only strengthens the Chavistas’ hold on their country. The diplomatic and economic opportunities that would stem from greater engagement would far outweigh the meager benefits reaped from our current policies**. Diplomatically, positive engagement with Venezuela would be** a major step toward building American credibility in the world at large**, especially in Latin America**. Chávez (along with his friends the Castros in Cuba) was able to [bolster](http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/cndy/2013-03/12/content_16300175.htm) regional support for his regime by pointing out the United States’ attempts to forcibly intervene in Venezuelan politics. Soon, a number of populist governments in Latin America had rallied around Chávez and his anti-American policies. In 2004, Bolivia, Ecuador, Nicaragua, and three Caribbean nations joined with Venezuela and Cuba to [form](http://www.alba-tcp.org/) the Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of our America, an organization in direct opposition to the Free Trade Area in the Americas proposed (but never realized) by the Bush administration. Chávez galvanized these nations—many of whom have experienced American interventionist tactics—by vilifying America as a common, imperial enemy.¶ **Unfortunately for the United States, its general strategy regarding Venezuela has often strengthened Chávez’s position. Every time Washington chastises Venezuela for opposing American interests or** [**attempts**](http://www.forbes.com/sites/greatspeculations/2011/06/13/silly-sanctions-against-venezuela-boost-hugo-chavez/) **to bring sanctions against the Latin American country, the leader in Caracas (whether it be Chávez or Maduro) simply gains more evidence toward his claim that Washington is a neo-colonialist meddler.** **This weakens the United States’ diplomatic position, while simultaneously strengthening Venezuela’s. If Washington wants Latin America to stop its current trend of electing leftist, Chavista governments, its first step should be to adopt a less astringent tone in dealing with Venezuela. Caracas will be unable to paint Washington as an aggressor, and Washington will in turn gain a better image in Latin America.** Beyond leading to more amicable, cooperative relationships with Latin American nations, **engagement with Venezuela would also be economically advisable. With the world’s largest oil** [**reserves**](http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-06-13/venezuela-overtakes-saudis-for-largest-oil-reserves-bp-says-1-.html)**, countless other valuable resources, and stunning natural beauty to attract scores of tourists, Venezuela has quite a bit to offer economically**. Even now, America can see the possible benefits of economic engagement with Caracas by looking at one of the few extant cases of such cooperation: Each year, thousands of needy Americans are able to keep their homes heated because of the [cooperation](http://abcnews.go.com/ABC_Univision/News/strange-bedfellows-venezuela-low-income-americans-warm/story?id=18650347#.UU9EnlvwJio) between Venezuela and a Boston-area oil company. **Engagement with Venezuela would also lead to stronger economic cooperation with the entirety of Latin America. It was mostly through Venezuela’s** [**efforts**](http://www.nytimes.com/2005/11/06/international/americas/06prexy.html?_r=0) **that the United States was unable to create a “Free Trade Area of the Americas,” an endeavor that would have eliminated most trade barriers among participant nations, thereby leading to more lucrative trade. In a world where the United States and Venezuela were to enjoy normalized relations, all nations involved would benefit from such agreements. For both diplomatic and economic reasons, then, positive engagement is the best course of action for the United States.** As it stands, the negative relationship between the countries has created an atmosphere of animosity in the hemisphere, hindering dialogue and making economic cooperation nearly impossible. **While there is** [**much**](http://www.hrw.org/americas/venezuela) **for which the Venezuelan government can rightly be criticized—authoritarian rule, abuse of human rights, lack of market-friendly policies—nothing that the United States is doing to counter those drawbacks is having any effect. The United States should stop playing “tough guy” with Venezuela, bite the bullet, and work toward stability and prosperity for the entire hemisphere. We aren’t catching any flies with our vinegar—it’s high time we started trying to catch them with honey.**

### 2ac k

Doesn’t change prolif

#### either they cant solve because there will be other simulations or they get rid of all simulations, some of which solve disease spread

Montini ’10 (Laura, 4/10, Carolina Journalism Network, UNC School of Journalism & Mass Communication, “Disease simulation could prevent an epidemic”, <http://cjn.jomc.unc.edu/node/523>, jj)

Scientists in RTP are using computerized simulation to map the path of an infectious disease and to prepare to stop an epidemic from happening in the future.﻿ When researchers wanted to study how disease spreads across North Carolina, they infected the population with influenza. "A virtual infection, of course," said Phil Cooley, an [RTI International](http://www.rti.org/) fellow in bioinformatics and high-performance computing. RTI, a scientific research institute, and the [National Institute of General Medical Sciences](http://www.nigms.nih.gov/) have worked together for the past four years to develop a virtual United States population that can be manipulated to simulate the spread of infectious disease. The synthetic population database used information from the 2000 census, and the system will be updated with information from the 2010 census as soon as it is available. An area comprised of six central North Carolina counties was used for the first disease simulation, Cooley said. Census data is the "static data" in these complex trials.  "That data stays the same throughout," Cooley said.  "And then basically what we do is describe how people interact and we superimpose it on top of that layer." Researchers infected virtual communities of people such as children, parents, schoolteachers, office workers and health care workers with influenza to see how it would progress throughout the population. Cooley could tell that the model had worked when the results aligned with actual data from a study of a past flu spreading. "We reconstructed a historical epidemic," he said. The National Institute of General Medical Sciences' [Models of Infectious Disease Agent Study](http://www.rti.org/page.cfm?objectid=0E4CA0BF-F0B7-4E63-AE7803D5D68ECD1C) and RTI, which is based in Research Triangle Park, have since used the North Carolina project as a steppingstone to larger simulations. "Right now, we're working on New York City to see what impact the subway might have on disease spread," Cooley said. "New York City has the fourth-largest number of subway riders in the world and no other city in the United States has anything comparable to it." Authorities might consider halting subway operations in the event of a disease outbreak, but there's no information that indicates whether or not this would be effective, Cooley said.  "It might be the case that it has very little impact," he said.  The idea for the disease simulation project originated in 2001 when anthrax attacks fueled fears of bioterrorism, Irene Eckstrand, director of the MIDAS program, said. "A lot of questions came up and people realized that we didn't really know how to answer those questions," she said. Researchers use the system to try and answer their own questions. "For example, if there was a bad flu strain going around out there and the local school systems decided to close the schools to protect the children, does that make the parents more susceptible?" Eckstrand posed. "And if they're going to work does that then make the workplace the place where transmission occurs?" Results from simulations are analyzed to help decision makers determine the best intervention policies, Eckstrand said. "The simulations are only run by the people who develop them," William Wheaton, director of RTI's Geospatial Science and Technology program, said. The complex supercomputing systems can take between minutes and days to complete a simulation trial. "They don't provide real-time results, so you don't see the simulation occurring visually as it's running," he said. "They run the models and they will run the same simulation maybe a 100 or 1,000 times.  Each time the results are a little bit different, so they look at the average results of all their runs." RTI has also developed synthetic datasets for Mexico, India and Cambodia, Wheaton said.  It is important to collaborate with other countries to develop international models because infectious diseases spread around the world, Wheaton said. "There are some extraordinary modeling groups in Europe, Asia and South America, and there is something of an international collaboration that is forming among modelers," Eckstrand said.

#### Which causes extinction

Yu, ’09 (Victoria, Dartmouth Undergraduate Journal of Science, Human Extinction: The Uncertainty of Our Fate, 22 May 2009, http://dujs.dartmouth.edu/spring-2009/human-extinction-the-uncertainty-of-our-fate)

A pandemic will kill off all humans. In the past, humans have indeed fallen victim to viruses. Perhaps the best-known case was the bubonic plague that killed up to one third of the European population in the mid-14th century (7). While vaccines have been developed for the plague and some other infectious diseases, new viral strains are constantly emerging — a process that maintains the possibility of a pandemic-facilitated human extinction. Some surveyed students mentioned AIDS as a potential pandemic-causing virus. It is true that scientists have been unable thus far to find a sustainable cure for AIDS, mainly due to HIV’s rapid and constant evolution. Specifically, two factors account for the virus’s abnormally high mutation rate: 1. HIV’s use of reverse transcriptase, which does not have a proof-reading mechanism, and 2. the lack of an error-correction mechanism in HIV DNA polymerase (8). Luckily, though, there are certain characteristics of HIV that make it a poor candidate for a large-scale global infection: HIV can lie dormant in the human body for years without manifesting itself, and AIDS itself does not kill directly, but rather through the weakening of the immune system. However, for more easily transmitted viruses such as influenza, the evolution of new strains could prove far more consequential. The simultaneous occurrence of antigenic drift (point mutations that lead to new strains) and antigenic shift (the inter-species transfer of disease) in the influenza virus could produce a new version of influenza for which scientists may not immediately find a cure. Since influenza can spread quickly, this lag time could potentially lead to a “global influenza pandemic,” according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (9). The most recent scare of this variety came in 1918 when bird flu managed to kill over 50 million people around the world in what is sometimes referred to as the Spanish flu pandemic. Perhaps even more frightening is the fact that only 25 mutations were required to convert the original viral strain — which could only infect birds — into a human-viable strain (10).

#### The role of the ballot is to simulate the enactment of the plan --- debate is a game and that game requires the neg to prove that the entire plan is a bad idea – their framework creates a self-serving vision of the topic where they create goal posts, assert we don’t meet them and then suddenly they have assembled a coherent neg argument – that disincentives substantive debate and research

#### And, imagining scenarios, even if unlikely or flawed is a pre requisite to good analysis – the aff isn’t a research paper, just dismiss poorly constructed impacts

Wimbush, 08 – director of the Center for Future Security Strategies

(S. Enders, senior fellow at the Hudson Institute and the author of several books and policy articles, “A Parable: The U.S.-ROK Security Relationship Breaks Down”, Asia Policy, Number 5 (January 2008), 7-24)

What if the U.S.-ROK security relationship were to break down? This essay explores the alternative futures of such a scenario. Analyzing scenarios is one technique for trying to understand the increasing complexity of strategic environments. A scenario is an account of an imagined sequence of events. The intent of a scenario is to suggest how alternative futures might arise and where they might lead, where conflicts might occur, how the interests ofdifferent actors might be challenged, and the kinds of strategies actors might pursue to achieve their objectives. Important to keep in mind is that scenarios arenothing more than invented, in-depth stories—stories about what different futures could look like and what might happen along plausible pathways to those futures. The trends and forces that go into building a scenario may be carefully researched**,** yet a scenario is not a research paper. Rather, it is a work of the imagination. As such, scenarios are, first, tools that can help bring order to the way analysts think about what might happen in future security environments; second, scenarios are a provocative way of revealing possible dynamics of future security environments that might not be apparent simply by projecting known trends into the future. Scenarios are particularly useful in suggesting where the interests and actions of different actors might converge or collide with other forces, trends, attitudes, and influences. By using scenarios, to explore the question “what if this or that happened?” in a variety of different ways, with the objective of uncovering as many potential answers as possible, analysts can build hedging strategies for dealing with many different kinds of potential problems. Though they may choose to discount some of these futures and related scenarios, analysts will not be ignorant of the possibilities, with luck avoiding having to say: “I never thought about that.”

#### And, policy simulation doesn’t preclude bottom up politics, but engaging in bureaucratic reform results in effective outcomes ---- it doesn’t deny agency or result in a technocratic stranglehold on politics

Hager, 92 [Carol, J, professor of political science – Bryn Mawr College, “Democratizing Technology: Citizen & State in West German Energy Politics, 1974-1990” *Polity*, Vol. 25, No. 1, p. 45-7]

During this phase, the citizen initiative attempted to overcome its defensive posture and implement an alternative politics. The strategy of legal and technical challenge might delay or even prevent plant construction, but it would not by itself accomplish the broader goal on the legitimation dimension, i.e., democratization. Indeed, it worked against broad participation. The activists had to find a viable means of achieving change. Citizens had proved they could contribute to a substantive policy discussion. Now, some activists turned to the parliamentary arena as a possible forum for an energy dialogue. Until now, parliament had been conspicuously absent as a relevant policy maker, but if parliament could be reshaped and activated, citizens would have a forum in which to address the broad questions of policy-making goals and forms. They would also have an institutional lever with which to pry apart the bureaucracy and utility. None of the established political parties could offer an alternative program. Thus, local activists met to discuss forming their own voting list. These discussions provoked internal dissent. Many citizen initiative members objected to the idea of forming a political party. If the problem lay in the role of parliament itself, another political party would not solve it. On the contrary, parliamentary participation was likely to destroy what political innovations the extraparliamentary movement had made. Others argued that a political party would give the movement an institutional platform from which to introduce some of the grassroots democratic political forms the groups had developed. Founding a party as the parliamentary arm of the citizen movement would allow these groups to play an active, critical role in institutionalized politics, participating in the policy debates while retaining their outside perspective. Despite the disagreements, the Alternative List for Democracy and Environmental Protection Berlin (AL) was formed in 1978 and first won seats in the Land parliament with 7.2 percent of the vote in 1981.43 The founders of the AL were encouraged by the success of newly formed local green parties in Lower Saxony and Hamburg,44 whose evolution had been very similar to that of the West Berlin citizen move-ment. Throughout the FRG, unpopular administrative decisions affect-ing local environments, generally in the form of state-sponsored indus-trial projects, prompted the development of the citizen initiative and ecology movements. The groups in turn focused constant attention on state planning "errors," calling into question not only the decisions themselves, but also the conventional forms of political decision making that produced them.45 Disgruntled citizens increasingly aimed their critique at the established political parties, in particular the federal SPD/ FDP coalition, which seemed unable to cope with the economic, social, and political problems of the 1970s. Fanned by publications such as the Club of Rome's report, "The Limits to Growth," the view spread among activists that the crisis phenomena were not merely a passing phase, but indicated instead "a long-term structural crisis, whose cause lies in the industrial-technocratic growth society itself."46 As they broadened their critique to include the political system as a whole, many grassroots groups found the extraparliamentary arena too restrictive. Like many in the West Berlin group, they reasoned that the necessary change would require a degree of political restructuring that could only be accomplished through their direct participation in parliamentary politics. Green/alternative parties and voting lists sprang up nationwide and began to win seats in local assemblies. The West Berlin Alternative List saw itself not as a party, but as the parliamentary arm of the citizen initiative movement. One member explains: "the starting point for alternative electoral participation was simply the notion of achieving a greater audience for [our] own ideas and thus to work in support of the extraparliamentary movements and initia-tives,"47 including non-environmentally oriented groups. The AL wanted to avoid developing structures and functions autonomous from the citizen initiative movement. Members adhered to a list of principles, such as rotation and the imperative mandate, designed to keep parliamentarians attached to the grassroots. Although their insistence on grassroots democracy often resulted in interminable heated discussions, the participants recognized the importance of experimenting with new forms of decision making, of not succumbing to the same hierarchical forms they were challenging. Some argued that the proper role of citizen initiative groups was not to represent the public in government, but to mobilize other citizens to participate directly in politics themselves; self-determination was the aim of their activity.48 Once in parliament, the AL proposed establishmento f a temporary parliamentaryco mmissiont o studye nergyp olicy,w hichf or the first time would draw all concernedp articipantst ogetheri n a discussiono f both short-termc hoicesa nd long-termg oals of energyp olicy. With help from the SPD faction, which had been forced into the opposition by its defeat in the 1981 elections, two such commissions were created, one in 1982-83 and the other in 1984-85.49T hese commissionsg ave the citizen activists the forum they sought to push for modernizationa nd technicali nnovation in energy policy. Although it had scaled down the proposed new plant, the utility had produced no plan to upgrade its older, more polluting facilities or to install desulfurizationd evices. With proddingf rom the energyc ommission, Land and utility experts began to formulate such a plan, as did the citizen initiative. By exposing administrative failings in a public setting, and by producing a modernization plan itself, the combined citizen initiative and AL forced bureaucratic authorities to push the utility for improvements. They also forced the authorities to consider different technological solutions to West Berlin's energy and environmental problems. In this way, the activists served as technological innovators. In 1983, the first energy commission submitted a list of recommendations to the Land parliament which reflected the influence of the citizen protest movement. It emphasized goals of demand reduction and efficiency, noted the value of expanded citizen participation and urged authorities to "investigate more closely the positive role citizen participation can play in achieving policy goals."50 The second energy commission was created in 1984 to discuss the possibilities for modernization and shutdown of old plants and use of new, environmentally friendlier and cheaper technologies for electricity and heat generation. Its recommendations strengthened those of the first commission.51 Despite the non-binding nature of the commissions' recommendations, the public discussion of energy policy motivated policy makers to take stronger positions in favor of environmental protection. III. Conclusion The West Berlin energy project eventually cleared all planning hurdles, and construction began in the early 1980s. The new plant now conforms to the increasingly stringent environmental protection requirements of the law. The project was delayed, scaled down from 1200 to 600 MW, moved to a neutral location and, unlike other BEWAG plants, equipped with modern desulfurization devices. That the new plant, which opened in winter 1988-89, is the technologically most advanced and environmen-tally sound of BEWAG's plants is due entirely to the long legal battle with the citizen initiative group, during which nearly every aspect of the original plans was changed. In addition, through the efforts of the Alter-native List (AL) in parliament, the Land government and BEWAG formulated a long sought modernization and environmental protection plan for all of the city's plants. The AL prompted the other parliamentary parties to take pollution control seriously. Throughout the FRG, energy politics evolved in a similar fashion. As Habermas claimed, underlying the objections against particular projects was a reaction against the administrative-economic system in general. One author, for example, describes the emergence of two-dimensional protest against nuclear energy: The resistance against a concrete project became understood simul-taneously as resistance against the entire atomic program. Questions of energy planning, of economic growth, of understanding of democracy entered the picture. . . . Besides concern for human health, for security of conditions for human existence and protec-tion of nature arose critique of what was perceived as undemocratic planning, the "shock" of the delayed public announcement of pro-ject plans and the fear of political decision errors that would aggra-vate the problem.52 This passage supports a West Berliner's statement that the citizen initiative began with a project critique and arrived at *Systemkritik*.53 I have labeled these two aspects of the problem the public policy and legitima-tion dimensions. In the course of these conflicts, the legitimation dimen-sion emergd as the more important and in many ways the more prob-lematic. Parliamentary Politics In the 1970s, energy politics began to develop in the direction Offe de-scribed, with bureaucrats and protesters avoiding the parliamentary channels through which they should interact. The citizen groups them-selves, however, have to a degree reversed the slide into irrelevance of parliamentary politics. Grassroots groups overcame their defensive posture enough to begin to formulate an alternative politics, based upon concepts such as decision making through mutual understanding rather than technical criteria or bargaining. This new politics required new modes of interaction which the old corporatist or pluralist forms could not provide. Through the formation of green/alternative parties and voting lists and through § Marked 18:22 § new parliamentary commissions such as the two described in the case study, some members of grassroots groups attempted to both operate within the political system and fundamentally change it, to restore the link between bureaucracy and citizenry. Parliamentary politics was partially revived in the eyes of West German grassroots groups as a legitimate realm of citizen participation, an outcome the theory would not predict. It is not clear, however, that strengthening the parliamentary system would be a desirable outcome for everyone. Many remain skeptical that institutions that operate as part of the "system" can offer the kind of substantive participation that grass-roots groups want. The constant tension between institutionalized politics and grassroots action emerged clearly in the recent internal debate between "fundamentalist" and "realist" wings of the Greens. Fundis wanted to keep a firm footing outside the realm of institutionalized politics. They refused to bargain with the more established parties or to join coalition governments. Realos favored participating in institutionalized politics while pressing their grassroots agenda. Only this way, they claimed, would they have a chance to implement at least some parts of their program. This internal debate, which has never been resolved, can be interpreted in different ways. On one hand, the tension limits the appeal of green and alternative parties to the broader public, as the Greens' poor showing in the December 1990 all-German elections attests. The failure to come to agreement on basic issues can be viewed as a hazard of grass-roots democracy. The Greens, like the West Berlin citizen initiative, are opposed in principle to forcing one faction to give way to another. Disunity thus persists within the group. On the other hand, the tension can be understood not as a failure, but as a kind of success: grassroots politics has not been absorbed into the bureaucratized system; it retains its critical dimension, both in relation to the political system and within the groups themselves. The lively debate stimulated by grassroots groups and parties keeps questions of democracy on the public agenda. Technical Debate In West Berlin, the two-dimensionality of the energy issue forced citizen activists to become both participants in and critics of the policy process. In order to defeat the plant, activists engaged in technical debate. They won several decisions in favor of environmental protection, often proving to be more informed than bureaucratic experts themselves. The case study demonstrates that grassroots groups, far from impeding techno-logical advancement, can actually serve as technological innovators. The activists' role as technical experts, while it helped them achieve some success on the policy dimension, had mixed results on the legitimation dimension. On one hand, it helped them to challenge the legitimacy of technocratic policy making. They turned back the Land government's attempts to displace political problems by formulating them in technical terms.54 By demonstrating the fallibility of the technical arguments, activists forced authorities to acknowledge that energy demand was a political variable, whose value at any one point was as much influenced by the choices of policy makers as by independent technical criteria. Submission to the form and language of technical debate, however, weakened activists' attempts to introduce an alternative, goal-oriented form of decision making into the political system. Those wishing to par-ticipate in energy politics on a long-term basis have had to accede to the language of bureaucratic discussion, if not the legitimacy of bureaucratic authorities. They have helped break down bureaucratic authority but have not yet offered a viable long-term alternative to bureaucracy. In the tension between form and language, goals and procedure, the legitima-tion issue persists. At the very least, however, grassroots action challenges critical theory's notion that technical discussion is inimical to democratic politics.55 Citizen groups have raised the possibility of a dialogue that is both technically sophisticated and democratic. In sum, although the legitimation problems which gave rise to grass-roots protest have not been resolved, citizen action has worked to counter the marginalization of parliamentary politics and the technocratic character of policy debate that Offe and Habermas identify. The West Berlin case suggests that the solutions to current legitimation problems may not require total repudiation of those things previously associated with technocracy.56 In Berlin, the citizen initiative and AL continue to search for new, more legitimate forms of organization consistent with their principles. No permanent Land parliamentary body exists to coordinate and con-solidate energy policy making.57 In the 1989 Land elections, the CDU/ FDP coalition was defeated, and the AL formed a governing coalition with the SPD. In late 1990, however, the AL withdrew from the coali-tion. It remains to be seen whether the AL will remain an effective vehi-cle for grassroots concerns, and whether the citizenry itself, now includ-ing the former East Berliners, will remain active enough to give the AL direction as united Berlin faces the formidable challenges of the 1990s. On the policy dimension, grassroots groups achieved some success. On the legitimation dimension, it is difficult to judge the results of grass-roots activism by normal standards of efficacy or success. Activists have certainly not radically restructured politics. They agree that democracy is desirable, but troublesome questions persist about the degree to which those processes that are now bureaucratically organized can and should be restructured, where grassroots democracy is possible and where bureaucracy is necessary in order to get things done. In other words, grassroots groups have tried to remedy the Weberian problem of the marginalization of politics, but it is not yet clear what the boundaries of the political realm should be. It is, however, the act of calling existing boundaries into question that keeps democracy vital. In raising alternative possibilities and encouraging citizens to take an active, critical role in their own governance, the contribution of grassroots environmental groups has been significant. As Melucci states for new social movements in general, these groups mount a "symbolic" challenge by proposing "a different way of perceiving and naming the world."58 Rochon concurs for the case of the West German peace movement, noting that its effect on the public discussion of secur-ity issues has been tremendous.59 The effects of the legitimation issue in the FRG are evident in increased citizen interest in areas formerly left to technical experts. Citizens have formed nationwide associations of environmental and other grassroots groups as well as alternative and green parties at all levels of government. The level of information within the groups is generally quite high, and their participation, especially in local politics, has raised the awareness and engagement of the general populace noticeably.60 Policy concessions and new legal provisions for citizen participation have not quelled grassroots action. The attempts of the established political parties to coopt "green" issues have also met with limited success. Even green parties themselves have not tapped the full potential of public support for these issues. The persistence of legitima-tion concerns, along with the growth of a culture of informed political activism, will ensure that the search continues for a space for a delibera-tive politics in modern technological society.61

#### Perm – do both: Radical opposition to the system affirms its existence. That creates endless shadow boxing of their impacts. Opposing discourses allow the system to simulate its own death and delay its collapse. Means the permutation is key to solve the negatives impacts.

Baudrillard in 81 [Jean, “Simulacra and Simulation” p. 18-19]

Conjunction of the system and of its extreme alternative like the two sides of a curved mirror, a "vicious" curvature of a political space that is henceforth magnetized, circularized, reversibilized from the right to the left, a torsion that is like that of the evil spirit of commutation, the whole system, the infinity of capital folded back on its own surface: transfinite? And is it not the same for desire and the libidinal space? Conjunction of desire and value, of desire and capital. Conjunction of desire and the law, the final pleasure as the metamorphosis of the law (which is why it is so widely the order of the day): only capital takes pleasure, said Lyotard, before thinking that we now take pleasure in capital. Overwhelming versatility of desire in Deleuze, an enigmatic reversal that brings desire "revolutionary in itself, and as if involuntarily, wanting what it wants," to desire its own repression and to invest in paranoid and fascist systems? A malign torsion that returns this revolution of desire to the same fundamental ambiguity as the other, the historical revolution. All the referentials combine their discourses in a circular, Mobian compulsion. Not so long ago, sex and work were fiercely opposed terms; today both are dissolved in the same type of demand. Formerly the discourse on history derived its power from violently opposing itself to that of nature, the discourse of desire to that of power-today they exchange their signifiers and their scenarios.¶ It would take too long to traverse the entire range of the operational negativity of all those scenarios of deterrence, which, like Watergate, try to regenerate a moribund principle through simulated scandal, phantasm, and murder-a sort of hormonal treatment through negativity and crisis. It is always a question of moving the real through the imaginary, proving truth through scandal, proving the law through transgression, proving work through striking, proving the system through crisis, and capital through revolution, as it is elsewhere (the Tasaday) of proving ethnology through the dispossession of its object-without taking into account:¶ the proof of theater through antitheater;¶ the proof of art through antiart;¶ the proof of pedagogy through antipedagogy;¶ the proof of psychiatry through antipsychiatry, etc.¶ Everything is metamorphosed into its opposite to perpetuate itself in its expurgated form. All the powers, all the institutions speak of themselves through denial, in order to attempt, by simulating death, to escape their real death throes. Power can stage its own murder to rediscover a glimmer of existence and legitimacy Such was the case with some American presidents: the Kennedys were murdered because they still had a political dimension. The others, Johnson, Nixon, Ford, only had the right to phantom attempts, to simulated murders. But this aura of an artificial menace was still necessary to conceal that they were no longer anything but the mannequins of power. Formerly, the king (also the god) had to die, therein lay his power. Today, he is miserably forced to feign death, in order to preserve the blessing of power. But it is lost.¶ To seek new blood in its own death, to renew the cycle through the mirror of crisis, negativity; and antipower: this is the only solution-alibi of every power, of every institution attempting to break the vicious circle of its irresponsibility and of its fundamental nonexistence, of its already seen and of its already dead.

#### Scientific predictions solve – defer to expert consensus

Sullivan 98 (Phillip A., professor of aerospace engineering at the University of Toronto’s Institute for Aerospace Studies, “An Engineer Dissects Two Cases Studies”, A House Built on Sand: Exposing Postmodernist Myths about Science, edited by Noretta Koertge)

The Process of Scientific Discovery This story illustrates all the characteristics of scientific discovery, and two points are relevant here. First, unless there is political interference, flawed or weak arguments of even the most respected scientists are rapidly exposed. Furthermore, eager for recognition and priority, individual scientists are quick to promote novel explanations. Thus, when scientists finally do agree on the solution to a problem, this agreement is not solely the result of negotiation; it is forged by the evidence. The second point is that interpretation of this evidence is often complex, being in many ways akin to the assembly of an elaborate jigsaw puzzle. The result of any individual theoretical or experimental investigation is at best ambiguous, and its ultimate meaning is dependent on other investigations. In the initial assembly stages, the available puzzle pieces may suggest many interpretations and may provoke much controversy, so rhetoric and reputation can play major roles in persuasion. As additional investigations are undertaken, however, any consensus on interpretation that develops often has such compelling consistency or § Marked 18:23 § can allow such spectacular predictions that it becomes increasingly difficult to deny that it reflects objectivity. [11](http://www.questiaschool.com/read/62417656) Finally, as the sound-speed story shows, for questions at the frontier of science, assembly of the puzzle may take decades and longer. It follows that to make a convincing case, advocates of relativism in science cannot simply point to the disputes and controversies surrounding a puzzle that is still being assembled. Rather, they must demonstrate that social factors have entered the content of Chalmers's "good science." For the purposes of this discussion, I understand "good science" to be those propositions that are part of an accepted scientific consensus and that have an established record of successful prediction. Both of the two case studies I examine here concern aspects of mature disciplines that, when used appropriately, are capable of making accurate predictions. [12](http://www.questiaschool.com/read/62417656)

#### Science is key to check authoritarianism and solves a multitude of extinction scenarios

**Sokal, 4** (Alan D. Department of Physics New York University Transgressing the Boundaries: Towards a Transformative Hermeneutics of Quantum Gravity)//ahayes

Finally, postmodern science provides a powerful refutation of the authoritarianism and elitism inherent in traditional science, as well as an empirical basis for a democratic approach to scientific work. For, as Bohr noted, ``a complete elucidation of one and the same object may require diverse points of view which defy a unique description'' -- this is quite simply a fact about the world, much as the self-proclaimed empiricists of modernist science might prefer to deny it. In such a situation, how can a self-perpetuating secular priesthood of credentialed ``scientists'' purport to maintain a monopoly on the production of scientific knowledge? (Let me emphasize that I am in no way opposed to specialized scientific training; I object only when an elite caste seeks to impose its canon of ``high science'', with the aim of excluding a priori alternative forms of scientific production by non-members.89) The content and methodology of postmodern science thus provide powerful intellectual support for the progressive political project, understood in its broadest sense: the transgressing of boundaries, the breaking down of barriers, the radical democratization of all aspects of social, economic, political and cultural life.90 Conversely, one part of this project must involve the construction of a new and truly progressive science that can serve the needs of such a democratized society-to-be. As Markley observes, there seem to be two more-or-less mutually exclusive choices available to the progressive community: On the one hand, politically progressive scientists can try to recuperate existing practices for moral values they uphold, arguing that their right-wing enemies are defacing nature and that they, the counter-movement, have access to the truth. [But] the state of the biosphere -- air pollution, water pollution, disappearing rain forests, thousands of species on the verge of extinction, large areas of land burdened far beyond their carrying capacity, nuclear power plants, nuclear weapons, clearcuts where there used to be forests, starvation, malnutrition, disappearing wetlands, nonexistent grass lands, and a rash of environmentally caused diseases -- suggests that the realist dream of scientific progress, of recapturing rather than revolutionizing existing methodologies and technologies, is, at worst, irrelevant to a political struggle that seeks something more than a reenactment of state socialism.91

#### Even if science is bad the alt is worse - Critiques of science will be exploited by groups interested in destroying the environment

Ted BENTONSociology @ Essex 5 in *After Postmodernism* eds. Jose Lopez and Garry Potter p. 137-138

Second, the post‑Kuhnian relativist aproaches to the sociology of science, in challenging the proclaimed finality and cultural authority of big science, saw themselves as on the side of 'the underdog', pressing for democratic account­ability on the part of the scientific establishment ‑ even for a thoroughgoing democratisation of knowledge itself. Sociologists of science have tended to see 'technoscience' as indissolubly tied to political and industrial power and domin­ation. To call into question its epistemological authority has been to undermine a key source of legitimation for established power. However, the politics of the critique of science become more complex and ambivalent in the face of the new ecological issues. While many Greens see the interests associated with technoscience as largely to blame for many ecological hazards, they also rely on scientific detection, measurement and theoretical explanations in making out the Green case. The construction of incinerators for waste disposal adjacent to working‑class estates, the noise and fumes emitted by heavy road‑traffic, the loss of treasured landscapes and so on, are forms of ecological degradation which are readily perceptible, and may enter directly into the discourses of popular movements. However, many other, often more sinister and catastrophic, forms of ecological transformation may only be detected by scientific instrumentation. Nuclear and other forms of radiation, low concentrations of toxins in food and drinking water, antibiotic‑resistant pathogens, shifts in the chemical composi­tion of the upper atmosphere and so on fall into this category. In other cases, the scale of transformation is what is ecologically significant and, here again, scientific modelling and measurement displace the evidence provided by the senses of necessarily localised human agents. Global climate change, biodiversity loss, ozone depletion are among the transformations which fall into this category. Finally, rational discourse about policy options depends on (but is certainly not restricted to) best‑available scientific thinking about the causal mechanisms § Marked 18:23 § involved(the 'greenhouse' effect, CO2 exchanges at the surface of the oceans, pholovvnthesis, mechanisms of cloud‑formation and many others in the case of dinsate 'hanged. To expose the normatively and culturally 'constructed' character of those scientific research programmes which have so far indcnt‑ifled, measured and explained the hazardous dynamics of ecological change is to run a serious political risk. The big industrial complexes, such as the biotech, pharmaceutical, agribusiness, petrochemical, construction and road transport sectors, together with their state sponsors, have a lifeline thrown to them. That the knowledge ‑base which exposes the ecological 'externalities' of their activities is culturally biased and epistemologically questionable is music to their ears. Why put the brakes on wealth creation and progress on the basis of such flimsy and questionable evidence (see R. Rowell, 1996, esp. chap. 5)? These misuses of the work of constructionist sociology of environmental science are often seen as problematic from the standpoint of its practitioners (see, for example, r} a special issue of Social *Studies of Science, 1996).* Of course, it would be quite posble to accept these implications of he approach, in the face of unwanied political consequences: perhaps the weakening or even abandoning of environmental regulation and technteal safety standards could be accepted as an appropriate response to the sociologied dchunking of en ironmental science. lot esnnglv, however, few constructionists would be happy with such an out­conic. the question is, can they coherently or consistently unhappy about it? Winne i9% and Burninghaio md. Coopei (1999) oiler sophisticated defences of their own variants of construe onism from this sort of 'realist' criticism. They claim, variously, that the 'taking of sides' in environmental conflicts is not necessarily the most productive role for social scientists to take, and that, not­withstanding rite realist [critique. it](http://critique.it) often possible to combine constructionism with cotmitiimmred cn'‑ironmen iahsns. These contributions deserve much fuller responses than I have space for here hot, as I shall argue below. dicnt are other reasons for scepticism about the more radical versions of constructionism.

#### Burden of proof is key --- other epistemologies cause extinction

**Coyne, 06** – Author and Writer for the Times (Jerry A., “A plea for empiricism”, FOLLIES OF THE WISE, Dissenting essays, 405pp. Emeryville, CA: Shoemaker and Hoard, 1 59376 101 5)

Supernatural forces and events, essential aspects of most religions, play no role in science, not because we exclude them deliberately, but because they have never been a useful way to understand nature. Scientific “truths” are empirically supported observations agreed on by different observers. Religious “truths,” on the other hand, are personal, unverifiable and contested by those of different faiths. Science is nonsectarian: those who disagree on scientific issues do not blow each other up. Science encourages doubt; most religions quash it. But religion is not completely separable from science. Virtually all religions make improbable claims that are in principle empirically testable, and thus within the domain of science: Mary, in Catholic teaching, was bodily taken to heaven, while Muhammad rode up on a white horse; and Jesus (born of a virgin) came back from the dead. None of these claims has been corroborated, and while science would never accept them as true without evidence, religion does. A mind that accepts both science and religion is thus a mind in conflict. Yet scientists, especially beleaguered American evolutionists, need the support of the many faithful who respect science. It is not politically or tactically useful to point out the fundamental and unbreachable gaps between science and theology. Indeed, scientists and philosophers have written many books (equivalents of Leibnizian theodicy) desperately trying to show how these areas can happily cohabit. In his essay, “Darwin goes to Sunday School”, Crews reviews several of these works, pointing out with brio the intellectual contortions and dishonesties involved in harmonizing religion and science. Assessing work by the evolutionist Stephen Jay Gould, the philosopher Michael Ruse, the theologian John Haught and others, Crews concludes, “When coldly examined . . . these productions invariably prove to have adulterated scientific doctrine or to have emptied religious dogma of its commonly accepted meaning”. Rather than suggesting any solution (indeed, there is none save adopting a form of “religion” that makes no untenable empirical claims), Crews points out the dangers to the survival of our planet arising from a rejection of Darwinism. Such rejection promotes apathy towards overpopulation, pollution, deforestation and other environmental crimes: “So long as we regard ourselves as creatures apart who need only repent of our personal sins to retain heaven’s blessing, we won’t take the full measure of our species-wise responsibility for these calamities”. Crews includes three final essays on deconstruction and other misguided movements § Marked 18:23 § in literary theory. These also show “follies of the wise” in that they involve interpretations of texts that are unanchored by evidence. Fortunately, the harm inflicted by Lacan and his epigones is limited to the good judgement of professors of literature. Follies of the Wise is one of the most refreshing and edifying collections of essays in recent years. Much like Christopher Hitchens in the UK, Crews serves a vital function as National Sceptic. He ends on a ringing note: “The human race has produced only one successfully validated epistemology, characterizing all scrupulous inquiry into the real world, from quarks to poems. It is, simply, empiricism, or the submitting of propositions to the arbitration of evidence that is acknowledged to be such by all of the contending parties. Ideas that claim immunity from such review, whether because of mystical faith or privileged “clinical insight” or the say-so of eminent authorities, are not to be countenanced until they can pass the same skeptical ordeal to which all other contenders are subjected.” As science in America becomes ever more harried and debased by politics and religion, we desperately need to heed Crews’s plea for empiricism.