# 1NC

### 1nc T – FTA

#### 1. Interpretation – “Its” is possessive of the USFG

Updegrave 91 (W.C., “Explanation of ZIP Code Address Purpose”, 8-19, <http://www.supremelaw.org/ref/zipcode/updegrav.htm>)

More specifically, looking at the map on page 11 of the National ZIP Code Directory, e.g. at a local post office, one will see that the first digit of a ZIP Code defines an area that includes more than one State. The first sentence of the explanatory paragraph begins: "A ZIP Code is a numerical code that identifies areas within the United States and its territories for purposes of ..." [cf. 26 CFR 1.1-1(c)]. Note the singular possessive pronoun "its", not "their", therefore carrying the implication that it relates to the "United States" as a corporation domiciled in the District of Columbia (in the singular sense), not in the sense of being the 50 States of the Union (in the plural sense). The map shows all the States of the Union, but it also shows D.C., Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, making the explanatory statement literally correct.

#### This means only direct aid and trade agreements – they’re third-party engagement

Daga 13 (Sergio Daga, director of research at Politicas Publicas para la Libertad, Bolivia, visiting senior policy analyst, Heritage Foundation, M.A. Economics, University of Chile, B.A. Economics, Catholic University of Bolivia, also trained at Libertad y Desarrollo, Chile, and the Atlas Economic Research Foundation, United States, “Economics of the 2013-2014 Debate Topic: U.S. Economic Engagement Toward Cuba, Mexico or Venezuela,” National Center for Policy Analysis, Debate Backgrounder No. 7, 5-15-2013, http://www.ncpa.org/pdfs/Message\_to\_Debaters\_6-7-13.pdf)

Economics is the branch of human knowledge concerned with the ¶ satisfaction of human wants through the production of goods and ¶ services, and the exchange of those goods and services between two ¶ or more individuals. Thus, economics encompasses human activities ¶ from simple barter between two individuals to international trade ¶ between firms or governments. Many of these economic activities ¶ are regulated by government, and some are outlawed. Trade and ¶ other economic activities that cross national borders — such as ¶ sales of goods and services, travel, migration or transfers of money ¶ — are regulated by both the government of the originating country ¶ and the government of the destination country. The government ¶ itself could be an economic actor, buying and selling from other ¶ governments or firms in other countries; or the government could ¶ regulate the private economic activities of individuals and firms.¶ Economic engagement between or among countries can take ¶ many forms, but this document will focus on government-to-government engagement through 1) international trade agreements ¶ designed to lower barriers to trade; and 2) government foreign ¶ aid; next, we will contrast government-to-government economic ¶ engagement with private economic engagement through 3) ¶ international investment, called foreign direct investment; and 4) ¶ remittances and migration by individuals. All of these areas are ¶ important with respect to the countries mentioned in the debate ¶ resolution; however, when discussing economic engagement by ¶ the U.S. federal government, some issues are more important with ¶ respect to some countries than to others.

#### Promoting investment in individual sectors is private NOT governmental engagement

Sullivan 8 (Daniel S. Sullivan, Assistant Secretary for Economic, Energy, and Business Affairs, which involves overseeing work on international trade and investment policy; international finance, development, and debt policy; economic sanctions, former Director and Acting Senior Director in the International Economics Directorate Director and Acting Senior Director in the International Economics Directorate in the National Security Council/National Economic Council Staff, graduated magna cum laude from Harvard University with a degree in Economics and graduated cum laude from Georgetown University with a J.D./Master of Science in Foreign Service joint degree, focusing on law, international economics, and national security studies, Remarks at the Inter-American Development Bank Annual Meeting: “Economic Engagement in the Americas,” April 6, 2008, <http://2001-2009.state.gov/e/eeb/rls/rm/2008/105276.htm> Xu)

QUESTION: In regards to Uruguay-U.S. negotiations – what are some of the objectives for a commercial exchange with Uruguay? ASSISTANT SECRETARY SULLIVAN: Well again, I think one thing that’s been a very positive element of our engagement with Uruguay was the Bilateral Investment Treaty. That was the first new "model BIT" in the United States – very high level investor protection for both Uruguayan investors in the U.S. and U.S. investors there. We saw that as an important development of our relationship. I believe my colleague Edward Eissenstat from the USTR office has been to Uruguay a few times in the last year; focused on deepening our trade relationship. And I know there have been a number of discussions on ways to build on the bilateral investment treaty, which I think we’ve seen is very successful. I think we also have a trade investment framework agreement with Uruguay which is another way in which to deepen the relationship. And I think there’s a lot of interest in building on what we saw as positive movement, to move forward on the BIT. So, I think there’s a lot of enthusiasm on continuing to deepen our economic relationship with Uruguay and the United States. Yes. QUESTION: Business News Americas. What will be the impact of the Uruguay BIT on new investment? ASSISTANT SECRETARY SULLIVAN: Let me take your first question. With regard to specific sectors, as you know, those are private sector decisions. What’s important about the BIT is that it provides the protections to encourage deeper economic engagement through investment, through trade. The different sectors where that engagement might take place is going to be up to the Uruguayan and U.S. private sector interests, but we think that having the investment treaty is a very important spur to making that happen.

### PTX iran

#### A nuclear deal with Iran is likely – Obama is conserving his PC to push it through Congress

Klein 4-10 (Joe Klein, Time, “Why Obama Hit Pause,” 4-10-2014, time.com/57181/obama-hits-pause-on-iran/)

Why hasn’t Kerry published a framework for the talks as promised? In my interviews with current and former diplomats, a prevailing theme emerged: a reiteration of the Clinton framework would activate the Sheldon Adelson neoconservative wing of the Republican Party, plus many Christian evangelicals who see the annexation of the West Bank territories as biblical prophesy, and this is a fight that Obama doesn’t particularly want at this point. Why not? The President may want to keep his powder dry, in part to keep Jewish voters on the reservation in the 2014 midterms but also because another, more promising fight is looming with the neoconservatives–over the Iran nuclear talks.¶ Indeed, the Iran talks seem to be going as well as the Middle East talks are going poorly. That’s why you haven’t read much about them in recent weeks. There are still major issues to overcome, but Western negotiators have been impressed by the Iranians’ seriousness and unwillingness to use extraneous events–like the U.S.-Russian tiff over Ukraine–to try to delay the talks or split the U.N. alliance. It is not inconceivable that a deal limiting Iran’s ability to enrich uranium and a strict regimen of international inspections will be completed by the end of the year … although, once again, the Administration won’t want it to be finished until after the midterm elections.¶ The Middle East peace talks continue to chug along, at the request of the Israelis and Palestinians, even after Kerry declared them moribund. It turns out that neither side wants to abandon the illusion of progress–and Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, in particular, may be keeping his powder dry for the Iran fight as well. But the paralyzed talks have now become another reminder of the Administration’s perceived weakness in foreign policy. Iran may well prove to be the President’s ultimate test–not just the political test of maneuvering a treaty through a Congress heavily influenced by the Israel lobby but also the diplomatic test of dealing with a complicated, opaque Iran, where the reactionary forces will want to reassert their authority if the treaty is successfully negotiated. A remarkable achievement may be within Obama’s grasp, but he and his Secretary of State are going to have to prove more solid, subtle and dependable policy implementers than they have in the past.

#### New agenda items overstretch PC and trigger cascading prolif and war with Iran

Sabet 9-13 (Farzan Sabet, co-founder and editing manager of IranPolitik.com, doctoral student in International History and M.A. International History & Politics, Graduate Institute, Geneva, focused on international relations, international trade law, and Iranian domestic politics and foreign policy, “4: Iran: Resolving the Nuclear Crisis,” Journal of Public and International Affairs, September 2013, p.74-77, http://www.princeton.edu/jpia/past-issues-1/2013/JPIA-2013-Final.pdf)

American President Barack Obama currently has an unprecedented opportunity to resolve the Iranian nuclear crisis. In¶ the first year of his second term, he has substantial political capital at home and a strong coalition of countries supporting his sanctions strategy and nuclear negotiations abroad. Just as¶ importantly, devastating economic sanctions since 2012 may¶ have increased the willingness of the Islamic Republic of Iran to¶ compromise¶ on its nuclear program. This policy paper argues¶ that President Obama should capitalize on this historic window¶ of opportunity by acknowledging Iran’s right to a peaceful¶ nuclear program and offering a roadmap for lifting sanctions in¶ exchange for deep concessions by Iran on its nuclear program.¶ The United States has not yet placed substantive sanctions relief on the table, and this may be the key to breaking the¶ deadlock in P5+1-Iran nuclear negotiations. However, the¶ current strong U.S. negotiating position will erode over time¶ and thus President Obama must take decisive action to resolve¶ the Iranian nuclear crisis.¶ INTRODUCTION¶ As President Barack Obama resettles into the White House and as pres¶ -¶ ident-elect Hassan Rouhani prepares to take on his new office, a historic¶ window of opportunity may exist for the United States of America and¶ the Islamic Republic of Iran to not only resolve the crisis over the contro¶ -¶ versial Iranian nuclear program but to also seek broader rapprochement.¶ There are, however, many obstacles in the path of successful negotiations.¶ Both sides will be under pressure from hardline domestic actors seeking¶ a continuation of the status quo. The United States will also be under¶ strong pressure from important allies abroad, including Israel and the Gulf¶ Cooperation Council (GCC), to extract maximum concessions from Iran.¶ The Islamic Republic, for its part, wants to project an image of strength¶ to foreign audiences and can only accept a deal which, at the very least,¶ allows it to save face (Mousavian 2013). This creates constraints on the¶ both sides, limiting the range of possible agreements.¶ Failure to reach a negotiated settlement, however, could have potentially¶ catastrophic consequences for American interests. At one extreme, this¶ failure may allow Iran to develop a nuclear weapons capability, shifting the¶ balance of power in the Middle East and beginning a nuclear proliferation cascade. The Obama administration, however, has ruled out a situation in¶ which the United States is forced to contain a nuclear weapon-latent Iran.¶ At the other extreme, the United States may have to carry out military operations on Iranian nuclear facilities, an option which could temporar¶ -¶ ily set back the Iranian nuclear program but would likely have disastrous¶ humanitarian consequences and lead to a regional conflagration. An attack¶ could also give Iran a justification to withdraw from the Non-Proliferation¶ Treaty (NPT) and make a dash for nuclear weapons, undermining the¶ cause of nuclear non-proliferation. The Iranian nuclear crisis is thus one¶ of the most important international security issues today.¶ Since the failure of the first round of negotiations between the Obama¶ administration and the Islamic Republic in October 2009, the United¶ States has pursued a “comprehensivizing” and “multilateralizing” economic¶ sanctions strategy. This means that the United States has expanded the¶ scope of sanctions to broader swaths of the Iranian economy, particularly¶ its financial and petroleum sector, and multiplied the number of actors¶ complying with sanctions. Since the five permanent members of the¶ United Nations Security Council plus Germany (P5+1) and the Islamic¶ Republic resumed high level political negotiations in February 2013, a¶ question has hung in the air: Has the Obama administration’s sanctions¶ strategy sufficiently changed Iran’s cost-benefit analysis to make a nuclear¶ deal more likely?¶ This policy paper argues that this is the case. More specifically, it argues ¶ that by applying sanctions to Iran the United States has increased the costs of¶ failing to reach an agreement for Tehran. Sanctions appear to have strongly¶ contributed to the rapid deterioration of the Iranian economy since at least¶ 2012. What this means for Iran is that the price of continuing its nuclear¶ program on the current trajectory is no longer diplomatic condemnation¶ or vague threats of military action but deteriorating social conditions and¶ severe economic pain that it can measure in the billions of dollars. While¶ sanctions have largely succeeded as a mechanism of economic pain, this¶ paper argues that expectations of what sanctions can achieve should be¶ tempered and that pain must be applied in a broader framework that¶ also includes incentives. As such, while sanctions have made a negotiated¶ settlement of the nuclear crisis more likely, they cannot be relied upon to¶ achieve a breakthrough by themselves. Negotiations must ultimately offer¶ acknowledgement of Iran’s right to a peaceful nuclear program under the¶ NPT and a viable road map for lifting sanctions if they are to succeed.¶ While President Obama’s re-election, Rouhani’s election, and the¶ relative success of sanctions thus far provide a window of opportunity for¶ a mutually beneficial negotiated settlement of the nuclear crisis, several¶ factors may erode the current strong U.S. position over time. First, as¶ time passes, other policy priorities will divide the Obama administration’s attention and political capital, weakening its ability to sell a negotiated settlement at home. Second, the Islamic Republic is already mitigating¶ some of the effects of sanctions through a variety of methods, decreasing¶ sanctions’ value as a bargaining chip for the United States. Finally, the¶ P5+1 and sanctions coalitions may begin to unravel over a wide range of¶ issues, such as the attractiveness of Iranian petroleum resources at steep¶ discounts or the humanitarian impact of sanctions, reducing the impact¶ of sanctions and the international momentum for a negotiated settlement.¶ Time is thus of the essence.¶ Based on these observations this paper proposes four specific policy¶ recommendations for the U.S. strategy toward P5+1-Iran nuclear negotia¶ -¶ tions, taking into account both domestic, foreign, and temporal factors.¶ First, President Obama should end the dual-track strategy as it is currently¶ conceived. This means halting the expansion of the Iran sanctions regime¶ by the U.S. Congress while negotiations are ongoing, as this may encourage Iran to escalate its nuclear program to maintain the balance of power¶ in negotiations. Second, President Obama can offer to help suspend E.U.¶ and some U.S. sanctions in exchange for suspensions of elements of the¶ Iranian nuclear program. This suspension-for-suspension proposal creates¶ further trust and builds momentum. Third, President Obama should use ¶ this momentum to reach a final agreement. A final resolution of the nuclear¶ crisis will require the Obama administration to offer both acknowledge¶ -¶ ment of Iran’s right to a peaceful nuclear program and a viable road map¶ for sanctions relief. Fourth, the Obama administration must put in place¶ guarantees that make any final agreement lasting. This paper makes its¶ case in three parts. Part one briefly reviews the historical background of¶ the Iranian nuclear crisis. Part two argues that current conditions could¶ allow for a mutually acceptable deal, but that this window of opportunity¶ will not last forever. Part three lays out the four policy proposals in detail.

#### War escalates, collapses the global economy and causes extinction

Avery 11-6 (John Scales Avery, Lektor Emeritus, Associate Professor, at the Department of Chemistry, University of Copenhagen, “An Attack On Iran Could Escalate Into Global Nuclear War,” 11-6-2013, http://www.countercurrents.org/avery061113.htm)

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

### Grad DA

#### The Cuban transition will be gradual and stable – Diaz-Canel makes a political transition inevitable

López-Levy, 13 - PhD candidate at the Josef Korbel School of International Studies at the University of Denver (Arturo, “Getting Ready for Post-Castro Cuba,” The National Interest, 4/10, http://nationalinterest.org/commentary/getting-ready-post-castro-cuba-8316)

In the last five years, the Cuban government has created an important institutional foundation for a parallel transition to a mixed economy (symbolized by the encouragement of non-state-sector firms) and a post-totalitarian relationship between the state and civil society (symbolized by relaxed travel restrictions). With the election of a new Council of State in February, the last phase of the transition to the post-Castro era began. Raúl Castro was reelected to the presidency, and for the first time a leader born after 1959, Miguel Díaz-Canel, became his second in command. Although this gradual transition is unfolding with the same party and president in power, one can begin to discern a new leadership and changing priorities. Looking at the Communist Party as a corporation (an analogy that should not be abused), Díaz-Canel is a manager who has served at various levels of the production chain. He worked at its foundation, as a university teacher and youth leader. Later, in the strategic provinces of Villa Clara and Holguin, he administered the implementation of economic reforms and directed the opening of the economy to foreign investment and tourism—all while maintaining party control over both processes. Díaz-Canel is part of the network of provincial party czars who are important in the implementation of the proposed changes, particularly decentralization. Having worked in central and eastern Cuba, the new first vice president has cordial ties with regional commanders of the armed forces—the other pillar, along with the Communist Party, of the current Cuban system. He is a civilian, the first in the line of succession to have little military experience. But he is steeped in the networks of power and well versed in carefully managing reform. Challenges for Cuban Leaders If Cuba implements the type of mixed economy proposed by the last Congress of the Communist Party—a new, more vital relationship with its diaspora and the world—it may also experience a political transformation. As the economy and society change, the political status quo cannot hold. The rise of market mechanisms and an autonomous non-state sector will reinforce the newly open flows of information, investment and technology. These new sectors will seek representation in the political arena. Citizens will have greater access to the Internet, and will be able to associate more horizontally. For at least the next five years, this does not imply a transition to multiparty democracy. But economic liberalization will force an expansion of the current system. Economic and migration opportunities will channel some of the energy in the direction of new businesses and travel, but it will not be enough. The party system will be reformed in order to remain at the helm of social and economic life. Political liberalization will probably start in the lower rungs of government, allowing citizens to vent their frustrations at that level. Raúl Castro’s decision to limit leadership positions to two terms, at a time when the older generation is leaving power by attrition, will result in a more institutionalized leadership that promotes younger leaders in an orderly fashion.

#### Lifting the embargo would pressure Cuba for rapid reforms

Cave, 12 – foreign correspondent for The New York Times, based in Mexico City and has a B.A. from Boston College and an M.S. from Columbia University's Graduate School of Journalism (Damien, “Easing of Restraints in Cuba Renews Debate on U.S. Embargo”, NY Times, 11/19/12, <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/11/20/world/americas/changes-in-cuba-create-support-for-easing-embargo.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0)//EX>

Still, in a country where Cubans “resolve” their way around government restrictions every day (private deals with customs agents are common), many Cubans anticipate real benefits should the United States change course. Mr. López, a meticulous mechanic who wears plastic gloves to avoid dirtying his fingers, said legalizing imports and investment would create a flood of the supplies that businesses needed, overwhelming the government’s controls while lowering prices and creating more work apart from the state. Other Cubans, including political dissidents, say softening the embargo would increase the pressure for more rapid change by undermining one of the government’s main excuses for failing to provide freedom, economic opportunity or just basic supplies. “Last month, someone asked me to redo their kitchen, but I told them I couldn’t do it because I didn’t have the materials,” said Pedro José, 49, a licensed carpenter in Havana who did not want his last name published to avoid government pressure. “Look around — Cuba is destroyed,” he added, waving a hand toward a colonial building blushing with circles of faded pink paint from the 1950s. “There is a lot of work to be done.”

#### Slow change key to Cuban reform - avoids rapid regime collapse

Feinberg 11 - professor of international political economy at UC San Dieg, nonresident senior fellow with the Latin America Initiative at Brookings (Richard E., “Reaching Out: Cuba’s New Economy and the International Response”, November, Brookings, http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/papers/2011/11/18%20cuba%20feinberg/1118\_cuba\_feinberg.pdf)//ID

Gradualism: Gradualism in economic reform—as opposed to an Eastern European-style sudden regime collapse—appears to be the most likely scenario that Cuba will follow. As a result of economic reforms, albeit halting and partial, Cuba today is different from the Cuba of 1989 . In 2011, Cuba’s current leadership, however aging and proud, promulgated reform guidelines that recognize the imperative of change and that empower the pro-reform factions. Moreover, as suggested by successful Asian experiences (Vietnam, Malaysia, Singapore, China), where political leadership provides stability and continuity, gradualism can be a feasible—indeed it may well be the only realistic—option. Gradualism must not, however, be an excuse for policy paralysis or a smoke-screen for maintenance of the status quo.

#### Rapid change risks Cuban civil war

Feinberg 11 - professor of international political economy at UC San Dieg, nonresident senior fellow with the Latin America Initiative at Brookings (Richard E., “Reaching Out: Cuba’s New Economy and the International Response”, November, Brookings, <http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/papers/2011/11/18%20cuba%20feinberg/1118_cuba_feinberg.pdf>)//ID

Some in the United States have long supported severe sanctions intended to starve the Cuban regime of resources and thereby precipitate a political breakdown . Yet, within the national security bureaucracy of the U .S . Executive Branch, notwithstanding occasional presidential rhetoric, there is a strong preference for gradual, peaceful evolution in Cuba . A sudden breakdown, it is feared, would entail substantial risks for U .S . interests, including an immigration crisis right off of our shores, and in the worst case, irresistible pressures for intervention to quell a bloody civil war and halt a mass exodus of refugees.

#### This turns every part of the aff

**NAÍM, 1** – editor of Foreign Policy (MOISÉS, “When Countries go Crazy”, MARCH 1, 2001, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2001/03/01/when\_countries\_go\_crazy)//eek

Some countries can drive other countries crazy. When people have this effect on one another, it is because of imbalances in the brain’s neurotransmitters. With countries, it often happens because of the disproportionate influence of special interests. Cuba, for example, has long driven the United States crazy. Just think of the Bay of Pigs invasion or the outsourcing of Castro's assassination to the Mafia. For more recent examples of irrational behavior, think of the Helms-Burton Law or Elián. The problem is that Cuba not only drives the United States crazy but also seems to induce some acute form of learning disability among U.S. politicians. Cuba makes them forget -- or unlearn -- everything the world has painfully discovered about the transition from communism. This knowledge can be distilled into five simple maxims: Lesson one: Failure is more common than success in the transition to a democratic market economy. Lesson two: The less internationally integrated, more centralized, and more personalized a former communist regime was, the more traumatic and unsuccessful its transition will be. Lesson three: Dismantling a communist state is far easier and faster than building a functional replacement for it. Lesson four: The brutal, criminal ways of a powerful Communist party with a tight grip on public institutions are usually supplanted by the brutal, criminal ways of powerful private business conglomerates with a tight grip on public institutions. Lesson five: Introducing a market economy without a strong and effective state capable of regulating it gives resourceful entrepreneurs more incentive to emulate Al Capone than Bill Gates. It is therefore safe to assume that if the Castro regime suddenly implodes, Cuba will end up looking more like Albania than the Bahamas. But that is not the assumption on which U.S politicians base their efforts to hasten Castro's demise. Although a lot of money, political capital, and thought have been expended trying to overthrow the Cuban government, ideas about what to do the morning after are scarce and often unrealistic. They usually hinge on the expectation that in the post-Castro era democracy will emerge and Cuban-American exiles will lead other investors in transforming Cuba into a capitalist hub. More likely is that instead of a massive flow of foreign investment into Cuba, the United States will get a massive inflow of refugees escaping the chaos of a post-Castro regime. Frictions between Cuban-Cubans and Miami-Cubans will make politics nasty and unstable. New investments and privatizations will be mired in the legal mess produced by the 5,911 claims to property in Cuba (valued at more than $17 billion) that have been filed with the United States Claims Commission by former property owners. (That amounts to nearly seven years' worth of Cuban exports.) The Cuban public sector is inextricably intertwined with the Communist Party, so the demise of the party will paralyze the government, at least for a while. And the cost of any resulting humanitarian crisis will mainly be borne by U.S. taxpayers, who will likely pay much more than the $2 billion spent containing the influx of Haitian refugees in 1994. But can't the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the International Monetary Fund support Cuba's transition with money, experts, and projects? Sure, except that the United States forbids them from spending even a dollar to prepare themselves and Cuba for the coming transition. The result is that these institutions are not ready to help Cuba. Again, the United States forgets a useful lesson from another continent: The day after Yasser Arafat and Yitzhak Rabin shook hands at the White House in 1993, the World Bank -- ­­­which had been instructed to prepare for the event -- was immediately ready to lend and invest in projects under the control of the Palestinian Authority, even though the authority was not and still is not a member of the bank. Allowing such an initiative in Cuba's case would cost U.S. taxpayers nothing and would help plan for the challenges ahead. Also, training Cuban professionals to run a modern market economy is bound to be a better investment for the United States than blocking academic exchanges with the island. The rational, self-interested approach for the United States that also avoids much future human pain in Cuba is to concentrate all efforts on ensuring as smooth a transition as possible. This view, of course, is not shared by all. U.S. Senator Jesse Helms recently said that "the opponents of the Cuban embargo are about to run into a brick wall on the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. President Bush is a committed supporter of the embargo." The failure of the U.S. trade embargo against Cuba to achieve its stated objectives over the last 40 years is dismissed by Senator Helms and some Cuban-Americans who argue that the embargo has never been vigorously implemented. Perhaps, as Senator Helms predicts, things are about to change and the aging Cuban dictator will finally fall. If Cuba collapses and becomes a failed state 90 miles away from U.S. shores, the epicenter of the Caribbean drug trade, the source of a massive flood of refugees to the United States, a corruption haven, and a black hole for substantial sums of U.S. aid, President Bush will have no one to blame but himself. Or, more precisely, the powerful interest groups that blinded him to the lessons of experience.

## XO CP

### 1nc cp text

#### Text: The President of the United States should issue an executive order to <<do the plan>>.

### 1nc Obama cred nb

#### Obama cred is *low* because of failure to make *unilateral* engagement decisions – acting unilaterally re-establishes credibility

Luxner 13 (Larry Luxner, citing Zbigniew Brzezinski, Senior Advisor to President Barack Obama on matters of National Security and Foreign Policy, former National Security Advisor to President Jimmy Carter, Senior Research Professor of International Relations, School of Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University, Counselor, Trustee and Co-Chair of the Advisory Board, Center for Strategic and International Studies, member of the International Advisory Board, Atlantic Council, “Brzezinski: Obama Must ‘Regain’ Lost Ground in Foreign Policy,” Washington Diplomat, 1-31-2013, http://www.washdiplomat.com/index.php?option=com\_content&view=article&id=8841&Itemid=414)

Two days after the election that returned President Barack Obama to the White House for a second term, one of America's best-known former diplomats offered his take on the world — and the audience found his observations just as relevant as they were three decades ago.¶ Zbigniew Brzezinski, national security advisor under President Jimmy Carter from 1977 to 1981, didn't mince words when it came to Obama. "He has to undo the excessive reliance on speeches as he acts on the world scene — that is to say, the apparent assumption that a powerful speech on this or that subject is the same as effecting change," Brzezinski said. "The speeches all promised a great deal, but a great deal did not transpire. There was some marginal progress here and there, but by and large, his speeches remain speeches."¶ The Polish-American diplomat, 84, gave his own speech Nov. 8 at the Aspen Institute's Ambassadors' Security Roundtable luncheon at the Four Seasons hotel; moderating the discussion was CNN's Washington-based foreign affairs correspondent Jill Dougherty. In attendance were some 75 guests, including ambassadors representing a range of countries from Afghanistan to Zambia, as well as lobbyists, consultants and various State Department officials.¶ The event was part of the recent launch of the Ambassadors' Security Roundtable, a quarterly convening of ambassadors from around the world to promote greater international cooperation in the critical realm of security. The luncheon followed an off-the-record gathering of European envoys at the Aspen Institute's Wye River campus on Maryland's Eastern Shore in October.¶ Brzezinski, whom Dougherty introduced as a "living legend," said that in 2008, "at a lunch of this sort," he spoke of how impressed he was with the president-elect's "knowledge and understanding of the basic dynamics of this era."¶ Four years later, Brzezinski argued that Obama must reassert his credibility on the world stage through serious commitment and decisive action that will shape both his legacy and the country's trajectory.¶ "The management of our foreign policy and the protection of our national security are interwoven, and the president has no peer," Brzezinski said. "Congress is not a partner in the shaping of foreign policy. That is the special domain of the president, and he has to regain that territory."¶ It's territory Brzezinski has traversed for decades. During his time as Carter's national security advisor, Brzezinski oversaw the normalization of U.S. relations with China, the overthrow of the Shah in Iran, the rise of mujahideen fighters in Afghanistan, the growth of dissent in Soviet-influenced Eastern Europe, the signing of a treaty to relinquish U.S. control over the Panama Canal, and the brokering of the Camp David peace accords between Egypt and Israel.¶ The chairman of countless commissions, task forces and councils, Brzezinski has been in the foreign policy trenches since the 1960s. The elder statesman remains active today, teaching at universities such as Harvard, Columbia and Johns Hopkins and writing numerous widely regarded books, including his most recent: "Strategic Vision: America and the Crisis of Global Power."¶ In the 2012 book, Brzezinski argues that U.S. policymakers need to rethink the country's place in an interdependent world where America is no longer the sole superpower — adapting to shifting geopolitics while reasserting American influence in order to preserve global stability.¶ "Indeed, the ongoing changes in the distribution of global power and mounting global strife make it all the more imperative that America not retreat into an ignorant garrison-state mentality or wallow in self-righteous cultural hedonism. Such an America could cause the geopolitical prospects of an evolving world — in which the center of gravity is shifting from West to East — to become increasingly grave," he writes. "The world needs an America that is economically vital, socially appealing, responsibly powerful, strategically deliberate, internationally respected, and historically enlightened in its global engagement with the new East."

### 1nc solvency – cuba embargo

#### An executive order can remove embargo provisions

ASCE 09 (Matias F. Travieso-Diaz, Association for the Study of the Cuban Economy, “Lifting the Cuban Embargo: The New Labors of Hercules?”, Cuba in Transition, 2009, <http://www.ascecuba.org/publications/proceedings/volume19/pdfs/traviesodiaz.pdf>)

The actions taken by the United States in the past to remove trade embargoes against foreign countries appear to show that, unless such lifting is specifically limited by the legislation, Presidential decisions and determinations are sufficient authority to lift trade embargoes. On that basis, removing the TWEA as a source of the Cuban trade embargo would be straightforward. The simplest procedure would be for the President to abstain from issuing the required annual Determination that exercise of the TWEA authority with respect to Cuba is in the national interest of the United States. An alternative, but perhaps more controversial, course of action would be for the President to issue an executive order expressly ending the state of emergency with regard to Cuba. The same document could repeal[s] other elements of the embargo, such as some of the CACR issued after March 1996. Alternatively, the Treasury Department could take administrative action to rescind the post-1996 CACR.64 In the case of the Foreign Assistance Act, Section 620(a)(1) of the FAA, 22 U.S.C. § 2370(a)(1), authorizes the President to “establish and maintain a total embargo upon all trade between the United States and Cuba.” This section is clearly permissive and leaves the President free to determine whether to “maintain” the embargo, and consequently whether to lift it. The President could remove the embargo, to the extent it is imposed under this provision, by an executive order that rescinds President Kennedy’s Proclamation and revokes all subsequent executive orders and regulations thereunder implementing aspects of the embargo. The President could also take this action unilaterally, without reference to any external events.

### 1nc k

#### Movements against neoliberalism are growing in Latin America and spill over -- the plans reifies neoliberalism --- ethics require we de-link to preserve the environment and indigenous culture.

Harris 8 (Richard L Harris: Professor of Global Studies at California State University, Monterey Bay; Managing Editor of the Journal of Developing Societies (SAGE India); and Coordi­ nating Editor of Latin American Perspectives (SAGE USA). “Latin America’s Response to Neoliberalism and Globalization,” http://www.nuso.org/upload/articulos/3506\_2.pdf)

The economic, political and social development of the Latin American and Caribbean countries is obstructed by the power relations and international structures that regulate the world capitalist system. The structures of this system provide a hierarchical political and economic exoskeleton that constrains all national efforts to pursue any significant degree of self-directed, inward-oriented, balanced and environmentally sustainable development. Indeed, the geopolitical power structures that preserve and support the world capitalist system have made it almost impossible for the governments of the core as well as the peripheral countries in this system to pursue a path of inward-oriented, equitable, democratically controlled and environmentally sustainable development (Amin 2001b:20). Since the 1980s, inter-American relations and the economic, political and social development of the Latin American and Caribbean states have been shaped by these geo­ political structures and the neoliberal strategic agenda put forward by the government of the United States of America (USA), the major transnational corporations and the three major international financial institutions (IFIs) that operate in the Latin American and Caribbean region (Harris and Nef, 2008). This later group of IFIs includes the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank, and the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB). The policies of these IFIs based in Washington generally follow the dictates of the government of the USA due to the controlling influence that it exercises over these institutions. Their agenda for the Latin American and Caribbean region gives priority to promoting and protecting the interests of the major investors and transnational corporations that are largely based in the USA and operate in the region. It also serves to maintain and strengthen the geopolitical hegemony of the USA over the Western Hemisphere (Harris and Nef). But conditions are changing. Washington’s neoliberal agenda for controlling the capi­ talist development of the Western Hemisphere and maintaining US hegemony over the region is increasingly threatened by a progressive alternative agenda for the regio­ nal integration of the Latin American and Caribbean countries that has begun to gain widespread support in the region. This alternative agenda for the region calls for the autonomous economic development of the region free of the hegemonic control and influence of the USA and the IFIs based in Washington. Not only does this type of development pose a fundamental threat to the hegemony of the USA in the region, it threatens the dominance of transnational capital throughout the Americas. Moreover, it also poses a significant threat to the global expansion and integration of the world capitalist system in general and to the global hegemonic coalition led by the government and transnational corporations of the USA. Today, political and economic strategies are being developed for moving from the prevailing export-oriented neoliberal model of economic development to new in­ ward-oriented models of sustainable development, tailored to the diverse conditions, economic capacities, political structures, natural endowments and cultural values of the societies involved. Moreover, a growing number of international and regional civil society organizations have emerged in recent years to create such alternatives. What the forums, networks, programs, and activities of these various types of organizations reveal is that there is a growing international network of organizations and social movements committed to promoting new, more equitable forms of international cooperation and regulation that support inward-oriented and sustainable development as well as genuine democracy at the regional and national levels. At the same time, these organizations argue that the present global trading regime that has been erected under the WTO should and can be replaced by a new global trading system that replaces the present system of so-called free but in fact unfair trade, with a sys­ tem that ensures «fair trade» and promotes South-South economic exchange and coo­ peration. Most of the progressive alternatives advocated by these organizations and the new left-leaning governments that have been elected to office in the region give priority to aligning the external relations of the countries in the region to the internal needs of the majority of the population. That is to say, decisions about what to export and what to import should be aligned with the needs of the population rather than the interests of transnational capitalists and transnational corporations or the hegemonic interests of the USA. Some of these alternative strategies involve what Walden Bello (2002) has referred to as «deglobalization.» That is to say, they involve unlinking the economies of these peripheral capitalist societies from the advanced capitalist centers of the world economy, particularly in the USA. They also involve throwing off the constraints that have been imposed upon the economic policies and structures of the­ se countries by the IFIs (IMF, World Bank, and IDB), the WTO and the other agents and regulatory regimes that regulate the world capitalist system. In fact, there appears to be growing interest throughout Latin America in revivifying the Pan-American ideal of unification, currently perhaps best expressed in Hugo Chávez’ Bolivarian dream of turning South America into a regional economic hegemon (DeLong, 2005). The governments of Bolivia, Cuba, Ecuador, Nicaragua and Uruguay have indicated they want to join the government of Venezuela in creating a regional union. It has been proposed that this coalescing continental confederation should shift the region’s extra-continental trade towards Europe, Asia and South Africa and away from North America. The prospect of this happening appears to have alarmed Washington more than the increasing number of electoral triumphs of leftist politicians in the region (Delong). There has also been considerable talk in the region about creating a single currency for the South American countries that would be modeled on and perhaps tied to the Euro rather than the US Dollar. This discussion is symptomatic of what appears to be an emerging desire to create an integrated economic and political community that is strikingly different from the type of hemispheric economic integration scheme being pursued by the Washington and its allies in the region (DeLong). Moreover, there is an increasing tendency in the region to find alternatives to trading with the USA. In particular, several Latin American nations (Brazil, Cuba, Venezuela and Chile) have been strengthening their economic relations with Asia, particularly with China. But the widespread popular opposition to neoliberalism and so-called globalization, and the shift to the Left in the region’s politics, represent much more than a serious challenge to US hegemony, they also represent a serious threat to the existing pattern of capitalist development in the region. Central to Washington’s strategy for the hemisphere has been the imposition of a neoliberal model of capitalist development on the region which involves the increasing integration of the region’s economies into a hemispheric ‘free trade’ area or rather a trade bloc that is dominated by the USA. This project is itself an essential part of the strategy of the USA for the domination of the global economy by its transnational corporations. The restructuring of the economies of the region under the mantra of neoliberalism and the banner of globalization has been aimed at giving the USA-based transnational corporations and investors free reign within the region and a strong hemispheric base from which to dominate the world economy In opposition to the neoliberal, polyarchical and globalizing model of development that has been imposed by the government of the USA and its allies in the region, the growing movement for an alternative form of development that is both genuinely democratic, equitable and environmentally sustainable appears to be gaining ground in various parts of Latin America and the Caribbean. This alternative model of development requires the reorganization and realignment of the existing economies in the region. It also requires the replacement of the existing political regimes, which serve the interests of the transnational bloc of social forces that are behind the integration of the region into the new global circuits of accumulation and production that the major trans­ national corporations and the IFIs have been constructing since the 1970s. In addition to fundamental economic changes, most of the existing pseudo-democratic political regimes in the region need to be thoroughly democratized so that they are responsive to and capable of serving the needs and interests of the majority of the people rather than the ruling polyarchies and the transnational corporations operating in the region. An essential requirement for realigning the region’s economies so that they produce people-centered and environmentally sustainable development is the integration of these economies into a regional economic and political union that has the resources, structures and the power to operate independently of the government of the USA and the transnational corporations based in the USA as well as in the European Union and Japan. If this type of regional integration takes place, it will enable the Latin American and Caribbean states to break free of the hegemonic influence of the USA, and reverse the denationalization (‘globalization’) of the Latin American and Caribbean economies. Instead of the corporate-driven hemispheric integration of the region under the hegemony of the USA, a new system of regional economic cooperation and both equitable as well as environmentally sustainable development is desperately needed to improve the lives of the vast majority of the people living in Latin America and the Caribbean. This type of regional, equitable and sustainable development can only be success­ fully carried out by truly democratically elected political leaders with broad-based popular support who are sincerely committed to achieving this alternative rather than the elitist neoliberal model. It probably will also require democratic socialist political institutions and structures of production and distribution. Regionalism has been the dream of the democratic left for some time. The European Union has its origins in the French socialist dream of ending Franco-German enmity through unifying Europe, and African regionalism was the vision of African socialists such as Julius Nyerere of Tanzania who saw regional integration as the only means to progress beyond tribalism and colonialism and create a united and democratic Africa (Faux, 2001:4). Viewed from the perspective of those who want to create a people-cen­ tered, democratic, equitable and environmentally sustainable social order in the Ame­ ricas, the corporate-dominated process of capitalist pseudo-globalization taking place in the region and around the world urgently needs to be replaced by what Samir Amin has referred to as a new system of «pluricentric regulated globalization» (Amin, 2001a). This alternative form of globalization requires the development of regional economic and political unions in Africa, Asia, Latin America, the Caribbean, the Middle East and elsewhere, which collaboratively promote people-centered, democratic and envi­ ronmentally sustainable forms of development on a regional basis. According to Amin, these regional unions of states are needed to collaborate as partners in collecti­ vely regulating the global restructuring of the world economy for the benefit of the vast majority of humanity rather than the transnational corporations and the northern centers of the world capitalist system in the USA, Europe and Japan. This type of regional-based regulative order is needed to regulate and redirect inter­ national economic, social, and political relations so that these relations serve the inte­ rests and needs of the vast majority of the world’s population. The present power structures and regulatory regime of the world capitalist system support the transna­ tional corporate-driven restructuring and denationalization of the economies of both the societies at the core and in the periphery of this system. The Latin American and Caribbean countries need to ‘de-link’ step-by-step from this exploitative and inequitable system. They need to redirect and restructure their eco­ nomies so that they serve the needs of the majority of their people while also protec­ ting their natural resources and ecosystems. The alternative policies of economic, poli­ tical and social development proposed and in some cases adopted by the new leftist leaders, the progressive civil society organizations and their supporters, combined with the project of regional integration associated with the new Unión de Naciones Suramericanas (UNASUR), are significant indications of unprecedented and pro­ found transformation unfolding in the Americas. A growing number of civil society organizations and social movements throughout the Americas are pressuring the governments of the region to follow what the pro­ gressive civil society networks such as the Alianza Social Continental/ Hemispheric Social Alliance (ASC/HSA) describes as a regional model of integration that supports the environmentally sustainable and democratic development of all the societies in the region (see ASC-HSA, 2006). The ASC/HSA also contends that the UNASUR pro­ ject and the Bolivarian dream of unification is threatened by the so-called free trade agreements that Washington has negotiated with Chile, Colombia, Peru, the Central American countries and the Dominican Republic. As the ASC/HSA makes clear in its documents and public information campaigns, these agreements compromise the national sovereignty, obstruct the local production of medicines, threaten public health, facilitate the profit-driven privatization of water and vital services such as health and sanitation, and threaten the survival of indigenous cultures, biodiversity, food sovereignty, and local control over natural resources. The «Alternatives for the Americas» proposal developed by this inter-American network of progressive civil society organizations and social movements calls on all governments in the region to subordinate trade and investments to sustainability and environmental protection as well as social justice and local democratic control over economic and social development (ASC/HSA 2002:5). The growing number and political influence of these kinds of networks, organizations and movements provide unquestionable evidence of the emergence of the social for­ ces and political conditions that Panitch (1996:89) and others (Harris, 1995:301-302; Jo­ nas and McCaughan, 1994) predicted in the 1990s would arise in opposition to neoli­ beralism, corporate-dominated pseudo globalization and the extension and consolida­ tion of the hegemony of the USA. It now seems increasingly possible that these forces and the political mobilization that they have helped to create will transform the politi­ cal regimes in the region as well as the nature of inter-American relations, bring about the regional integration of the Latin American countries and free these countries from US hegemony and the form of ‘turbo-capitalism’ to which they have been subjected. At this point, we can only speak in general terms about the new model(s) of develop­ ment that will replace the neoliberal model of uneven and inequitable development that has pillaged most of the region.

#### Environment collapse causes extinction – tipping points are coming

**Foster et al., Oregon sociology professor, 2010**

(John, The Ecological Rift: Capitalism’s War on the Earth, pg 14-8, ldg)

It is common today to see this ecological rift simply in terms of climate change, which given the dangers it poses and the intractable problems for capitalism it presents has grabbed all the headlines. But recently scientists—in a project led by Johan Rockstrom at the Stockholm Resilience Centre, and including Crutzen and the leading U.S. climatologist, James Hansen—have developed an analysis of nine "planetary boundaries" that are crucial to maintaining an earth-system environment in which humanity can exist safely. Climate change is only one of these, and the others are ocean acidification, stratospheric ozone depletion, the nitrogen and the phosphorus cycles, global freshwater use, change in land use, biodiversity loss, atmospheric aerosol loading, and chemical pollution. For the last two, atmospheric aerosol loading and chemical pollution, there are not yet adequate physical measures, but for the other seven processes clear boundaries have been designated. Three of the boundaries—those for climate change, ocean acidification, and stratospheric ozone depletion—can be regarded as tipping points, which at a certain level lead to vast qualitative changes in the earth system that would threaten to destabilize the planet, causing it to depart from the "boundaries for a healthy planet." The boundaries for the other four processes—the nitrogen and phosphorus cycles, freshwater use, change in land use, and biodiversity loss—are better viewed as signifying the onset of irreversible environmental degradation. Three processes have already crossed their planetary boundaries: climate change, the nitrogen cycle, and biodiversity loss. Each of these can therefore be seen, in our terminology, as constituting an extreme "rift" in the planetary system. Stratospheric ozone depletion was an emerging rift in the 1990s, but is now stabilizing, even subsiding. Ocean acidification, the phosphorus cycle, global freshwater use, and land system change are all rapidly emerging global rifts, though not yet extreme. Our knowledge of these rifts can be refined, and more plan-etary rifts may perhaps be discovered in the future. Nevertheless, the analysis of planetary boundaries and rifts, as they present themselves today, helps us understand the full scale of the ecological crisis now confronting humanity. The simple point is that the planet is being assaulted on many fronts as the result of human-generated changes in the global environment.4 In the planetary boundaries model developed by Rockstrom and his associates, each ecological process has a preindustrial value (that is, the level reached before the advent of industrial capitalism), a pro-posed boundary, and a current status. In the case of climate change the preindustrial value was 280 parts per million (ppm) of carbon dioxide concentration in the atmosphere; its proposed boundary is 350 ppm (necessary if tipping points such as a catastrophic rise in sea level are to be avoided); and its current status is 390 ppm. Biodiversity loss is measured by the rate of extinction (number of species lost per million species per year). The preindustrial annual rate, referred to as the "natural" or "background" rate of species loss, was 0.1-1 per million; the proposed boundary is 10 per million; whereas the current rate is greater than 100 per million (100-1,000 times the preindustrial back-ground rate). With respect to the nitrogen cycle, the boundary is con-cerned with the amount of nitrogen removed from the atmosphere for human use in millions of tons per year. Before the rise of industrial capitalism (more specifically before the discovery of the Haber-Bosch process early in the twentieth century), the amount of nitrogen removed from the atmosphere was 0 tons. The proposed boundary, to avoid irreversible degradation of the earth system, is 35 million tons per year. The current status is 121 million tons per year. In each of these extreme rifts, the stability of the earth system as we know it is being endangered. We are at red alert status. If business as usual continues, the world is headed within the next few decades for major tipping points along with irreversible environmental degradation, threatening much of humanity. Biodiversity loss at current and projected rates could result in the loss of upward of a third of all living species this century. The pumping of more and more nitrogen into the biosphere is resulting in the creation of dead zones in lakes and ocean regions (a phenomenon also affected by phosphorus). Each one of these rifts by itself constitutes a global ecological crisis. These ruptures reveal that the limits of the earth system are not determined by the sheer physical scale of the economy but by the particular rifts in natural processes that are generated.5 The emerging rifts in the other ecological processes, which have not yet overshot their boundaries, are scarcely less threatening. For the phosphorus cycle (categorized as part of a single planetary boundary together with the nitrogen cycle), the preindustrial quantity flowing into the oceans per year was approximately 1 million tons; the proposed boundary is 11 million tons (based on the assumption that ocean anoxic events begin at ten times the background rate); and its current status is already 8.5 to 9.5 million tons. In regard to ocean acidification, the value refers to a global mean saturation state of arag-onite (a form of calcium carbonate) in surface seawater. A decline in the number indicates an increase in the acidity of the ocean. The preindustrial value was 3.44 (surface ocean aragonite saturation state); the proposed boundary—after which there would be a massive die-down of shell-forming organisms—is 2.75; and the current status is 2.90. In the case of freshwater use, the preindustrial annual consumption of freshwater in km3 (cubic kilometers) was 415; the estimated boundary is 4,000 km3 (marking a threshold beyond which the irreversible degradation and collapse of terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems is likely); and the current rate of consumption is 2,600 km3. For change in land use, the parameters are set by the percentage of global ice-free land surface converted to cropland. In preindustrial times, this percentage was very low. The proposed boundary is 15 percent (after which there is the danger of triggering catastrophic effects on ecosystems), and the current status is 11.7 percent. In each of these emerging rifts, we are faced with an orange alert status, in which we are rapidly moving toward extreme conditions, whereby we will pass the planetary boundaries, undermining the earth system that supports the conditions of life. No measure for chemical pollution has yet been determined, but proposals include measuring the effects of persistent organic pollu-tants (otherwise known as POPs), plastics, endocrine disrupters, heavy metals, and nuclear waste on ecosystems and the earth system in general. Likewise, no measure has yet been determined for atmospheric aerosol loading (the overall particulate concentration in the atmosphere on a regional basis), which can disrupt monsoon systems, lead to health problems, and interact with climate change and freshwater boundaries. Stratospheric ozone depletion is the one previously emerging rift that was brought under control (as far as anthropogenic drivers were concerned) in the 1990s, reducing what was a rapidly growing threat to life on the planet due to an increase in ultraviolet radiation from the sun. The preindustrial value of ozone concentration was 290 (Dobson Units—the measurement of atmospheric ozone columnar density, where 1 Dobson Unit is defined as 0.01 millimeters thick under standard pressure and temperature); the proposed planetary boundary is a concentration of 276 (after which life on the planet would experience devastating losses); and the current status is 283. Between 60°S and 60°N latitude, the decline in stratospheric ozone concentrations has been halted. Nevertheless, it will take decades for the Antarctic ozone hole to disappear, and Arctic ozone loss will likely persist for decades. Life on the planet had a close call.6 The mapping out of planetary boundaries in this way gives us a better sense of the real threat to the earth system. Although in recent years the environmental threat has come to be seen by many as simply a question of climate change, protecting the planet requires that we attend to all of these planetary boundaries, and others not yet determined. The essential problem is the unavoidable fact that an expanding economic system is placing additional burdens on a fixed earth system to the point of planetary overload. It has been estimated that in the early 1960s humanity used half of the planet's biocapacity in a year. Today this has risen to an overshoot of 30 percent beyond the earth's regenerative capacity. Business-as-usual projections point to a state in which the ecological footprint of humanity will be equivalent to the regenerative capacity of two planets by the mid-2030s.7 Rockstrom and his associates concluded their article in Nature by stating: "The evidence so far suggests that, as along as the [planetary boundary] thresholds are not crossed, humanity has the freedom to pursue long-term social and economic development." Although this is undoubtedly true, what is obviously not addressed in this conclu-sion—but is clearly the point of their whole analysis—is that these thresholds have in some cases already been crossed and in other cases will soon be crossed with the continuation of business as usual. Moreover, this can be attributed in each and every case to a primary cause: the current pattern of global socioeconomic development, that is, the capitalist mode of production and its expansionary tendencies. The whole problem can be called "the global ecological rift," referring to the overall break in the human relation to nature arising from an alienated system of capital accumulation without end.'

#### Vote Neg to reject the Aff’s neoliberal economic engagement in favor of a commons-based approach. That solves and creates space to challenge neoliberalism

**De Angelis, East London political economy professor, 2003**

(Massimo, “Reflections on alternatives, commons and communities”, Winter, <http://www.commoner.org.uk/deangelis06.pdf>, DOA: 7-2-12, ldg)

This movement has posed the question of a plurality of “alternatives” to the social processes and arrangements that produce the horrors of modern global capital. In order to take the many calls for and practices of alternatives seriously, we have to make them relevant to the real people at the fringe or outside the movement. In other words, we want to move from movement to society not so much by persuading people to “join” our movement, but through a language and a political practice that by tracing the connections between diverse practices attempts to dissolve the distinctions between inside and outside the movement, i.e., actually moves ‘from movement to society’. To make the possibility of a new world that contains many worlds an actuality, we have to be able to shape our own discourse in such a way as to echo the needs and aspirations coming from below. We have to give coherence to their plurality, without imposing a model or reiterating dead ideologies. We need a discourse that helps to articulate the many alternatives that spring out of the points of crises of neoliberal capital, which seriously threaten to dispossess people of their livelihood and impose on them new or more intensified commodified patterns of life. We need a discourse that builds on the plurality of the many concrete struggles and their methods and help us to articulate a vision – not a plan – of the whole. Then we can better evaluate what are the global implications of our local struggles, as well as the local implications of global struggles for the building of a world that contains many worlds. But most of all, we need a discourse that recognizes the power we have to shape alternatives, at every level in society, that sets out from the simple fact that, contrarily to common belief, alternatives do exist, are everywhere and plural. To clarify, I think that every social node, that is every individual or network of individuals is a bearer of alternatives. This is evident not only when struggles erupt in any of the waged or unwaged local and trans-local nodes of social production. We just need to look around in the relative normality of daily routines to see that every social node “knows” of different ways to do things within its life-world and sphere of action longs for a different space in which things can be done in different ways. Each social node expresses needs and aspirations that are the basis of alternatives. For example: the alternative to working 10 hours a day is working 6; the alternative to poverty is access to the means of existence; the alternative to indignity is dignity; the alternative to building that dam and uprooting communities is not building that dam and leaving communities where they are; the alternative to tomatoes going rotten while transported on the back of an old woman for 20 miles is not GM tomatoes that do not rot, but access to land near home, or a home, or a road and a truck. Since every social node is aware of a spectrum of alternatives, the problem is simply how to make these alternatives actual? What resources are needed? How to coordinate alternatives in such a way that they are not pitted against each other as is the case of the competitive markets’ understanding of alternatives? How to solve the many existing problems without relying on the alienating coordinating mechanism of the market and creating instead social relations of mutual enrichment, dignity, and respect? These are I believe the bottom line questions on which a new political discourse must be based. Once we acknowledge the existence of the galaxy of alternatives as they emerge from concrete needs and aspirations, we can ground today’s new political discourse in the thinking and practice of the actualization and the coordination of alternatives, so as each social node and each individual within it has the power to decide and take control over their lives. It is this actualization and this coordination that rescues existing alternatives from the cloud of their invisibility, because alternatives, as with any human product, are social products, and they need to be recognized and validated socially. Our political projects must push their way through beyond the existing forms of coordination, beyond the visible fist of the state, beyond the invisible hand of competitive markets, and beyond the hard realities of their interconnections that express themselves in today forms of neoliberal governance, promoting cooperation through competition and community through disempowerment. As I will argue, this new political discourse is based on the project of defending and extending the space of commons, at the same time building and strengthening communities through the social fields.

### Case

### Biotech

#### Biotech firms hurting now- in need of expansion

Weisman 10

Robert Weisman, November 6, 2010, “Biotech firms squeezed by economy and hungry giants,” http://www.boston.com/business/healthcare/articles/2010/11/06/biotech\_firms\_squeezed\_by\_economy\_and\_hungry\_giants/

The week’s drumbeat of bad news in an industry state government officials have targeted as a future growth engine seemed to drown out — at least temporarily — recent encouraging announcements by a pair of European pharmaceutical firms, Novartis AG of Switzerland and Sanofi Aventis. Both companies are planning to expand their existing research centers in Cambridge and create up to 600 new jobs. State business and government leaders said it’s too soon to herald a changing of the guard. But with smaller biotechs finding it harder to raise money in a weak economy, it’s been easier for the big pharmaceutical companies to invest in drug development here, they conceded. “There’s going to be some readjustment, and there’s going to be some dislocation,’’ Bialecki said. “But if you’re laid off from a job in biotech, and that’s unfortunate, your chances of getting another job are greater in Massachusetts right now than anywhere in the country.’

Rifkin 98 – American economist, founder and president of the Foundation on Economic Trends

Jeremy Rifkin, the founder and president of the Foundation on Economic Trends, is an American economist, writer, and public speaker. The Biotech Century. p.92-93. 1998

With recombinant DNA technology, it is now possible to develop “a nearly infinity variety of what might be termed ‘designer agents.’” The DOD report concludes that the new developments in genetic engineering technology make possible “the rapid exploitation of nature’s resources for warfare purposes in ways not even imagined ten to fifteen years ago.” In August 1986, Douglas J. Feith, then Deputy Secretary of Defense, noted the near impossibility of defending against this newfound ability to genetically engineer biowarfare agents: It is now possible to synthesize BW agents tailored to military specifications. The technology that makes possible so-called “designer drugs” also makes possible designer BW…. It is [becoming] a simple matter to produce new agents but a problem to develop antidotes. New agents can be produced in hours; antidotes may take years. To gauge the magnitude of the antidote problem, consider the many years and millions of dollars that have been invested, as yet without success, in developing a means of countering a single biological agent outside the BW field—the AIDS virus. Such an investment far surpasses the resources available for BW defense work.

#### Impact is extinction – *no burnout*

Sandberg, et al 8 (Anders Sandberg, Research Fellow, Future of Humanity Institute, Oxford University; Jason G. Matheny, Ph.D. candidate, Health Policy and Management, Bloomberg School of Public Health, Johns Hopkins University, special consultant, Center for Biosecurity, University of Pittsburgh Medical Center; and Milan M. Ćirković, Senior Research Associate, Astronomical Observatory of Belgrade, Assistant Professor of Physics, University of Novi Sad, Serbia and Montenegro; “How can we reduce the risk of human extinction?” Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, 9-8-2008, <http://www.thebulletin.org/web-edition/features/how-can-we-reduce-the-risk-of-human-extinction>)

The risks from anthropogenic hazards appear at present larger than those from natural ones. Although great progress has been made in reducing the number of nuclear weapons in the world, humanity is still threatened by the possibility of a global thermonuclear war and a resulting nuclear winter. We may face even greater risks from emerging technologies. Advances in synthetic biology might make it possible to engineer pathogens capable of extinction-level pandemics. The knowledge, equipment, and materials needed to engineer pathogens are more accessible than those needed to build nuclear weapons. And unlike other weapons, pathogens are self-replicating, allowing a small arsenal to become exponentially destructive. Pathogens have been implicated in the extinctions of many wild species. Although most pandemics "fade out" by reducing the density of susceptible populations, pathogens with wide host ranges in multiple species can reach even isolated individuals. The intentional or unintentional release of engineered pathogens with high transmissibility, latency, and lethality might be capable of causing human extinction. While such an event seems unlikely today, the likelihood may increase as biotechnologies continue to improve at a rate rivaling Moore's Law.

#### Biotech doesn’t solve – ruins soil and multiple cropping is comparatively better

**Altieri ’1** – Ph.D., teaches agroecology in the Department of Environmental Science, Policy and Management at University of California at Berkeley, and is a technical advisor to the Latin American Consortium on Agroecology and Development in Santiago (Miguel, “The Ecological Impacts of Agricultural Biotechnology,” Actionbiosence, February 2001, <http://www.actionbioscience.org/biotechnology/altieri.html#fullbio>)//SS

Not enough research has been done to evaluate the environmental and health risks of transgenic crops, an unfortunate trend. Most scientists feel that such knowledge is crucial to have before biotechnological innovations are implemented. There is a clear need to further assess the severity, magnitude and scope of risks associated with the massive field deployment of transgenic crops. Much of the evaluation of risks must move beyond comparing GMC fields and conventionally managed systems to include alternative cropping systems featuring crop diversity and low-external input approaches. This will allow real risk/benefit analysis of transgenic crops in relation to known and effective alternatives.¶ Moreover, the large-scale landscape homogenization with transgenic crops will exacerbate the ecological problems already associated with monoculture agriculture. Unquestioned expansion of this technology into developing countries may not be wise or desirable. There is strength in the agricultural diversity of many of these countries, and it should not be inhibited or reduced by extensive monoculture, especially when consequences of doing so results in serious social and environmental problems.2¶ The repeated use of transgenic crops in an area may result in cumulative effects such as those resulting from the buildup of toxins in soils. For this reason, risk assessment studies not only have to be of an ecological nature in order to capture effects on ecosystem processes, but also of sufficient duration so that probable accumulative effects can be detected. The application of multiple diagnostic methods will provide the most sensitive and comprehensive assessment of the potential ecological impact of transgenic crops.¶ Although biotechnology is an important tool, at this point alternative solutions exist to address the problems that current GMCs, developed mostly by profit motives, are designed to solve. The dramatic positive effects of rotations, multiple cropping, and biological control on crop health, environmental quality and agricultural productivity have been confirmed repeatedly by scientific research. Biotechnology should be considered as one more tool that can be used, provided the ecological risks are investigated and deemed acceptable, in conjunction with a host of other approaches to move agriculture towards sustainability.17

### Struct viol

**All forms of structural violence are decreasing**

**Goklany 9—**Worked with federal and state governments, think tanks, and the private sector for over 35 years. Worked with IPCC before its inception as an author, delegate and reviewer. Negotiated UN Framework Convention on Climate Change. Managed the emissions trading program for the EPA. Julian Simon Fellow at the Property and Environment Research Center, visiting fellow at AEI, winner of the Julian Simon Prize and Award. PhD, MS, electrical engineering, MSU. B.Tech in electrical engineering, Indian Institute of Tech. (Indur, “Have increases in population, affluence and technology worsened human and environmental well-being?” 2009, http://www.ejsd.org/docs/HAVE\_INCREASES\_IN\_POPULATION\_AFFLUENCE\_AND\_TECHNOLOGY\_WORSENED\_HUMAN\_AND\_ENVIRONMENTAL\_WELL-BEING.pdf, AMiles)

Although global population is no longer growing exponentially, it has quadrupled since 1900. Concurrently, affluence (or GDP per capita) has sextupled, global economic product (a measure of aggregate consumption) has increased 23-fold and carbon dioxide has increased over 15-fold (Maddison 2003; GGDC 2008; World Bank 2008a; Marland et al. 2007).4 But contrary to Neo- Malthusian fears, average human well-being, measured by any objective indicator, has never been higher. Food supplies, Malthus’ original concern, are up worldwide. Global food supplies per capita increased from 2,254 Cals/day in 1961 to 2,810 in 2003 (FAOSTAT 2008). This helped reduce hunger and malnutrition worldwide. The proportion of the population in the developing world, suffering from chronic hunger declined from 37 percent to 17 percent between 1969–71 and 2001–2003 despite an 87 percent population increase (Goklany 2007a; FAO 2006). The reduction in hunger and malnutrition, along with improvements in basic hygiene, improved access to safer water and sanitation, broad adoption of vaccinations, antibiotics, pasteurization and other public health measures, helped reduce mortality and increase life expectancies. These improvements first became evident in today’s developed countries in the mid- to late-1800s and started to spread in earnest to developing countries from the 1950s. The infant mortality rate in developing countries was 180 per 1,000 live births in the early 1950s; today it is 57. Consequently, global life expectancy, perhaps the single most important measure of human well-being, increased from 31 years in 1900 to 47 years in the early 1950s to 67 years today (Goklany 2007a). Globally, average annual per capita incomes tripled since 1950. The proportion of the world’s population outside of high-income OECD countries living in absolute poverty (average consumption of less than $1 per day in 1985 International dollars adjusted for purchasing power parity), fell from 84 percent in 1820 to 40 percent in 1981 to 20 percent in 2007 (Goklany 2007a; WRI 2008; World Bank 2007). Equally important, the world is more literate and better educated. Child labor in low income countries declined from 30 to 18 percent between 1960 and 2003. In most countries, people are freer politically, economically and socially to pursue their goals as they see fit. More people choose their own rulers, and have freedom of expression. They are more likely to live under rule of law, and less likely to be arbitrarily deprived of life, limb and property. Social and professional mobility has never been greater. It is easier to transcend the bonds of caste, place, gender, and other accidents of birth in the lottery of life. People work fewer hours, and have more money and better health to enjoy their leisure time (Goklany 2007a). Figure 3 summarizes the U.S. experience over the 20th century with respect to growth of population, affluence, material, fossil fuel energy and chemical consumption, and life expectancy. It indicates that population has multiplied 3.7-fold; income, 6.9-fold; carbon dioxide emissions, 8.5-fold; material use, 26.5-fold; and organic chemical use, 101-fold. Yet its life expectancy increased from 47 years to 77 years and infant mortality (not shown) declined from over 100 per 1,000 live births to 7 per 1,000. It is also important to note that not only are people living longer, they are healthier. The disability rate for seniors declined 28 percent between 1982 and 2004/2005 and, despite better diagnostic tools, major diseases (e.g., cancer, and heart and respiratory diseases) occur 8–11 years later now than a century ago (Fogel 2003; Manton et al. 2006). If similar figures could be constructed for other countries, most would indicate qualitatively similar trends, especially after 1950, except Sub-Saharan Africa and the erstwhile members of the Soviet Union. In the latter two cases, life expectancy, which had increased following World War II, declined after the late 1980s to the early 2000s, possibly due poor economic performance compounded, especially in Sub-Saharan Africa, by AIDS, resurgence of malaria, and tuberculosis due mainly to poor governance (breakdown of public health services) and other manmade causes (Goklany 2007a, pp.66–69, pp.178–181, and references therein). However, there are signs of a turnaround, perhaps related to increased economic growth since the early 2000s, although this could, of course, be a temporary blip (Goklany 2007a; World Bank 2008a). Notably, in most areas of the world, the healthadjusted life expectancy (HALE), that is, life expectancy adjusted downward for the severity and length of time spent by the average individual in a less-than-healthy condition, is greater now than the unadjusted life expectancy was 30 years ago. HALE for the China and India in 2002, for instance, were 64.1 and 53.5 years, which exceeded their unadjusted life expectancy of 63.2 and 50.7 years in 1970–1975 (WRI 2008). Figure 4, based on cross country data, indicates that contrary to Neo-Malthusian fears, both life expectancy and infant mortality improve with the level of affluence (economic development) and time, a surrogate for technological change (Goklany 2007a). Other indicators of human well-being that improve over time and as affluence rises are: access to safe water and sanitation (see below), literacy, level of education, food supplies per capita, and the prevalence of malnutrition (Goklany 2007a, 2007b).

#### Moral focus wrong – reproduces evil

Isaac 2 — Jeffrey C. Isaac, James H. Rudy Professor of Political Science and Director of the Center for the Study of Democracy and Public Life at Indiana University-Bloomington, 2002 (“Ends, Means, and Politics,” *Dissent*, Volume 49, Issue 2, Spring, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via EBSCOhost, p. 35-36)

As writers such as Niccolo Machiavelli, Max Weber, Reinhold Niebuhr, and Hannah Arendt have taught, an unyielding concern with moral goodness undercuts political responsibility. The concern may be morally laudable, reflecting a kind of personal integrity, but it suffers from three fatal flaws: (1) It fails to see that the purity of one’s intention does not ensure the achievement of what one intends. Abjuring violence or refusing to make common cause with morally compromised parties may seem like the right thing; but if such tactics entail impotence, then it is hard to view them as serving any moral good beyond the clean conscience of their supporters; (2) it fails to see that in a world of real violence and injustice, moral purity is not simply a form of powerlessness; it is often a form of complicity in injustice. [end page 35] This is why, from the standpoint of politics—as opposed to religion—pacifism is always a potentially immoral stand. In categorically repudiating violence, it refuses in principle to oppose certain violent injustices with any effect; and (3) it fails to see that politics is as much about unintended consequences as it is about intentions; it is the effects of action, rather than the motives of action, that is most significant. Just as the alignment with “good” may engender impotence, it is often the pursuit of “good” that generates evil. This is the lesson of communism in the twentieth century: it is not enough that one’s goals be sincere or idealistic; it is equally important, always, to ask about the effects of pursuing these goals and to judge these effects in pragmatic and historically contextualized ways. Moral absolutism inhibits this judgment. It alienates those who are not true believers. It promotes arrogance. And it undermines political effectiveness.

#### Extinction outweighs

Bostrom 12 – Professor of Philosophy at Oxford, directs Oxford's Future of Humanity Institute, Interview with Ross Andersen, correspondent at The Atlantic, 3/6, “We're Underestimating the Risk of Human Extinction”, http://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2012/03/were-underestimating-the-risk-of-human-extinction/253821/)

Bostrom, who directs Oxford's Future of Humanity Institute, has argued over the course of several papers that human extinction risks are poorly understood and, worse still, severely underestimated by society. Some of these existential risks are fairly well known, especially the natural ones. But others are obscure or even exotic. Most worrying to Bostrom is the subset of existential risks that arise from human technology, a subset that he expects to grow in number and potency over the next century.¶ Despite his concerns about the risks posed to humans by technological progress, Bostrom is no luddite. In fact, he is a longtime advocate of transhumanism---the effort to improve the human condition, and even human nature itself, through technological means. In the long run he sees technology as a bridge, a bridge we humans must cross with great care, in order to reach new and better modes of being. In his work, Bostrom uses the tools of philosophy and mathematics, in particular probability theory, to try and determine how we as a species might achieve this safe passage. What follows is my conversation with Bostrom about some of the most interesting and worrying existential risks that humanity might encounter in the decades and centuries to come, and about what we can do to make sure we outlast them.¶ Some have argued that we ought to be directing our resources toward humanity's existing problems, rather than future existential risks, because many of the latter are highly improbable. You have responded by suggesting that existential risk mitigation may in fact be a dominant moral priority over the alleviation of present suffering. Can you explain why? ¶ Bostrom: Well suppose you have a moral view that counts future people as being worth as much as present people. You might say that fundamentally it doesn't matter whether someone exists at the current time or at some future time, just as many people think that from a fundamental moral point of view, it doesn't matter where somebody is spatially---somebody isn't automatically worth less because you move them to the moon or to Africa or something. A human life is a human life. If you have that moral point of view that future generations matter in proportion to their population numbers, then you get this very stark implication that existential risk mitigation has a much higher utility than pretty much anything else that you could do. There are so many people that could come into existence in the future if humanity survives this critical period of time---we might live for billions of years, our descendants might colonize billions of solar systems, and there could be billions and billions times more people than exist currently. Therefore, even a very small reduction in the probability of realizing this enormous good will tend to outweigh even immense benefits like eliminating poverty or curing malaria, which would be tremendous under ordinary standards.

#### Ethics not first – scientific studies prove consequentialism is good

Greene 10 (Joshua Greene, Associate Professor of Social Science at Harvard, “The Secret Joke of Kant’s Soul published in Moral Psychology: Historical and Contemporary Readings,” Chinese University of Hong Kong, [www.fed.cuhk.edu.hk/~lchang/material/Evolutionary/Developmental/Greene-KantSoul.pdf](http://www.fed.cuhk.edu.hk/~lchang/material/Evolutionary/Developmental/Greene-KantSoul.pdf) | Danco)

What turn-of-the-millennium science is telling us is that human moral judgment is not a pristine rational enterprise, that our moral judgments are driven by a hodgepodge of emotional dispositions, which themselves were shaped by a hodgepodge of evolutionary forces, both biological and cultural. Because of this, it is exceedingly unlikely that there is any rationally coherent normative moral theory that can accommodate our moral intuitions. Moreover, anyone who claims to have such a theory, or even part of one, almost certainly doesn't. Instead, what that person probably has is a moral rationalization. It seems then, that we have somehow crossed the infamous "is"-"ought" divide. How did this happen? Didn't Hume (Hume, 1978) and Moore (Moore, 1966) warn us against trying to derive an "ought" from and "is?" How did we go from descriptive scientific theories concerning moral psychology to skepticism about a whole class of normative moral theories? The answer is that we did not, as Hume and Moore anticipated, attempt to derive an "ought" from and "is." That is, our method has been inductive rather than deductive. We have inferred on the basis of the available evidence that the phenomenon of rationalist deontological philosophy is best explained as a rationalization of evolved emotional intuition (Harman, 1977). Missing the Deontological Point I suspect that rationalist deontologists will remain unmoved by the arguments presented here. Instead, I suspect, they will insist that I have simply misunderstood what Kant and like-minded deontologists are all about. Deontology, they will say, isn't about this intuition or that intuition. It's not defined by its normative differences with consequentialism. Rather, deontology is about taking humanity seriously. Above all else, it's about respect for persons. It's about treating others as fellow rational creatures rather than as mere objects, about acting for reasons rational beings can share. And so on (Korsgaard, 1996a; Korsgaard, 1996b). This is, no doubt, how many deontologists see deontology. But this insider's view, as I've suggested, may be misleading. The problem, more specifically, is that it defines deontology in terms of values that are not distinctively deontological, though they may appear to be from the inside. Consider the following analogy with religion. When one asks a religious person to explain the essence of his religion, one often gets an answer like this: "It's about love, really. It's about looking out for other people, looking beyond oneself. It's about community, being part of something larger than oneself." This sort of answer accurately captures the phenomenology of many people's religion, but it's nevertheless inadequate for distinguishing religion from other things. This is because many, if not most, non-religious people aspire to love deeply, look out for other people, avoid self-absorption, have a sense of a community, and be connected to things larger than themselves. In other words, secular humanists and atheists can assent to most of what many religious people think religion is all about. From a secular humanist's point of view, in contrast, what's distinctive about religion is its commitment to the existence of supernatural entities as well as formal religious institutions and doctrines. And they're right. These things really do distinguish religious from non-religious practices, though they may appear to be secondary to many people operating from within a religious point of view. In the same way, I believe that most of the standard deontological/Kantian self-characterizatons fail to distinguish deontology from other approaches to ethics. (See also Kagan (Kagan, 1997, pp. 70-78.) on the difficulty of defining deontology.) It seems to me that consequentialists, as much as anyone else, have respect for persons, are against treating people as mere objects, wish to act for reasons that rational creatures can share, etc. A consequentialist respects other persons, and refrains from treating them as mere objects, by counting every person's well-being in the decision-making process. Likewise, a consequentialist attempts to act according to reasons that rational creatures can share by acting according to principles that give equal weight to everyone's interests, i.e. that are impartial. This is not to say that consequentialists and deontologists don't differ. They do. It's just that the real differences may not be what deontologists often take them to be. What, then, distinguishes deontology from other kinds of moral thought? A good strategy for answering this question is to start with concrete disagreements between deontologists and others (such as consequentialists) and then work backward in search of deeper principles. This is what I've attempted to do with the trolley and footbridge cases, and other instances in which deontologists and consequentialists disagree. If you ask a deontologically-minded person why it's wrong to push someone in front of speeding trolley in order to save five others, you will get characteristically deontological answers. Some will be tautological: "Because it's murder!" Others will be more sophisticated: "The ends don't justify the means." "You have to respect people's rights." But, as we know, these answers don't really explain anything, because if you give the same people (on different occasions) the trolley case or the loop case (See above), they'll make the opposite judgment, even though their initial explanation concerning the footbridge case applies equally well to one or both of these cases. Talk about rights, respect for persons, and reasons we can share are natural attempts to explain, in "cognitive" terms, what we feel when we find ourselves having emotionally driven intuitions that are odds with the cold calculus of consequentialism. Although these explanations are inevitably incomplete, there seems to be "something deeply right" about them because they give voice to powerful moral emotions. But, as with many religious people's accounts of what's essential to religion, they don't really explain what's distinctive about the philosophy in question.

#### Utilitarianism inevitable even in deontological frameworks

Green, 02 – Assistant Professor Department of Psychology Harvard University (Joshua, November 2002 "The Terrible, Horrible, No Good, Very Bad Truth About Morality And What To Do About It", 314)

Some people who talk of balancing rights may think there is an algorithm for deciding which rights take priority over which. If that’s what we mean by 302 “balancing rights,” then we are wise to shun this sort of talk. Attempting to solve moral problems using a complex deontological algorithm is dogmatism at its most esoteric, but dogmatism all the same. However, it’s likely that when some people talk about “balancing competing rights and obligations” they are already thinking like consequentialists in spite of their use of deontological language. Once again, what deontological language does best is express the thoughts of people struck by strong, emotional moral intuitions: “It doesn’t matter that you can save five people by pushing him to his death. To do this would be a violation of his rights!”19 That is why angry protesters say things like, “Animals Have Rights, Too!” rather than, “Animal Testing: The Harms Outweigh the Benefits!” Once again, rights talk captures the apparent clarity of the issue and absoluteness of the answer. But sometimes rights talk persists long after the sense of clarity and absoluteness has faded. One thinks, for example, of the thousands of children whose lives are saved by drugs that were tested on animals and the “rights” of those children. One finds oneself balancing the “rights” on both sides by asking how many rabbit lives one is willing to sacrifice in order to save one human life, and so on, and at the end of the day one’s underlying thought is as thoroughly consequentialist as can be, despite the deontological gloss. And what’s wrong with that? Nothing, except for the fact that the deontological gloss adds nothing and furthers the myth that there really are “rights,” etc. Best to drop it. When deontological talk gets sophisticated, the thought it represents is either dogmatic in an esoteric sort of way or covertly consequentialist.

# 2NC

### 2nc impact o/v

Press TV 11-13 (“Global nuclear conflict between US, Russia, China likely if Iran talks fail,” <http://www.presstv.ir/detail/2013/11/13/334544/global-nuclear-war-likely-if-iran-talks-fail/>)

A global conflict between the US, Russia, and China is likely in the coming months should the world powers fail to reach a nuclear deal with Iran, an American analyst says.¶ “If the talks fail, if the agreements being pursued are not successfully carried forward and implemented, then there would be enormous international pressure to drive towards a conflict with Iran before [US President Barack] Obama leaves office and that’s a very great danger that no one can underestimate the importance of,” senior editor at the Executive Intelligence Review Jeff Steinberg told Press TV on Wednesday. ¶ “The United States could find itself on one side and Russia and China on the other and those are the kinds of conditions that can lead to miscalculation and general roar,” Steinberg said. ¶ “So the danger in this situation is that if these talks don’t go forward, we could be facing a global conflict in the coming months and years and that’s got to be avoided at all costs when you’ve got countries like the United States, Russia, and China with” their arsenals of “nuclear weapons,” he warned. ¶ The warning came one day after the White House told Congress not to impose new sanctions against Tehran because failure in talks with Iran could lead to war. ¶ White House press secretary Jay Carney called on Congress to allow more time for diplomacy as US lawmakers are considering tougher sanctions. ¶ "This is a decision to support diplomacy and a possible peaceful resolution to this issue," Carney said. "The American people do not want a march to war." ¶ Meanwhile, US Secretary of State John Kerry is set to meet with the Senate Banking Committee on Wednesday to hold off on more sanctions on the Iranian economy. ¶ State Department spokeswoman Jen Psaki said Kerry "will be clear that putting new sanctions in place would be a mistake." ¶ "While we are still determining if there is a diplomatic path forward, what we are asking for right now is a pause, a temporary pause in sanctions. We are not taking away sanctions. We are not rolling them back," Psaki added.

####

#### AND, we control the only risk of *escalation* – *deterrence solves all other impacts*

Gable 11 (William Gable, US Army War College, “An Era of Persistent Conflict?” http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA560155)

Exceptional individuals are key contributors to the turmoil the U.S. experienced in the last decade through the present, and their objectives could portend continued conflict. While the existence of these exceptional individuals alone does not necessarily assure conflict, the ideologies they espouse are underpinned by religion adding a nondeterrable dimension to their struggle. The actual or perceived preponderance of U.S. power will not diminish the likelihood of future attacks. In fact, such attacks will only serve to enhance these organizations‘ status and power, fueling every aspect of their operations from recruiting to financing operations. Consequently, threats from non-state actors will continue. Depending on the potential destruction inflicted by any terrorist attack, the attacker‘s sanctuary, and the threat posed to the aforementioned governments, the U.S. may be compelled to fight wars similar to the war in Afghanistan. Conflict with another state is possible, though less likely. Although the relative decline of U.S. economic power in relation to China appears to constitute a potential ―window‖ or threat to peace, **both** governments are aware of the risks and are working to mitigate them. Moreover, the U.S., China, and Russia represent deterrable nuclear powers**,** states dissuaded from conflict with each other due to the potential costs of a nuclear exchange. Conflict between these states appears unlikely. However, existing theory suggests problems with nondeterrable states that are not responsive to punishment or are willing to take risks that prompt conflict**.** North Korea and Iran seem to fit this description**.** Their efforts to develop, acquire, and possibly proliferate nuclear weapons, combined with the potential threat posed by a non-state actor acquiring such weapons, form conditions that indicate a strong possibility of war. In particular, Iran‘s nuclear program presents a potentially ominous window. Should diplomacy, sanctions, and cyber attacks fail to sidetrack Iran‘s nuclear program, the U.S. will be presented with an ever-narrowing window to act with force to deny Iran this capability. This could result in conflict with Iran. While false optimism is a potent and pervasive cause of war, recent experience with war and the nature of these and likely future conflicts will diminish leaders support for initiating war. Similarly, the current economic conditions and concern over the national debt will dampen leaders‘ enthusiasm for wars. But existing theories that discuss these factors fail to consider the impact of non-state actors. Thus, conflict is still possible despite them. Overall, the combination of factors seems to indicate continuing conflict with nonstate actors and potential conflict with states over development and proliferation of nuclear weapons. These factors identify specific circumstances where U.S. involvement in war is likely, and represent the primary drivers for concluding that the current era will be one of persistent conflict. The U.S. government should use all of the elements of power to focus on these factors to prevent what history and theory suggest the inevitability of war.

### --a2 n/u – top level

#### And, this strategy is *working now* – but continued application of PC is key

Rosenberg 2-7 (M.J. Rosenberg, Special Correspondent for The Washington Spectator, former Foreign Policy fellow at Media Matters For America, former Senate and House aide, former editor of AIPAC's newsletter Near East Report and director of policy at Israel Policy Forum, “When Obama Made the Lobby Stand Down,” Washington Spectator, 2-7-2014, www.washingtonspectator.org/index.php/AIPAC.html#.U0diZnCwXcg)

It didn’t take much. Just the power of the presidency, the State of the Union, and the whole country watching. Plus the president’s will.¶ And AIPAC’s entire campaign to destroy America’s chance to reach an agreement with Iran crumbled. Within hours, three senators announced they were no longer co-sponsoring AIPAC’s bill to kill the Iran negotiations (Kirsten Gillibrand, Chris Coons and Joe Manchin), and AIPAC’s hopes to override Obama’s veto ended with a whimper, AIPAC’s whimper. On Feb. 2, former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton announced, in a letter to Sen. Carl Levin (D-MI) that she opposed the AIPAC bill and supported President Obama’s commitment to negotiations. And that was that.¶ No, this does not mean that AIPAC and Israeli Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu are giving up. At every critical junction during the process of reaching a deal with Iran they will be there working hard to subvert Obama’s effort. Their March conference in Washington (with 400 members of Congress in attendance) is already slated to be one massive “Bomb Iran” rally, with congresspeople and candidates pledging support for war in exchange for campaign cash. (I’ve been in the room and watched how they do it).¶ And they still might succeed, particularly if the Iranians give them any ammunition.¶ But it is less likely now, not after Obama issued his veto threat and asserted that he would continue to pursue diplomacy in the name of “our national interest” (not Israel’s, although an agreement is in Israel’s interest too, but our national interest). At that moment, with those words, Obama won and the lobby lost.¶ Think about it. For months AIPAC (and all its satellite organizations and neocon mouthpieces) had prepared for this moment. For a dozen years, the centerpiece of AIPAC’s annual confab has been fear-mongering about Iran and making members of Congress enact more and more sanctions bills. And then, since Obama announced his breakthrough, they lined up clear majorities in both houses to defeat him. Their favored cutouts Schumer, Kirk, Lindsey Graham, Menendez, Booker, and Hoyer have hollered that “this will not stand” and, yet, with two sentences, Obama crushed them.¶ How badly? Sen. Menendez scurried for the elevators the second the speech ended, dodging reporters, and muttering that “the president has the right” to defend the national interest. So he does. Schumer had nothing to say. He really has no interest in the issue, he’s just dialing for dollars, while Kirk no doubt had to call headquarters.¶ No matter. The President won. And he showed how he can continue to win.

### --a2 no deal – top level ()

#### Deal is likely – all sides feel pressure to agree next month

The Hindu 4-8 (“Iran, six powers push for nuclear deal by July,” 4-8-2014, www.thehindu.com/news/international/world/iran-six-powers-push-for-nuclear-deal-by-july/article5887794.ece)

Senior envoys from Iran and six world powers met for a new round of negotiations on Tuesday, in an effort to reach a broad agreement on scaling back Iran’s nuclear programme and lifting sanctions by July.¶ Iran’s President Hassan Rowhani is under pressure to see the crippling sanctions against his country lifted, while US Republicans gearing up for Congressional mid-term elections in November are pushing President Barack Obama to take a tough stance on the issue.¶ Adding more urgency is the expected end-of-year departure of EU foreign policy chief Catherine Ashton, the chief negotiator for Britain, China, France, Russia, the United States and Germany.¶ “We’re trying as hard as we can to drive the process forward,” Ashton’s spokesman Michael Mann said in Vienna. “We’re engaged in very detailed and substantial negotiations at this point.” Both sides in the talks have said they want to start drafting the agreement next month.¶ However, Iran and the six powers have yet to agree on the limits that Tehran will have to accept on its enrichment programme, and on the future of the plutonium—producing Arak reactor, Iranian and Western diplomats have said.¶ The six powers are concerned that Iran could use enriched uranium or plutonium to make nuclear weapons. Iranian leaders insist they are only interested in nuclear energy and scientific applications.¶ Iran’s Deputy Foreign Minister Majid Takht Ravanchi said his delegation was considering proposals on Arak, which is still under construction.¶ “We have not reached a conclusion on Arak but at least we know very well where they are and where we are and how the positions of the two sides can merge,” he told the Wall Street Journal.¶ Western officials have said one option would be to convert Arak into a type of reactor that does not produce plutonium as a side product.¶ Iranian officials have proposed instead that countries such as Germany, France, Japan, Brazil or Argentina join the Arak research reactor project, to guarantee that it serves peaceful purposes.¶ Ravanchi also said that nuclear inspections that are to be part of the final agreement were on the agenda of talks this week.¶ Iran and the six powers have been implementing a preliminary agreement since January, under which Tehran has slowed down its drive to enrich uranium and halted construction at Arak, while some Western sanctions have been suspended.¶ As part of that preliminary deal that was signed in November, US aircraft maker Boeing announced last week that it would resume supplying spare parts for Iran’s ageing fleet.

#### Prefer insiders – all sides are optimistic

DeYoung 4-4 (Karen DeYoung, Washington Post, “Administration official ‘absolutely convinced’ that nuclear deal with Iran will be reached,” 4-4-2014, www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/us-official-absolutely-convinced-that-nuclear-deal-with-iran-will-be-reached/2014/04/04/f65f0f48-bc33-11e3-96ae-f2c36d2b1245\_story.html)

Significant gaps remain between international negotiators and Iran over its nuclear program, but talks that began early this year are “getting down to the serious business” and the drafting of a comprehensive agreement will begin in May, a senior Obama administration official said Friday.¶ “I’m absolutely convinced that we can” complete a deal by a July 20 deadline, the official said, “although the real issue is not whether you can write the words on paper . . . it’s about the choices that Iran has to make. Some of them are very difficult.”¶ The official spoke as high-level negotiators prepared to return next week to Vienna for a third round of talks between Iran and group known as the P5+1 — the five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council (the United States, Britain, China, France and Russia) plus Germany. The European Union also is participating in the negotiations.¶ In November, the parties agreed to a plan for negotiating a long-term deal to define the scope of Iran’s nuclear program and ensure that it cannot build a weapon, in exchange for lifting international economic sanctions.¶ To show good faith during the talks, Iran froze parts of its nuclear program and the West provided some temporary sanctions relief.¶ Negotiations that began Jan. 20 are to be completed within six months, although the agreement allows for an extension if progress is being made.¶ Negotiators on all sides have publicly praised the substance and seriousness of the talks, including Undersecretary of State Wendy Sherman, the chief U.S. negotiator, and Iranian Foreign Minister Mohammad Javad Zarif.¶ Outside of the closed-door sessions, however, there have been calls in the United States and Iran for a hard line. Some Iranian leaders have said that they will never give up a heavy-water reactor and the ability to enrich uranium — two paths to nuclear weapons material. Numerous lawmakers in the United States, along with Israel, have said that neither can be part of a final agreement, even under strict safeguards, because Iran cannot be trusted.¶ The senior official, speaking on condition of anonymity to brief reporters on administration views, brushed off those concerns. “We’re quite direct and quite straightforward with each other, so I don’t think there’s any mystery about positions. And what we are focused on is what is discussed in the room, not what anyone says on the outside.”¶ “We know where we can see points of agreement,” the official said. “We know where the gaps are that have to be bridged. But I’ve also said this is a Rubik’s Cube, and where one makes progress on one element may mean there’s more trade space on another element.”¶ The official declined to provide specifics about the negotiations but said that “nothing is agreed until everything is agreed, and I would add to that nothing is agreed till everyone agrees to it.”

#### Even if the deal fails, success in Congress is key – perception that Iran and not the U.S. is to blame is key to make hardline options more credible

Ereli 2-17 --- former deputy spokesman of the State Department (2/17/2014, “The Iranian Nuclear Deal: A Foreign Policy ‘Hail Mary’” <http://www.ibtimes.com/iranian-nuclear-deal-foreign-policy-hail-mary-1556004>))

So where does that leave us? America is right to put Iran’s stated intention to disarm to the test. Paradoxically, providing the regime an opportunity to fail is the surest way to undermine it. Let the world see that despite its seductive charm offensive, Iran’s fundamental interests have not changed and a resolute, unified stance by the international community is our best protection. As the Obama Administration’s former Deputy National Security Advisor recently wrote, “…if diplomacy fails, the United States will be far more credible in reinforcing sanctions or using force -- or both -- if it puts a proposal on the table that the rest of the international community will find serious and plausible.”

#### Our internal link is plan-specific – uniquely costs PC with Dems who don’t want to look soft on unpopular regimes – and Obama needs all of it for Iran

Stanton 11-25 (Joshua Stanton, congressional staffer with the U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Foreign Affairs, principal drafter of the North Korea Sanctions Enforcement Act, former U.S. Army Judge Advocate in Korea, “How the Iran deal affects North Korea policy,” One Free Korea, 11-25-2013, http://freekorea.us/2013/11/25/how-the-iran-deal-affects-north-korea-policy/)

You would think that the world’s biggest government would be capable of handling more than one global proliferation crisis at a time. Unfortunately, Washington isn’t wired for that kind of bandwidth. Major policy initiatives require political capital, and it will take all of this administration’s dwindling reserves to fend off a new round of Iran sanctions in Congress.\* The administration couldn’t defend a deal with North Korea now if it had one, and that goes double for the sort of non-disarmament deal being pushed by the likes of Robert Gallucci and Stephen Bosworth.¶ Regardless of your subjective views, the Obama Administration’s political position has eroded significantly in the last month. Its approval ratings on foreign policy are almost as low as they are on Obamacare. I suspect that the administration’s approval rating on foreign policy will get a short-term bump — reporters are using words like “historic” and “euphoria,” word choices that have proven to be poor predictors of longer-term success. Opposition to the deal, however, is already significant. Even key Democrats like Bob Menendez and Charles Schumer reason that the deal fails to freeze Iran’s enrichment or do enough to stop its progress toward the Bomb to merit billions of dollars in sanctions relief, and the lost leverage that entails. It can’t help that Iran’s President Hassan Rouhani is saying this:¶ Let anyone make his own reading, but this right is clearly stated in the text of the agreement that Iran can continue its enrichment, and I announce to our people that our enrichment activities will continue as before.¶ Unlike Agreed Framework II in 2007, this deal will exacerbate, rather than mollify, opposition to the President when the President is weakened politically. Agreed Framework II was the Bush Administration’s way of deferring a North Korea debate when it was weakened by Iraq. The Iran deal will intensify the Iran debate when it is weakened by Obamacare. All bets are off, of course, if the Democrats lose the Senate next year, but in the meantime, Democratic senators in swing states will face tough pre-election votes and won’t want to be portrayed as soft on regimes that most Americans loathe. It seems unlikely that the administration would expend more of its capital on appeasing North Korea at a time like this.

**Resnik, 1 – Assistant Professor of Political Science at Yeshiva University (Evan, Journal of International Affairs, “Defining Engagement” v54, n2, political science complete)**

Thus, a rigid conceptual distinction can be drawn between engagement and appeasement. Whereas both policies are positive sanctions--insofar as they add to the power and prestige of the target state--engagement does so in a less direct and less militarized fashion than appeasement. In addition, engagement differs from appeasement by establishing anincreasingly interdependent relationship between the sender and the target state. At any juncture, the sender state can, in theory, abrogate such a relationship at some (ideally prohibitive) cost to the target state.(n34) Appeasement, on the other hand, does not involve the establishment of contacts or interdependence between the appeaser and the appeased. Territory and/or a sphere of influence are merely transferred by one party to the other either unconditionally or in exchange for certain concessions on the part of the target state.
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### biotech

### Biotech creates new virulent strains that can be harnessed as weapons.

Nandy 2

Urmila Singh Nandy, Kriger Research Institute. International Biopharmaceutical Association Publication. “How to Prevent the Biotechnological Revolution to Facilitate the Development of Biological Weapons?”. April 2002.

Biological warfare agents are a unique class of weapons that pose dangers to all biodiversity and whose future threat is directly linked to the regulation of modern biotechnology. Biological weapons include living organisms that are able to reproduce and perpetuate their destructive mission beyond the intended target area and time. 2 Biosafety and biosecurity both relate to new genetic techniques and to the release of living organisms into the environment with harmful impacts. Thirty years ago, on April 10 1972, the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention (BTWC) was opened for signature. The BTWC outlaws any development and production of biological weapons and has contributed to biological disarmament and the prevention of a biological arms race. The last decade, however, has witnessed dramatic and rapid changes in bioscience that are easing the development of biological weapons. Considering the worldwide availability of modern biotechnology know how and hardware, it is obvious that classical biowarfare agents like anthrax are now much easier to produce than 30 years ago. And new genetically engineered weapons for non-traditional conflicts are already under development, threatening to undermine the global consensus against the hostile use of living organisms and thereby endangering every country and its resources. Use of modern biotechnology entails biodiversity, health and security risks. By using genetic engineering and closely-related techniques, an expanding variety of new organisms can and have been created that pose risks to biodiversity and human health. The dangers these organisms pose is multiplied by the possibilities of their exploitation as weapons. A quintessential example in this regard is an experiment with mousepox viruses in Australia that were genetically engineered to induce sterility in mice. Unexpectedly, the experiment actually generated more lethal strains of mousepox. From a biosafety point of view, this highlights the potential dangers of genetic engineering, and from a biosecurity point of view it underlines the vast potential of genetic engineering to generate new weapons.

### Biotech will make bioweapons cheap and require little scientific knowledge.

Rifkin 98 – American economist, founder and president of the Foundation on Economic Trends

Jeremy Rifkin, the founder and president of the Foundation on Economic Trends, is an American economist, writer, and public speaker. The Biotech Century. p.93. 1998

Recombinant DNA “designer” weapons can be created in many ways. The new technologies can be used to program genes into infectious microorganisms to increase their antibiotic resistance, virulence, and environmental stability. It is possible to insert lethal genes into harmless microorganisms, resulting in biological agents that the body recognizes as friendly and does not resist. It is even possible to insert genes into organisms that affect regulatory functions that control mood, behavior, and body temperature. Scientists say they may be able to clone selective toxins to eliminate specific racial or ethnic groups whose genotypical makeup predisposes them to certain disease patterns. Genetic engineering can also be used to destroy specific strains or species of agricultural plants or domestic animals, if the intent is to cripple the economy of a country. The new genetic engineering technologies provide a versatile form of weaponry that can be used for a wide variety of military purposes, ranging from terrorism and counterinsurgency operations to large-scale warfare aimed at entire populations. Unlike nuclear technologies, genetically engineered organisms can be cheaply developed and produced, require far less scientific expertise, and can be effectively employed in many diverse settings.

## Struct viol

#### Utilitarianism inevitable even in deontological frameworks

Green, 02 – Assistant Professor Department of Psychology Harvard University (Joshua, November 2002 "The Terrible, Horrible, No Good, Very Bad Truth About Morality And What To Do About It", 314)

Some people who talk of balancing rights may think there is an algorithm for deciding which rights take priority over which. If that’s what we mean by 302 “balancing rights,” then we are wise to shun this sort of talk. Attempting to solve moral problems using a complex deontological algorithm is dogmatism at its most esoteric, but dogmatism all the same. However, it’s likely that when some people talk about “balancing competing rights and obligations” they are already thinking like consequentialists in spite of their use of deontological language. Once again, what deontological language does best is express the thoughts of people struck by strong, emotional moral intuitions: “It doesn’t matter that you can save five people by pushing him to his death. To do this would be a violation of his rights!”19 That is why angry protesters say things like, “Animals Have Rights, Too!” rather than, “Animal Testing: The Harms Outweigh the Benefits!” Once again, rights talk captures the apparent clarity of the issue and absoluteness of the answer. But sometimes rights talk persists long after the sense of clarity and absoluteness has faded. One thinks, for example, of the thousands of children whose lives are saved by drugs that were tested on animals and the “rights” of those children. One finds oneself balancing the “rights” on both sides by asking how many rabbit lives one is willing to sacrifice in order to save one human life, and so on, and at the end of the day one’s underlying thought is as thoroughly consequentialist as can be, despite the deontological gloss. And what’s wrong with that? Nothing, except for the fact that the deontological gloss adds nothing and furthers the myth that there really are “rights,” etc. Best to drop it. When deontological talk gets sophisticated, the thought it represents is either dogmatic in an esoteric sort of way or covertly consequentialist.

#### Util is key to value of life – it maximizes happiness for the most people making it the best framework for the policymaker and those whom are affected

[**Smith** 19**97**. Book Review: Jonathan Schell’s Fate of the Earth and The Abolition, [www.tc.umn.edu/~smith097/articles/L%2011.The%20Fate%20of%20the%20Earth%20.pdf](http://www.tc.umn.edu/~smith097/articles/L%2011.The%20Fate%20of%20the%20Earth%20.pdf)]

Utilitarianism begins by generalizing the hedonistic pleasure principle in terms of¶ happiness. Then what is moral or good is that which brings an agent happiness. This thesis is further generalized to say that happiness should be secured for as many agents in the community as possible. Every action, therefore, should be motivated in terms of trying to maximize as much happiness for as many agents as possible within the given community. The use of happiness in this thesis is in relation to the overall consequences of all the agents in the given community. The basic argument is that individual good is maximizing individual happiness. Morality though, involves the common good of all the agents in the community. The common good, therefore, is maximizing every ones happiness. I think the most promising variation of utilitarianism is rule utilitarianism where emphasis is placed on the consequences of every agent in the community adopting a particular action as a rule. Implicit within rule utilitarianism is a strong consistency thesis which places necessary constraints on the basic utilitarian argument.

### a2 structural violence

#### Nuke war outweighs structural violence – prioritizing structural violence makes preventing war impossible

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

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

#### War turns structural violence not vice versa

Goldstein 2001 – IR professor at American University (Joshua, War and Gender, p. 412, Google Books)

First, peace activists face a dilemma in thinking about causes of war and working for peace. Many peace scholars and activists support the approach, “if you want peace, work for justice.” Then, if one believes that sexism contributes to war, one can work for gender justice specifically (perhaps. among others) in order to pursue peace. This approach brings strategic allies to the peace movement (women, labor, minorities), but rests on the assumption that injustices cause war. The evidence in this book suggests that causality runs at least as strongly the other way. War is not a product of capitalism, imperialism, gender, innate aggression, or any other single cause, although all of these influence wars’ outbreaks and outcomes. Rather, war has in part fueled and sustained these and other injustices.9 So, “if you want peace, work for peace.” Indeed, if you want justice (gender and others), work for peace. Causality does not run just upward through the levels of analysis, from types of individuals, societies, and governments up to war. It runs downward too. Enloe suggests that changes in attitudes towards war and the military may be the most important way to “reverse women’s oppression.” The dilemma is that peace work focused on justice brings to the peace movement energy, allies, and moral grounding, yet, in light of this book’s evidence, the emphasis on injustice as the main cause of war seems to be empirically inadequate.

#### Preventing nuclear war is the absolute prerequisite to positive peace

Folk, 78 Professor of Religious and Peace Studies at Bethany College [Jerry, “Peace Educations – Peace Studies : Towards an Integrated Approach,” Peace & Change, volume V, number 1, Spring, p. 58]

Those proponents of the positive peace approach who reject out of hand the work of researchers and educators coming to the field from the perspective of negative peace too easily forget that the prevention of a nuclear confrontation of global dimensions is the prerequisite for all other peace research, education, and action. Unless such a confrontation can be avoided there will be no world left in which to build positive peace. Moreover, the blanket condemnation of all such negative peace oriented research, education or action as a reactionary attempt to support and reinforce the status quo is doctrinaire. Conflict theory and resolution, disarmament studies, studies of the international system and of international organizations, and integration studies are in themselves neutral. They do not intrinsically support either the status quo or revolutionary efforts to change or overthrow it. Rather they offer a body of knowledge which can be used for either purpose or for some purpose in between. It is much more logical for those who understand peace as positive peace to integrate this knowledge into their own framework and to utilize it in achieving their own purposes. A balanced peace studies program should therefore offer the student exposure to the questions and concerns which occupy those who view the field essentially from the point of view of negative peace.