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## 1AC Inherency

The United States maintains an embargo that bars nearly all economic activity with Cuba

Guzmán ‘13, Emmy award winning journalist, 2013

(Sandra, “Jay-Z and Beyoncé's trip to Cuba isn't the problem, the embargo is,” *CNN*, May 8, Online: <http://www.cnn.com/2013/05/07/opinion/guzman-beyonce-jay-z-cuba/index.html>)

The few but very influential pro-embargo lobby have put a stranglehold on a lucid discussion surrounding Cuba. Five decades of failed policy later, our nation is being held hostage unable to have a cogent discussion on anything Cuba-related.¶ The U.S. embargo has not and will not work. Put in place in 1962 by President John F. Kennedy, the policy is stuck in a time warp that has nothing to do with modern-day reality. The most enduring embargo in modern day history is a remnant of a Cold War past when the Soviet Union was the enemy and the world was on the brink of nuclear war. The thinking was that financial sanctions, which included a ban on travel by American citizens, would collapse the island economy and force people to revolt against Fidel Castro.¶ Over the years, these sanctions have been eased or toughened depending on political winds. In 1992, disgraced New Jersey Rep. Robert Torricelli was behind one the cruelest acts which banned, among many things, food and medicine sales to Cuba and prevented Cuban-American families from sending cash to their relatives. These were tough times and seeing many friends and families suffer because they couldn't visit their elderly mothers more than once every three years, or being prevented from sending them needed supplies, was very painful. Restrictions have eased under President Barack Obama but there is still a major ban.¶ Enter Jay Z and Beyoncé.¶ It's 2013 and we need to debate Cuban policy earnestly. Members of Congress must stop the cowardice around the issue and stop humoring the delusions of passionate folks stuck in the 1960s for political votes and favor. The pro-embargo folks are ignoring the policy's epic failure and fail to recognize that U.S. policy has played into the hands of the Castro brothers, who have sinisterly used it to make the case to their people that if Cuba is starving and the island economy can't grow, it's because of this U.S. policy.

## Plan

Thus the Plan: The United States Federal Government should lift its trade embargo on the Republic of Cuba.

## 1AC Warming

**US-Latin American Relations are low**

Lehmann, 5/30 [5/30/13, Catalina Lehmann is a reporter for Talk News Radio Service, “Officials: Obama Has Yet To Improve U.S.-Latin America Relations”, <http://www.talkradionews.com/us/2013/05/30/officials-obama-has-yet-to-improve-u-s-latin-america-relations.html#.Udnf9jvqn80>]

Latin America, particularly South America, has experienced unprecedented political change in the past 15 years said officials who discussed the issue during a briefing held by the Center for Economic Policy and Research. The briefing analyzed how the Obama administration has responded to the region’s leftward shifting of political dynamics. In the past, during the Bush administration, efforts were made to isolate and suppress left-leaning political movements in Latin America, said the officials. When President George W. Bush attended the Summit of the Americas in Argentina, his lecture was received with protests against his administration’s polices. When President Barak Obama attended the Summit in Columbia, he spoke about the need for “equal partnerships” and “a new chapter of engagement” with the countries that make up Latin America. Leaders such as President Hugo Chavez had a new sense of hope instilled after President Obama’s remarks, said CEPR Co-Director Mark Weisbrot. “When Latin America’s left presidents watched the campaign of Barack Obama for president in 2008, they thought that they might finally see a U.S. president who would change Washington’s foreign policy in the region,” said Weisbrot. However, panelists claimed that up to this point in time, little has been done to improve U.S.-Latin America relations. “The Obama administration, like that of President Bush, does not accept that the region has changed, Weisbrot stated. “That goal is to get rid of all of the left-of-center governments, partly because they tend to be more independent from Washington.”

Cuba is key to US-Latin American Relations-specifically spills-over to *global* coop on warming- overcomes alt causes

Shifter ‘12

(Michael is an Adjunct Professor of Latin American Studies at Georgetown University's School of Foreign Service. He is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations and writes for the Council's journal Foreign Affairs. He serves as the President of Inter-American Dialogue. “Remaking the Relationship: The United States and Latin America,” April, IAD Policy Report, http://www.thedialogue.org/PublicationFiles/IAD2012PolicyReportFINAL.pdf)

Cuba, too, poses a significant challenge for relations between the United States and Latin America. The 50-year-old US embargo against Cuba is rightly criticized throughout the hemisphere as a failed and punitive instrument. It has long been a strain on US-Latin American relations. Although the United States has **recently** moved in the right direction and taken **steps** to relax restrictions on travel to Cuba, Washington needs to do far more to dismantle **its severe, outdated** constraints on **normalized** relations with Cuba. Cuba is one of the residual issues that most obstructs more effective US-Latin American engagement. At the same time, Cuba’s authoritarian regime should be of utmost concern to all countries in the Americas. At present, it is the only country without free, multi-party elections, and its government fully controls the press. Latin American and Caribbean nations could be instrumental in supporting Cuba’s eventual transition to democratic rule. An end to the US policy of isolating Cuba, without setting aside US concern about human rights violations, would be an important first step. Many of the issues on the hemispheric agenda carry critical global dimensions. Because of this, the United States should seek greater cooperation and consultation with Brazil, Mexico, and other countries of the region in world forums addressing shared interests. Brazil has the broadest international presence and influence of any Latin American nation. In recent years it has become far more active on global issues of concern to the United States. The United States and Brazil have clashed over such issues as Iran’s nuclear program, non-proliferation, and the Middle East uprisings, but they have cooperated when their interests converged, such as in the World Trade Organization and the G-20 (Mexico, Argentina, and Canada also participate in the G-20), and in efforts to rebuild and provide security for Haiti. Washington has worked with Brazil and other Latin American countries to raise the profile of emerging economies in various international financial agencies, including the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. In addition to economic and financial matters, Brazil and other Latin American nations are assuming enhanced roles on an array of global political, environmental, and security issues. Several for which US and LatinAmerican cooperation could become increasingly important include: As the world’s lone nuclear-weapons-free region, Latin America has the opportunity to participate more actively in non-proliferation efforts. Although US and Latin American interests do not always converge on non-proliferation questions, they align on some related goals. For example, the main proliferation challenges today are found in developing and unstable parts of the world, as well as in the leakage—or transfer of nuclear materials—to terrorists. In that context, south-south connections are crucial. Brazil could play a pivotal role. Many countries in the region give priority to climate change challenges. This may position them as a voice in international debates on this topic. The importance of the Amazon basin to worldwide climate concerns gives Brazil and five other South American nations a special role to play. Mexico already has assumed a prominent position on climate change and is active in global policy debates. Brazil organized the first-ever global environmental meeting in 1992 and, this year, will host Rio+20. Mexico hosted the second international meeting on climate change in Cancún in 2010. The United States is handicapped by its inability to devise a climate change policy. Still, it should support coordination on the presumptionof shared interests on a critical policy challenge. Latin Americans are taking more active leadership on drug policy in the hemisphere and could become increasingly influential in global discussions of drug strategies. Although the United States and Latin America are often at odds on drug policy, they have mutual interests and goals that should allow consultation and collaboration on a new, more effective approach to the problem.

Now is key—failing to lift the embargo dooms Latin American relations forever

**White 3/17** [3/7/13, Robert E. White, a senior fellow at the Center for International Policy, was the United States ambassador to Paraguay from 1977 to 1979 and to El Salvador from 1980 to 1981, “After Chávez, a Chance to Rethink Relations With Cuba”, <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/03/08/opinion/after-chavez-hope-for-good-neighbors-in-latin-america.html?pagewanted=all>]

FOR most of our history, the United States assumed that its security was inextricably linked to a partnership with Latin America. This legacy dates from the Monroe Doctrine, articulated in 1823, through the Rio pact, the[postwar treaty](http://www.state.gov/p/wha/rls/70681.htm) that pledged the United States to come to the defense of its allies in Central and South America. Yet for a half-century, our policies toward our southern neighbors have alternated between intervention and neglect, inappropriate meddling and missed opportunities. The death this week of President [Hugo Chávez](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/c/hugo_chavez/index.html?inline=nyt-per) of Venezuela — who along with Fidel Castro of [Cuba](http://www.nytimes.com/info/cuba?inline=nyt-geo) was perhaps the most vociferous critic of the United States among the political leaders of the Western Hemisphere in recent decades — offers an opportunity to restore bonds with potential allies who share the American goal of prosperity. Throughout his career, the autocratic Mr. Chávez used our embargo as a wedge with which to antagonize the United States and alienate its supporters. His fuel helped prop up the rule of Mr. Castro and his brother Raúl, Cuba’s current president. The embargo no longer serves any useful purpose (if it ever did at all); President Obama should end it, though it would mean overcoming powerful opposition from Cuban-American lawmakers in Congress. An end to the Cuba embargo would send a powerful signal to all of Latin America that the United States wants a new, warmer relationship with democratic forces seeking social change throughout the Americas. I joined the State Department as a Foreign Service officer in the 1950s and chose to serve in Latin America in the 1960s. I was inspired by President John F. Kennedy’s creative response to the revolutionary fervor then sweeping Latin America. The 1959 Cuban revolution, led by the charismatic Fidel Castro, had inspired revolts against the cruel dictatorships and corrupt pseudodemocracies that had dominated the region since the end of Spanish and Portuguese rule in the 19th century. Kennedy had a charisma of his own, and it captured the imaginations of leaders who wanted democratic change, not violent revolution. Kennedy reacted to the threat of continental insurrection by creating the [Alliance for Progress](http://history.state.gov/milestones/1961-1968/AllianceforProgress), a kind of Marshall Plan for the hemisphere that was calculated to achieve the same kind of results that saved Western Europe from Communism. He pledged billions of dollars to this effort. In hindsight, it may have been overly ambitious, even naïve, but Kennedy’s focus on Latin America rekindled the promise of the [Good Neighbor Policy](http://history.state.gov/milestones/1921-1936/GoodNeighbor) of Franklin D. Roosevelt and transformed the whole concept of inter-American relations. Tragically, after Kennedy’s assassination in 1963, the ideal of the Alliance for Progress crumbled and “la noche mas larga” — “the longest night” — began for the proponents of Latin American democracy. Military regimes flourished, democratic governments withered, moderate political and civil leaders were labeled Communists, rights of free speech and assembly were curtailed and human dignity crushed, largely because the United States abandoned all standards save that of anti-Communism. During my Foreign Service career, I did what I could to oppose policies that supported dictators and closed off democratic alternatives. In 1981, as the ambassador to [El Salvador](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/elsalvador/index.html?inline=nyt-geo), I refused a demand by the secretary of state, [Alexander M. Haig Jr.](http://www.nytimes.com/2010/02/21/us/politics/21haig.html), that I use official channels to cover up the Salvadoran military’s responsibility for the murders of four American churchwomen. [I was fired and forced out of the Foreign Service.](http://www.nytimes.com/1981/03/12/world/former-envoy-to-el-salvador-says-his-views-have-led-to-his-ouster.html) The Reagan administration, under the illusion that Cuba was the power driving the Salvadoran revolution, turned its policy over to the Pentagon and C.I.A., with predictable results. During the 1980s the United States helped expand the Salvadoran military, which was dominated by uniformed assassins. We armed them, trained them and covered up their crimes. After our counterrevolutionary efforts failed to end the Salvadoran conflict, the Defense Department asked its research institute, the RAND Corporation, what had gone wrong. RAND analysts found that United States policy makers had refused to accept the obvious truth that the insurgents were rebelling against social injustice and state terror. As a result, “we pursued a policy unsettling to ourselves, for ends humiliating to the Salvadorans and at a cost disproportionate to any conventional conception of the national interest.” Over the subsequent quarter-century, a series of profound political, social and economic changes have undermined the traditional power bases in Latin America and, with them, longstanding regional institutions like the Organization of American States. The organization, which is headquartered in Washington and which excluded Cuba in 1962, was seen as irrelevant by Mr. Chávez. He promoted the creation of the [Community of Latin American and Caribbean States](http://www.celac.gob.ve/index.php?lang=en) — which excludes the United States and Canada — as an alternative. At a regional meeting that included Cuba and excluded the United States, Mr. Chávez said that “the most positive thing for the independence of our continent is that we meet alone without the hegemony of empire.” Mr. Chávez was masterful at manipulating America’s antagonism toward Fidel Castro as a rhetorical stick with which to attack the United States as an imperialist aggressor, an enemy of progressive change, interested mainly in treating Latin America as a vassal continent, a source of cheap commodities and labor. Like its predecessors, the Obama administration has given few signs that it has grasped the magnitude of these changes or cares about their consequences. After President Obama took office in 2009, Latin America’s leading statesman at the time, Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva, then the president of Brazil, urged Mr. Obama to normalize relations with Cuba. Lula, as he is universally known, correctly identified our Cuba policy as the chief stumbling block to renewed ties with Latin America, as it had been since the very early years of the Castro regime. After the failure of the 1961 Bay of Pigs invasion, Washington set out to accomplish by stealth and economic strangulation what it had failed to do by frontal attack. But the clumsy mix of covert action and porous boycott succeeded primarily in bringing shame on the United States and turning Mr. Castro into a folk hero. And even now, despite the relaxing of travel restrictions and Raúl Castro’s announcement that he will retire in 2018, the implacable hatred of many within the Cuban exile community continues. The fact that two of the three Cuban-American members of the Senate — Marco Rubio of Florida and Ted Cruz of Texas — are rising stars in the Republican Party complicates further the potential for a recalibration of Cuban-American relations. (The third member, Senator Robert Menendez, Democrat of New Jersey, is the new chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, but his power has been weakened by a continuing ethics controversy.) Are there any other examples in the history of diplomacy where the leaders of a small, weak nation can prevent a great power from acting in its own best interest merely by staying alive? The re-election of President Obama, and the death of Mr. Chávez, give America a chance to reassess the irrational hold on our imaginations that Fidel Castro has exerted for five decades. The president and his new secretary of state, John Kerry, should quietly reach out to Latin American leaders like President [Juan Manuel Santos](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/s/juan_manuel_santos/index.html) of Colombia and [José Miguel Insulza](http://www.oas.org/en/about/secretary_general.asp), secretary general of the Organization of American States. The message should be simple: The president is prepared to show some flexibility on Cuba and asks your help. Such a simple request could transform the Cuban issue from a bilateral problem into a multilateral challenge. It would then be up to Latin Americans to devise a policy that would help Cuba achieve a sufficient measure of democratic change to justify its reintegration into a hemisphere composed entirely of elected governments. If, however, our present policy paralysis continues, we will soon see the emergence of two rival camps, the United States versus Latin America. While Washington would continue to enjoy friendly relations with individual countries like Brazil, Mexico and Colombia, the vision of Roosevelt and Kennedy of a hemisphere of partners cooperating in matters of common concern would be reduced to a historical footnote.

Latin American relations are key to solving warming, Amazon deforestation and promoting alternative energy production

**Zedillo et al, ‘8** [2008, Ernesto Zedillo Commission co-chair; Former President of Mexico Thomas R. Pickering Commission co-chair; Former U.S. Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs Memb e r s o f the Par t n e r s h i p for t h e Ame r i cas Commi ssi o n Mauricio Cárdenas Director of the Commission; Senior Fellow and Director, Latin America Initiative, Brookings Leonardo Martinez-Diaz Deputy Director of the Commission; Political Economy Fellow, Global Economy and Development, Brookings , “Rethinking U.S.–Latin American Relations A Hemispheric Partnership for a Turbulent World Report of the Partnership for the Americas Commission”, <http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/reports/2008/11/24%20latin%20america%20partnership/1124_latin_america_partnership.pdf>]

The link between carbon-intensive activities and changes in the world’s climate is now well established, and the consequences will be felt across the hemisphere. According to figure 2, if current human activity remains unchanged, the hemisphere will likely suffer from a variety of ecological shocks, including declines in agricultural yields, water shortages, the loss of animal and plant species, and more frequent and destructive storms in the Caribbean Basin. These extreme weather events could bring devastation to Central America, the Caribbean, and the southeastern United States, imposing a heavy human and material toll. As we know from recent storms, the costs of replacing homes, businesses, and infrastructure—along with the higher costs of energy if refineries and offshore rigs are damaged—will be vast. Hemispheric Solutions Addressing the challenge of energy security will require making energy consumption more efficient and developing new energy sources, whereas addressing the challenge of climate change will require finding ways to control carbon emissions, helping the world shift away from carbon-intensive energy generation, and adapting to some aspects of changing ecosystems. Potential solutions to these problems exist in the Americas, but mobilizing them will require a sustained hemispheric partnership. Latin America has enormous potential to help meet the world’s growing thirst for energy, both in terms of hydrocarbons and alternative fuels. Latin America has about 10 percent of the world’s proven oil reserves. Venezuela accounts for most of these, though Brazil’s oil reserves could increase from 12 to 70 billon barrels if recent discoveries can be developed. Bolivia is an important producer of natural gas, Mexico has great potential in solar energy generation, and several countries in the region could potentially produce much more hydroelectric power. Brazil is a world leader in sugarcane-based ethanol production, and the United States is a leader in corn-based ethanol (figure 3). Solar and wind power, particularly in Central America and the Caribbean, remain underdeveloped. To expand the hemisphere’s energy capacity, massive infrastructure investments will be required. Major investments in oil productionespecially deep offshore), refining, and distribution will be needed to achieve the region’s potential. Developing the Tupi project in Brazil alone will cost $70–240 billion. Liquefied natural gas will become an important source of energy, but not before major investments are made in infrastructure to support liquefaction, regasification, transport, and security. U.S. and Canadian electricity networks, which are already highly integrated, can be further integrated with Mexico’s. Mexico also plans to connect its grid to those of Guatemala and Belize, eventually creating an integrated power market in Central America. Power integration in South America will demand even larger investments in generation, transmission, and distribution. Finally, reliance on nuclear power may grow because it is carbon free and does not require fossil fuel imports. However, efforts to expand energy capacity and integrate hemispheric energy markets face a variety of obstacles. Energy nationalism has led to disruptive disputes over pricing and ownership. Tensions and mistrust in South America have hindered regional cooperation and investment, particularly on natural gas. The security of the energy infrastructure, especially pipelines, remains a concern in Mexico and parts of South America. Gas, oil, and electricity subsidies distort patterns of production and consumption, and they are triggering protectionist behavior elsewhere. Technology on renewables remains underdeveloped, and research in this area can be better centralized and disseminated. Overcoming these obstacles will require high levels of cooperation among hemispheric partners. In addition to developing carbon-neutral sources of energy, the Western Hemisphere has other roles to play in combating climate change. The LAC region currently accounts for about 5 percent of annual global carbon emissions, and emissions per capita are still relatively low compared with other regions. However, minimizing the LAC region’s future carbon footprint will require new policies. Also, deforestation globally accounts for 20 percent of greenhouse gas emissions. The Amazon River Basin contains one of the world’s three most important rainforests, whose protection can therefore very significantly contribute to combating climate change. Brazil is pioneering the use of information technology to lessen deforestation in the Amazon.

Improving the effectiveness of global coop key to solve warming

Slaughter‘11

(Anne-Marie, Bert G. Kerstetter '66 university professor of politics and international affairs at Princeton University, “Problems Will Be Global -- And Solutions Will Be, Too”, Foreign Policy, Sept/Oct, Issue 188, Ebsco)

A more multilateral world is just the beginning Before considering the world in 2025,14 years from now, it is worth remembering the world 14 years ago, in 1997. Back then, the United States was the sole superpower, its immensity and dominance of the international system so evident as to trigger the resentful label of "hyperpower" from the French foreign minister. The American economy was expanding fast enough to leave the country a healthy and growing surplus by the end of Bill Clinton's presidency three years later. The European Union, then still only four years old, had just 15 members; the euro did not exist. The wars dominating the headlines were in Europe: Bosnia, Croatia, and, soon, Kosovo. The term BRICs -- the Goldman Sachs label attached to the fast-growing emerging markets of Brazil, Russia, India, and China -- had not yet been invented. The Internet was booming, but social media did not exist. You get the point: A lot can change in 14 years, and rarely in ways foreseen. In the spirit of proper humility, then, here's my take on what the landscape of global diplomacy will look like a decade and a half from now: For starters, the world will be much more multilateral. By 2025 the U.N. Security Council will have expanded from the present 15 members to between 25 and 30 and will include, either as de jure or de facto permanent members, Brazil, India, Japan, South Africa, either Egypt or Nigeria, and either Indonesia or Turkey. At the same time, regional organizations on every continent -- the African Union, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, some version of the Organization of American States -- will be much stronger. Each will follow its own version of economic and political integration, inspired by the European Union, and many will include representation from smaller subregional organizations. In the Middle East, Israel, Palestine, Jordan, Syria, and Turkey could provide the core of a new Middle East free trade area; alternatively the European Union could be interlocked with an emerging Mediterranean Union. Driving this massive multilateralization is the increasingly global and regional nature of our problems, combined with an expanding number of countries splitting off from existing states. National governments will remain essential for many purposes, but managing bilateral relations and engaging in successful global negotiations with nearly 200 states will become increasingly unwieldy. So we'll negotiate territorial disputes in the South China Sea in a regional framework and deal with crises in Ivory Coast or Guinea through the African Union or even smaller subregional forums. At the global level, the speed and flexibility necessary to resolve crises require smaller groups like the G-20, while long-term legitimacy and durability still require the representation of all countries affected by a particular issue through large standing organizations. As for individual countries, the states that will be the strongest in 2025 will be those that have figured out how to do more with less. They will be those governments that have successfully embraced radical sustainability -- maintaining vibrant economies through largely renewable energy and creative reuse of just about everything. The leader will be Japan, a great civilization that has for centuries pioneered spectacularly beautiful ways of appreciating and coexisting with nature. As China's youth seek more of everything, Japan's are prepared to embrace a far more sustainable path. Scandinavia, Germany, New Zealand, and possibly South Korea will also be strong; many emerging or even less developed economies have real potential, if they can tap into their indigenous habits of conservation. Embracing sustainable growth will challenge the United States; its national renewal will depend on connecting its traditions of innovation, decentralization, and liberty with a narrative of protecting America's natural bounty. Think America the Beautiful more than the Star-Spangled Banner. But the most dramatic changes between 2011 and 2025 won't take place at the level of statecraft and grand strategy; they are likely to happen as new technologies continue to transform businesses, civic organizations of all kinds, universities, foundations, and churches -- now able to self-organize as never before around issues they care about. The American social revolution that Alexis de Tocqueville observed in the early 19th century, of citizens joining groups of every conceivable kind, is about to go global, forever changing the relationship between citizens and their governments, and governments with each other. The Arab revolutions are but the first taste of this larger change. These predictions may appear rosy. In fact, the enormous changes on the horizon will require major crises, even cataclysm, before they can materialize. It took World War I to generate the political will and circumstances necessary to create the League of Nations; it took World War II to create the United Nations; it took the worst economic crisis since the 1930s to force the expansion of the G-8 into the G-20. Just imagine what it will take to break the decades-old logjam of Security Council reform. And creating and changing multilateral organizations is child's play next to the profound changes in public and private behavior required to move away from the more-is-better economic model to one which accepts that our resources are finite on a planetary scale. Yet the sources of potential crises and disasters of a magnitude sufficient to force systemic change are all around us: Climate change is driving countries closer to the extremes of desert and jungle, droughts and floods, while a global pandemic or a nuclear terrorist attack would have a similar impact. This is not Malthusian gloom, however. As Robert Wright argues in Nonzero: The Logic of Human Destiny, catastrophe is terrible for individual human beings but beneficial for humanity as a whole. As the full consequences of genuinely global interconnectedness continue to make themselves felt, the world of both states and the societies they represent will have no choice but to adapt.

Warming is real and anthropogenic

EDF ‘9

[Environmental Defense Fund, a US-based nonprofit environmental advocacy group, “Global Warming Myths and Facts,” 1/13/2009, http://mrgreenbiz.wordpress.com/2009/01/13/global-warming-myths-and-facts-2/]

**There is no debate among scientists about the basic facts of global warming**. The most respected scientific bodies have stated unequivocally that global **warming is occurring, and people are causing it** by burning fossil fuels (like coal, oil and natural gas) and cutting down forests. The U.S. National Academy of Sciences, which in 2005 the White House called "the gold standard of objective scientific assessment," issued a joint statement with 10 other National Academies of Science saying "the scientific understanding of climate change is now sufficiently clear to justify nations taking prompt action. It is vital that all nations identify cost-effective steps that they can take now, to contribute to substantial and long-term reduction in net global greenhouse gas emissions." (Joint Statement of Science Academies: Global Response to Climate Change [PDF], 2005) The only debate in the science community about global warming is about how much and how fast warming will continue as a result of heat-trapping emissions. Scientists have given a clear warning about global warming, and we have more than enough facts — about causes and fixes — to implement solutions right now. MYTH Even if global warming is a problem, addressing it will hurt American industry and workers. FACT A well designed trading program will harness American ingenuity to decrease heat-trapping pollution cost-effectively, jumpstarting a new carbon economy. Claims that fighting global warming will cripple the economy and cost hundreds of thousands of jobs are unfounded. In fact, companies that are already reducing their heat-trapping emissions have discovered that cutting pollution can save money. The cost of a comprehensive national greenhouse gas reduction program will depend on the precise emissions targets, the timing for the reductions and the means of implementation. An independent MIT study found that a modest cap-and-trade system would cost less than $20 per household annually and have no negative impact on employment. Experience has shown that properly designed emissions trading programs can reduce compliance costs significantly compared with other regulatory approaches. For example, the U.S. acid rain program reduced sulfur dioxide emissions by more than 30 percent from 1990 levels and cost industry a fraction of what the government originally estimated, according to EPA. Furthermore, a mandatory cap on emissions could spur technological innovation that could create jobs and wealth. Letting global warming continue until we are forced to address it on an emergency basis could disrupt and severely damage our economy. It is far wiser and more cost-effective to act now. MYTH Water vapor is the most important, abundant greenhouse gas. So if we’re going to control a greenhouse gas, why don’t we control it instead of carbon dioxide (CO2)? FACT Although water vapor traps more heat than CO2, because of the relationships among CO2, water vapor and climate, to fight global warming nations must focus on controlling CO2. Atmospheric levels of CO2 are determined by how much coal, natural gas and oil we burn and how many trees we cut down, as well as by natural processes like plant growth. Atmospheric levels of water vapor, on the other hand, cannot be directly controlled by people; rather, they are determined by temperatures. The warmer the atmosphere, the more water vapor it can hold. As a result, water vapor is part of an amplifying effect. Greenhouse gases like CO2 warm the air, which in turn adds to the stock of water vapor, which in turn traps more heat and accelerates warming. Scientists know this because of satellite measurements documenting a rise in water vapor concentrations as the globe has warmed. **The best way to lower temperature and** thus reduce **water vapor levels is to reduce CO2 emissions.** MYTH Global warming and extra CO2 will actually be beneficial — they reduce cold-related deaths and stimulate crop growth. FACT **Any beneficial effects will be far outweighed by damage and disruption.** Even a warming in just the middle range of scientific projections would have devastating impacts on many sectors of the economy. Rising seas would inundate coastal communities, contaminate water supplies with salt and increase the risk of flooding by storm surge, affecting tens of millions of people globally. Moreover, extreme weather events, including heat waves, droughts and floods, are predicted to increase in frequency and intensity, causing loss of lives and property and throwing agriculture into turmoil. Even though higher levels of CO2 can act as a plant fertilizer under some conditions, scientists now think that the "CO2 fertilization" effect on crops has been overstated; in natural ecosystems, the fertilization effect can diminish after a few years as plants acclimate. Furthermore, increased CO2 may benefit undesirable, weedy species more than desirable species. Higher levels of CO2 have already caused ocean acidification, and scientists are warning of potentially devastating effects on marine life and fisheries. Moreover, higher levels of regional ozone (smog), a result of warmer temperatures, could worsen respiratory illnesses. Less developed countries and natural ecosystems may not have the capacity to adapt. The notion that there will be regional “winners” and “losers” in global warming is based on a world-view from the 1950’s. We live in a global community. Never mind the moral implications — when an environmental catastrophe creates millions of refugees half-way around the world, Americans are affected. MYTH Global warming is just part of a natural cycle. The Arctic has warmed up in the past. FACT The global warming we are experiencing is not natural. **People are causing it**. People are causing global warming by burning fossil fuels (like oil, coal and natural gas) and cutting down forests. Scientists have shown that these activities are pumping far more CO2 into the atmosphere than was ever released in hundreds of thousands of years. **This buildup of CO2 is the biggest cause of global warming**. Since 1895, scientists have known that CO2 and other greenhouse gases trap heat and warm the earth. As the warming has intensified over the past three decades, scientific scrutiny has increased along with it. Scientists have considered and ruled out other, natural explanations such as sunlight, volcanic eruptions and cosmic rays. (IPCC 2001) Though natural amounts of CO2 have varied from 180 to 300 parts per million (ppm), today's CO2 levels are around 380 ppm. That's 25% more than the highest natural levels over the past 650,000 years. Increased CO2 levels have contributed to periods of higher average temperatures throughout that long record. (Boden, Carbon Dioxide Information Analysis Center) As for previous Arctic warming, it is true that there were stretches of warm periods over the Arctic earlier in the 20th century. The limited records available for that time period indicate that the warmth did not affect as many areas or persist from year to year as much as the current warmth. But that episode, however warm it was, is not relevant to the issue at hand. Why? For one, a brief regional trend does not discount a longer global phenomenon. We know that the planet has been warming over the past several decades and Arctic ice has been melting persistently. And unlike the earlier periods of Arctic warmth, there is no expectation that the current upward trend in Arctic temperatures will reverse; the rising concentrations of greenhouse gases will prevent that from happening. MYTH We can adapt to climate change — civilization has survived droughts and temperature shifts before. FACT Although humans as a whole have survived the vagaries of drought, stretches of warmth and cold and more, entire societies have collapsed from dramatic climatic shifts. The current warming of our climate will bring major hardships and economic dislocations — untold human suffering, especially for our children and grandchildren. We are already seeing significant costs from today's global warming which is caused by greenhouse gas pollution. Climate has changed in the past and human societies have survived, but today six billion people depend on interconnected ecosystems and complex technological infrastructure. What's more, **unless we limit the amount of heat-trapping gases we are putting into the atmosphere, we will face a warming trend unseen since human civilization began** 10,000 years ago. (IPCC 2001) The consequences of continued warming at current rates are likely to be dire. Many densely populated areas, such as low-lying coastal regions, are highly vulnerable to climate shifts. A middle-of-the-range projection is that the homes of 13 to 88 million people around the world would be flooded by the sea each year in the 2080s. Poorer countries and small island nations will have the hardest time adapting. (McLean et al. 2001) In what appears to be the first forced move resulting from climate change, 100 residents of Tegua island in the Pacific Ocean were evacuated by the government because rising sea levels were flooding their island. Some 2,000 other islanders plan a similar move to escape rising waters. In the United States, the village of Shishmaref in Alaska, which has been inhabited for 400 years, is collapsing from melting permafrost. Relocation plans are in the works. <continues…> Scarcity of water and food could lead to major conflicts with broad ripple effects throughout the globe. Even if people find a way to adapt, the wildlife and plants on which we depend may be unable to adapt to rapid climate change. While the world itself will not end, the world as we know it may disappear. MYTH Recent cold winters and cool summers don’t feel like global warming to me. FACT While different pockets of the country have experienced some cold winters here and there, the overall trend is warmer winters. Measurements show that over the last century the Earth’s climate has warmed overall, in all seasons, and in most regions. Climate skeptics mislead the public when they claim that the winter of 2003–2004 was the coldest ever in the northeastern United States. That winter was only the 33rd coldest in the region since records began in 1896. Furthermore, a single year of cold weather in one region of the globe is not an indication of a trend in the global climate, which refers to a long-term average over the entire planet. MYTH Global warming can’t be happening because some glaciers and ice sheets are growing, not shrinking. FACT In most parts of the world, the retreat of glaciers has been dramatic. The best available scientific data indicate that Greenland's massive ice sheet is shrinking. Between 1961 and 1997, the world’s glaciers lost 890 cubic miles of ice. The consensus among scientists is that rising air temperatures are the most important factor behind the retreat of glaciers on a global scale over long time periods. Some glaciers in western Norway, Iceland and New Zealand have been expanding during the past few decades. That expansion is a result of regional increases in storm frequency and snowfall rather than colder temperatures — not at all incompatible with a global warming trend. In Greenland, a NASA satellite that can measure the ice mass over the whole continent has found that although there is variation from month to month, over the longer term, the ice is disappearing. In fact, there are worrisome signs that melting is accelerating: glaciers are moving into the ocean twice as fast as a decade ago, and, over time, more and more glaciers have started to accelerate. What is most alarming is the prediction, based on model calculations and historical evidence, that an approximately 5.4 degree Fahrenheit increase in local Greenland temperatures will lead to irreversible meltdown and a sea-level rise of over 20 feet. Since the Arctic is warming 2-3 times faster than the global average, this tipping point is not far away. The only study that has shown increasing ice mass in Greenland only looked at the interior of the ice sheet, not at the edges where melting occurs. This is actually in line with climate model predictions that global warming would lead to a short-term accumulation of ice in the cold interior due to heavier snowfall. (Similarly, scientists have predicted that Antarctica overall will gain ice in the near future due to heavier snowfall.) The scientists who published the study were careful to point out that their results should not be used to conclude that Greenland's ice mass as a whole is growing. In addition, their data suggested that the accumulation of snow in the middle of the continent is likely to decrease over time as global warming continues. MYTH Accurate weather predictions a few days in advance are hard to come by. Why on earth should we have confidence in climate projections decades from now? FACT Climate prediction is fundamentally different from weather prediction, just as climate is different from weather. It is often more difficult to make an accurate weather forecast than a climate prediction. The accuracy of weather forecasting is critically dependent upon being able to exactly and comprehensively characterize the present state of the global atmosphere. Climate prediction relies on other, longer ranging factors. For instance, we might not know if it will be below freezing on a specific December day in New England, but we know from our understanding of the region's climate that the temperatures during the month will generally be low. Similarly, climate tells us that Seattle and London tend to be rainy, Florida and southern California are usually warm, and the Southwest is often dry and hot. Today’s climate models can now reproduce the observed global average climates over the past century and beyond. Such findings have reinforced scientist’s confidence in the capacity of models to produce reliable projections of future climate. Current climate assessments typically consider the results from a range of models and scenarios for future heat-trapping emissions in order to identify the most likely range for future climatic change.

The impact is billions of deaths.

Cummins ‘10

(Ronnie, International Director – Organic Consumers Association and Will Allen, Advisor – Organic Consumers Association, “Climate Catastrophe: Surviving the 21st Century”, 2-14, http://www.commondreams.org/view/2010/02/14-6)

The hour is late. Leading climate scientists such as James Hansen are literally shouting at the top of their lungs that the world needs to reduce emissions by 20-40% as soon as possible, and 80-90% by the year 2050, if we are to avoid climate chaos, crop failures, endless wars, melting of the polar icecaps, and a disastrous rise in ocean levels. Either we radically reduce CO2 and carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2e, which includes all GHGs, not just CO2) pollutants (currently at 390 parts per million and rising 2 ppm per year) to 350 ppm, including agriculture-derived methane and nitrous oxide pollution, or else survival for the present and future generations is in jeopardy. As scientists warned at Copenhagen, business as usual and a corresponding 7-8.6 degree Fahrenheit rise in global temperatures means that the carrying capacity of the Earth in 2100 will be reduced to one billion people. Under this hellish scenario, billions will die of thirst, cold, heat, disease, war, and starvation. If the U.S. significantly reduces greenhouse gas emissions, other countries will follow. One hopeful sign is the recent EPA announcement that it intends to regulate greenhouse gases as pollutants under the Clean Air Act. Unfortunately we are going to have to put tremendous pressure on elected public officials to force the EPA to crack down on GHG polluters (including industrial farms and food processors). Public pressure is especially critical since "just say no" Congressmen-both Democrats and Republicans-along with agribusiness, real estate developers, the construction industry, and the fossil fuel lobby appear determined to maintain "business as usual."

Warming disproportionately hurts minorities and lower class

Hoerner 8—Former director of Research at the Center for a Sustainable Economy, Director of Tax Policy at the Center for Global Change at the University of Maryland College Park, and editor of Natural Resources Tax Review. He has done research on environmental economics and policy on behalf of the governments of Canada, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Switzerland, and the United States. Andrew received his B.A. in Economics from Cornell University and a J.D. from Case Western Reserve School of Law—AND—Nia Robins—former inaugural Climate Justice Corps Fellow in 2003, director of Environmental Justice and Climate Change Initiative (J. Andrew, “A Climate of Change African Americans, Global Warming, and a Just Climate Policy for the U.S.” July 2008, [http://www.ejcc.org/climateofchange.pdf](http://www.ejcc.org/climateofchange.pdf%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank))

Everywhere we turn, the issues and impacts of climate change confront us. One of the most serious environmental threats facing the world today, climate change has moved from the minds of scientists and offices of environmentalists to the mainstream. Though the media is dominated by images of polar bears, melting glaciers, flooded lands, and arid desserts, there is a human face to this story as well. Climate change is not only an issue of the environment; it is also an issue of justice and human rights, one that dangerously intersects race and class. All over the world people of color, Indigenous Peoples  and low-income communities bear disproportionate burdens from climate change itself, from ill-designed policies to prevent it, and from side effects of the energy systems that cause it. A Climate of Change explores the impacts of climate change on African Americans, from health to economics to community, and considers what policies would most harm or benefit African Americans—and the nation as a whole. African Americans are thirteen percent of the U.S. population and on average emit nearly twenty percent less greenhouse gases than non-Hispanic whites per capita. Though far less responsible for climate change, African Americans are significantly more vulnerable to its effects than non- Hispanic whites. Health, housing, economic well-being, culture, and social stability are harmed from such manifestations of climate change asstorms, floods, and climate variability. African Americans are also more vulnerable to higher energy bills, unemployment, recessions caused by global energy price shocks, and a greater economic burden from military operations designed to protect the flow of oil to the U.S. Climate Justice: The Time Is Now Ultimately, accomplishing climate justice will require that new alliances are forged and traditional movements are transformed. An effective policy to address the challenges of global warming cannot be crafted until race and equity are part of the discussion from the outset and an integral part of the solution. This report finds that: Global warming amplifies nearly all existing inequalities. Under global warming, injustices that are already unsustainable become catastrophic. Thus it is essential to recognize that all justice is climate justice and that the struggle for racial and economic justice is an unavoidable part of the fight to halt global warming. Sound global warming policy is also economic and racial justice policy. Successfully adopting asound global warming policy will do as much to strengthen the economies of low-income communities and communities of coloras any other currently plausible stride toward economic justice. Climate policies that best serve African Americans also best serve a just and strong United States. This paper shows that policies well-designed to benefit African Americans also provide the most benefit to all people in the U.S.Climate policies that best serve African Americans and other disproportionately affected communities also best serve global economic and environmental justice. Domestic reductions in global warming pollution and support for such reductions in developing nations financed by polluter-pays principles provide the greatest benefit to African Americans, the peoples of Africa, and people across the Global South. A distinctive African American voice is critical for climate justice. Currently, legislation is being drafted, proposed, and considered without any significant input from the communities most affected. Special interests are represented by powerful lobbies, while traditional environmentalists often fail to engage people of color, Indigenous Peoples, and low-income communities until after the political playing field has been defined and limited to conventional environmental goals. A strong focus on equity is essential to the success of the environmental cause, but equity issues cannot be adequately addressed by isolating the voices of communities that are disproportionately impacted. Engagement in climate change policy must be moved from the White House and the halls of Congress to social circles, classrooms, kitchens, and congregations. The time is now for those disproportionately affected to assume leadership in the climate change debate, to speak truth to power, and to assert rights to social, environmental and economic justice. Taken together, these actions affirm a vital truth that will bring communities together: Climate Justice is Common Justice. African Americans and Vulnerability In this report, it is shown that African Americans are disproportionately affected by climate change. African Americans Are at Greater Risk from Climate Change and Global Warming Co-Pollutants ¶ • The six states with the highest African American population are all in the Atlantic hurricane zone, and are expected to experience more intense storms resembling Katrina and Rita in the future. ¶ • Global warming is expected to increase the frequency and intensity of heat waves or extreme heat events. African Americans suffer heat death at one hundred fifty to two hundred percent of the rate for non-Hispanic whites. ¶ • Seventy-one percent of African Americans live in counties in violation of federal air pollution standards, as compared to fifty-eight percent of the white population. Seventy-eight percent of African Americans live within thirty miles of a coal-fired power plant, as compared to fifty-six percent of non-Hispanic whites.¶ • Asthma has strong associations with air pollution, and African Americans have a thirty-six percent higher rate ofincidents of asthma than whites. Asthma is three times as likely to lead to emergency room visits or deaths for African Americans. ¶ • This study finds that a twenty-five percent reduction in greenhouse gases—similar to what passed in California and is proposed in major federal legislation—would reduce infant mortality by at least two percent, asthma by at least sixteen percent, and mortality from particulates by at least 6,000 to 12,000 deaths per year. Other estimates have run as high as 33,000 fewer deaths per year. A disproportionate number of the lives saved by these proposed reductions would be African American. African Americans Are Economically More Vulnerable to Disasters and Illnesses ¶ • In 2006, twenty percent of African Americans had no health insurance, including fourteen percent of African American children—nearly twice the rate of non-Hispanic whites. ¶ • In the absence of insurance, disasters and illness (which will increase with global warming) could be cushioned by income and accumulated wealth. However, the average income of African American households is fifty-seven percent that of non-Hispanic whites, and median wealth is only one-tenth that of non-Hispanic whites. ¶ • Racist stereotypes have been shown to reduce aid donations and impede service delivery to African Americans in the wake of hurricanes, floods, fires and other climate-related disasters as compared to non-Hispanic whites in similar circumstances. African Americans Are at Greater Risk from Energy Price Shocks ¶ • African Americans spend thirty percent more of their income on energy than non-Hispanic whites. • Energy price increases have contributed to seventy to eighty percent of recent recessions. The increase in unemployment of African Americans during energy caused recessions is twice that of non-Hispanic whites, costing the community an average of one percent of income every year. • Reducing economic dependence on energy will alleviate the frequency and severity of recessions and the economic disparities they generate. African Americans Pay a Heavy Price and a Disproportionate Share of the Cost of Wars for Oil • Oil company profits in excess of the normal rate of profit for U.S. industries cost the average household $611 in 2006 alone and are still rising. • The total cost of the war in Iraq borne by African Americans will be $29,000 per household if the resulting deficit is financed by tax increases, and $32,000 if the debt is repaid by spending cuts. This is more than three times the median assets of African American households. A Clean Energy Future Creates Far More Jobs for African Americans • Fossil fuel extraction industries employ a far lower proportion of African Americans on average compared to other industries. Conversely, renewable electricity generation employs three to five times as many people ascomparable electricity generation from fossil fuels, a higher proportion of whom are African American. ¶ • Switching just one percent of totalelectricity generating capacity per year from conventional to renewable sources would result in an additional 61,000 to 84,000 jobs for African Americans by 2030. ¶ • A well-designed comprehensive climate plan achieving emission reductions comparable to the Kyoto Protocol would create over 430,000 jobs for African Americans by 2030, reducing the African American unemployment rate by 1.8 percentage points and raising the average African American income by 3 to 4 percent.

## 1AC Imperialism

The embargo is just another part of the United States’ endless effort to imperialize Cuba

Lamrani 03

Lamrani, Salim, Sorbonne University Paris. “U.S. Economic sanctions against Cuba:
objectives of an imperialist policy.” Third World Traveler. 12/17/2003. <http://www.thirdworldtraveler.com/Caribbean/USEconomicSanctions_Cuba.html>

The economic sanctions imposed on Cuba by the United States are unique in view of their longevity and of their complexity but they are consistent with the real objectives of the first world power. In order to show this, it is necessary to base this analysis on the following postulate: the blockade is part of a scheme designed not to promote democratic values, as the administration in Washington would have us believe, but to control the natural resources of Third World nations through subjugation. And the history of the United States ­ characterized mainly by violent and bloody conquest of new territories ­ proves this unequivocally.¶ As far back as the middle of the 19th century, U.S. expansionist William Gilpin announced: "The destiny of the American people is to subdue the continent." The primary goal of the United States is to make sure that the resources of the countries of the South remain at hand of the capital of the masters of the universe. The case of Cuba is exceptional because it is the only country that has dared to refuse to follow the orders set by their northern neighbor, designing its political, economic and social system, at once sovereign and independent, despite the unilateral constraints imposed by Washington. The enmity Cuba is a victim of reflects a historical continuity whose broad lines must be retraced. And by the way, it would be widely-known if something like a sense of respect for obvious historical truisms existed. This topic would not be controversial if the society we live in was intellectually free.¶ Cuba is no doubt the oldest preoccupation of U.S. colonialists. As far back as October 20, 1805, Thomas Jefferson evoked the extreme importance of the Caribbean archipelago ­ under Spanish rule at the time ­ stating: "The control which, with Florida Point, this island would give us over the Gulf of Mexico, and the countries and isthmus bordering on it, as well as all those whose waters flow into it, would fill up the measure of our political well-being." However, Spain could rule the island until "our people is sufficiently advanced to take those territories from the Spanish, bit by bit" . In 1809, in a letter to James Madison, he wrote: "I candidly confess that I have ever looked on Cuba as the most interesting addition which could ever be made to our system of States." The theory of the "ripe fruit" ­ evoked in 1823 by one of the most clear-sighted and intelligent political visionary of the history of the United States, John Quincy Adams ­ mentioned "an object of transcendent importance to the commercial and political interests of our Union" that was to fall in the hands of the United States at all costs . This object was the Cuban island, which was already the priority of the United States government of the time.¶ After the collapse of Napoleon's empire, the Monroe doctrine came into the world. It stipulated that the United States would on no account accept European interventions in the affairs of the American hemisphere. It would enable the northern giant to establish its power on the whole continent without hindrance, since Europe would not interfere. The theory was first motivated by Russian designs on Oregon and by the will to prevent any reconquest of the young Latin American republics by European nations. The Monroe doctrine ­ one of the founding principles of U.S. foreign policy ­ had imperialist and hegemonic aims. With the Roosevelt Corollary, its scope was later extended to encompass a diversity of situations. Economic factors had a primary role in the search for new markets. The birth of an industrial nation and the rapid increase in the production of goods entailed the need to conquer new territories. Because of its strategic position if the Gulf of Mexico and despite the failure of the various attempts to buy the island to Spain, Cuba was in the U.S. line of sight.

Patriarchy, racism, homophobia, and class distinction all survive because imperialism necessitates it. Only a mindset shift in the motivations behind our political actions can solve.

Mason 12

Sofia Mason. Sofia Mason is a post-doctoral researcher whose specialisms include the testimonies of politically active Latin American women, the Cuban and Nicaraguan Revolutions and feminism. “Unpicking the narratives: only by rejecting patriarchy and imperialism can we end war.” Ceasefire. December 6, 2012. <http://ceasefiremagazine.co.uk/war-if-you-want-it/>

Those of us who are against racism, white supremacy and imperialism while also opposing patriarchy, sexism and misogyny, might ask how we can simultaneously end these intersecting forms of oppression by unpicking the narratives that justify them, learning from historical examples and taking political action on this basis.¶ During colonialism, narratives of white supremacy were employed to justify the [barbarity](http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2012/apr/23/british-empire-crimes-ignore-atrocities) and immorality of European settlers. The cruel exploitation of the people of the majority world, and the theft of their natural resources, was re-inscribed as taking Christianity to “savages.” Current day media narratives may appear, superficially, more complex, but the same underlying assumptions remain. The invasion of Iraq, in order to steal [oil](http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=-8957268309327954402), was presented as the generous extension of “democracy” to that country. Only those audaciously convinced of their innate moral superiority can justify such a huge loss of human life in the name of a failing political system that serves only to protect corporate elites, alienating the vast majority of the population (many of whom don’t vote anyway).¶ While the West ceaselessly attempts to assert its right to police the world on the basis of its “advanced” economy, the truth is that the wealth of Europe, Australia and the USA is entirely the result of systematic theft, genocide, slavery, incessant exploitation and perpetual war. Needless to say, the current global economic recession, driven by blind greed and desperation for short term profit, exposes how the West’s inherently flawed economy is only able to squander its vast amassed wealth leaving disparity, poverty and [environmental destruction](http://wakeupfreakout.org/) in its wake.¶ In addition to rejecting the racist narratives underpinning war, it is also important to examine the gendered myths surrounding conflict and male violence. The widespread nature of the violence that women face during so-called peacetime, and the fact that men’s violence against women is often exacerbated during male-dominated conflicts, has led some to conclude that there must be something innate about men’s violence. This natural aggression, so the argument goes, inevitably leads to the creation of bellicose institutions and practices such as armies and war. Men are, apparently, strong, virile, aggressive and competitive; women on the other hand, despite their conventional support for wars and their successful participation in both statist and guerilla armies, are more often associated with the home-front and peace.¶ Women, we are led to believe, are neither violent nor aggressive, but rather they are caring and gentle. The peace movement and anti-war activism are also often associated with women; see for example the [Mothers of the Plaza de Mayo](http://www.madres.org/navegar/nav.php) in Argentina, the [International Women’s Peace Service in Palestine](http://iwps.info/?page_id=62), [the Greenham Common Women’s Peace Camp](http://www.greenhamwpc.org.uk/) in the UK and [Code Pink](http://www.codepink4peace.org/) in the US.¶ However, feminist critiques of traditional, patriarchal gender roles have thrown the gendered nature of war into question. The crucial role of environmental factors such as cultural expectations and socio-political norms has questioned the biological justifications for the apparent differences between the behaviour of men and women.¶ To put it crudely, scientists have never found the part of the Y chromosome that determines that men like competitive sports and are predisposed to aggression. Similarly, there is no part of women’s genetic make-up that makes them naturally better at cleaning, cooking or caring for others. So, the gender roles that underpin patriarchy and war are socially constructed; indeed, they change over time and according to different cultural contexts. Nevertheless, those who continue to espouse patriarchal explanations will assure us that our hormones cause and explain the inequality of male and female social roles.¶ The fact is that the popular division of testosterone and estrogen into ‘male’ and ‘female’ hormones respectively is simplistic and misguided. Women and men produce both hormones in their adrenal glands and a biochemical reaction actually converts testosterone, which is a by-product of progesterone, into an estrogen. Perhaps most interestingly, from the age of about 7 months to 7 years, levels of testosterone are the same in boys and girls.¶ In other words, young boys complete seven years of indoctrination into an all-encompassing global patriarchal system that teaches them that boys and girls are completely different, before this starts to affect their testosterone levels. Our bodies and brains are profoundly affected by our social environment. Hormones levels are inhibited and suppressed, or conversely, encouraged and increased, depending on whether they receive positive or negative feedback from the social environment. Social cues affect neural activity which in turn affects the structure of the brain itself, as well as gene expression. It is impossible to ascertain how children would act if they were allowed to develop their own identities, based on personal preference, free from the restraints and expectations of patriarchal gender roles.¶ Under patriarchy, white men have disproportionate political, social and economic power. Violence is male-dominated just as most aspects of political and social life are controlled by white men. War propaganda in the West has often employed gendered notions of manhood to encourage young men to fight. Utilising the idea of the sacred patriarchal lineage, men are reminded that their fathers and grandfathers sacrificed and fought and if they are ‘real men’ and not ‘cowards’ then they should too. Enemies are feminised and demonised while the home front is also equated with women as young soldiers are encouraged to feel as if they are going to war to protect female relatives and loved ones.¶ But who benefits from this gendered war propaganda? The often under-privileged young soldiers who return from war rarely feel as if their masculinity has been validated; they often suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder and [many](http://www.ivaw.org/about/why-we-are-against-wars) are aware that they have been co-opted into participating in genocidal imperialism. As mentioned above, the inherently flawed economic and political logic of capitalism financially and ideologically depends on wars and armed conflicts to boost arms sales and to ‘divide and rule’ by rallying different groups of oppressed people into fighting against each other, while the elites divide the spoils of wars amongst themselves.¶ In order to prevent working-class whites from realising what they have [in common](http://rebelgriot.blogspot.co.uk/2011/08/david-starkey-is-right.html) with the global majority, narratives of white supremacy and the [economic](http://www.guardian.co.uk/society/2012/mar/09/half-uk-young-black-men-unemployed) and socio-political [benefits](http://www.amptoons.com/blog/files/mcintosh.html#daily) of being white (aka [white privilege](http://gse.berkeley.edu/faculty/ZLeonardo/ColorofSupremacy.pdf)), often succeed in encouraging racism, and can also lead to an increase in the popularity of [fascism](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/English_Defence_League)

The embargo against Cuba violates human rights and is racist—defenses of the embargo based on Cuba’s human rights violations overlook the immorality of the collective punishment of civilians

**Mwaria 99** (Cheryl, “The Immorality of Collective Punishment: A closer look on the impact of the U.S embargo on the health of Cubans, 1999, <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10999949909362163>)

Nowhere is the interrelationship of the moral, the political, and the medical more evident than in the impact of the U.S embargo on the health system of Cuba. By banning the sale of food and most medicine, the embargo “appears to violate the most basic international charters and conventions governing human rights,” according to a March 1997 report of the American Association for World Health. Supporters of the embargo attempt to justify it on the basis of Cuba’s alleged violation of individual rights. Such a justification overlooks the immorality of the collective punishment of everyday citizens. It is both hypocritical and subtly racist. As a growing number of human rights advocates have argued, only the combined perspective of cultural arrogance and willful ignorance enable such assertions.

Imperialism is ethically bankrupt by valuing security risks over collateral damage

McNally 6 (David, Professor of political science at York University “The new imperialists – Ideologies of Empire” Ch 5 Pg 92) JL

Yet, even on Ignatieff ’s narrow definition, in which human rights are about stopping unmerited cruelty and suffering, the crucial question is how we are to do so. What if some means to this ostensible end – say, a military invasion – can reasonably be expected to produce tens of thousands of civilian casualties and an almost certain breakdown in social order? Ignatieff ’s doctrine of human rights provides absolutely no ethico-philosophical criteria in that regard. Instead, he offers a pragmatic judgement – and a highly dubious one – that only U.S. military power can be expected to advance human rights in the zones where “barbarians” rule. But note: this is an utterly ad hoc addition to his theory. In no respect can it be said to flow from any of his reflections on human rights per se. Moreover, others proceeding from the same principle of limiting cruelty and suffering have arrived at entirely opposite conclusions with respect to imperial war. Ignatieff ’s myriad proclamations for human rights thus lack any demonstrable tie to his support of empire and imperial war. This is convenient, of course, since the chasm between moralizing rhetoric and imperial advocacy allows Ignatieff to pump out empty platitudes as if these contained real ethical guidance. Concrete moral choices, involving historical study and calibrations of real human risk, never enter the equation. So, Ignatieff can drone on about the world being a better place without Saddam, never so much as acknowledging the cost of this result: some 25,000 Iraqis killed as a result of armed conflict since the start of the U.S. invasion, and probably more than 100,000 dead as a result of all the consequences of the U.S. war.24 Nowhere does he offer any kind of calculus for determining if these tens of thousands of deaths are ethically justified. Instead, banalities about being rid of Saddam are offered up without even countenancing the scale of human suffering that Ignatieff ’s preferred course of action – war and occupation – has entailed. But then, Ignatieff shows little regard for ordinary people in the zones of military conflict. His concern is for the security of the West and of the U.S.A. in particular. Ruminating about America’s new “vulnerability” in the world, for instance, he writes, When American naval planners looked south from the Suez Canal, they had only bad options. All the potential refuelling stops – Sudan, Somalia, Djibouti, Eritrea and Yemen – are dangerous places for American warships. As the attack on the U.S.S. Cole made clear, none of the governments in these strategically vital refuelling stops can actually guarantee the safety of their imperial visitors.25

We have a moral impetus to affirm universal human rights in international relations—debate is key to communicate a new epistemology of morality

Bernstorff and Venzke 9 (Jochen Von Bernstorff and Ingo Venzke, Max Planck Institute for Comparative Public Law and International Law and the University of Amsterdam center for International Law, “Ethos, Ethics, and Morality in International Relations” 2009)

27. According to a broad group of scholars, universally shared values lay the¶ foundation of international law, they provide guidance for its development and¶ they are the ultimate yardstick for any normative assessment. Universal values¶ form the spine of **a normative** order that aims at effective governance to¶ safeguard and promote universal values and global goals. Such approaches are¶ modified or rejected by others who draw attention to persistent normative¶ conflicts, rather unmediated power relations and the pitfalls on the way to just¶ action. Some scholars caution against the imposition of particular interests and of¶ particular moral convictions in the guise of claims to universal values; in this line,¶ international law may, in parts, be seen as legalized hegemony. Scholars prone to¶ such views would tend to accuse those who seek to backbone international law¶ with a moral impetus of engaging in an apologetic project. In turn, sceptical¶ approaches face the reproach of diminishing a benevolent force of international¶ law, or, in the extreme, of engaging in a nihilist destruction of all possibilities and¶ hopes to pursue universal values and to fight blatant injustices.¶ 28. Procedural and communicative approaches to conceiving the relationship¶ between morality and international law bear a grand potential for theoretical¶ refinement and improvement. In a world characterized by deep and persistent¶ value conflicts and power imbalances the imperative appears adequate that¶ assertions about the contents of a substantive morality can be continuously¶ contested in legal language. Morality in this perspective is the contingent aim of¶ continuous argument, persuasion and contestation in the legal form.¶ **29**. In a conclusive observation, the diverging conceptions, approaches and methods¶ respond to distinct sensibilities and priorities of concerns that arise from¶ diverging views on the existence and accessibility of a morality as well as on the¶ reality of international law. Leaving epistemology aside, such divergence appears¶ to emerge from disagreements about the degree to which the international legal¶ order does in fact reflect aspirations of all those affected by it, about the extent to¶ - 11 -¶ which it does already work towards justice, and about the potential and promise¶ that international law can actually sustain. In other words, under the surface of¶ distinct theoretical approaches to morality and international law loom diverging¶ political judgments of the status quo of the current international legal order, of its¶ history, its achievements and of its future. In this perspective, the professional¶ ethos of each international lawyer is carried by his or her normative convictions¶ and sensibilities.

## 1AC Contraceptives

Embargo-caused shortages of contraceptives cause abortion, teen pregnancy, and HIV

Lundy 13, and Therese Jennissen, Colleen Lundy School of Social Work, Carleton University Associate Professor, supervisor of doctoral studies, Ph. D, teaches Women, Male Violence and Social change Direct Intervention: individuals, Families and Groups Foundations of Structural Analysis, Social Welfare and Social Work http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0277539501001637

Cuban women are affected by the serious shortage of reliable contraceptives. Although access to contraceptives is a fundamental right, shortages of products such as condoms have necessitated a reliance on abortion (Aguilar & Pereira, 1995), and have led to a rise in teenage pregnancies (Catasús Cervera, 1996) and HIV infections in Cuban women (Dı́az Alonzo, Sintes, & Fernández, 1995). There is a growing concern over the increase in numbers of teen mothers who now represent 25% of new mothers. This rate, one of the highest rates worldwide, exceeds the rate of 14% in both Costa Rica and Nicaragua (Neft & Levine, 1997, p. 111).

Embargo forces pregnancy and abortions

Walker 98 S. Lynne Copley News Service, won the 2006 National Reporting prize, *Abortions have become a part of life for many Cuban women* text copy

Alensay Perez had an abortion the day after Christmas. It was her fifth abortion in 10 years.¶ The unemployed, single mother can't afford to have more children. So she will have more abortions instead.¶ Although Pope John Paul II has repeatedly condemned Cuba's practice of legal abortions during his five-day visit, Perez and hundreds of thousands of other Cuban women see abortion as the only way to keep their families small.¶ Contraceptives are scarce in this island nation isolated from the rest of the world by the U.S. embargo and Fidel Castro's Communist regime. And abortions are provided free of charge at government-run hospitals.¶ John Paul accused the Castro government of fomenting ''anti-birth mentality'' under ''the guise of freedom and progress.''¶ The Pope is expected to speak out against sexual promiscuity and deteriorating family values during his final Mass Sunday (Jan. 25) in Havana.¶ Perez will be at the Mass. Her 10-year-old daughter, the only child Perez says she'll ever have, will be listening too.¶ ''There should not be so many abortions,'' the soft-spoken, 24-year-old woman says. ''Women should take care of themselves.'' ¶ Cuba has the highest abortion rate in Latin America.¶ In this nation of 11 million people, Cuba's top public health official says there is one abortion for every child born.¶ That means there were 152,547 abortions and an equal number of births in Cuba last year.¶ Abortions have been permitted by the Cuban government for the past 20 years. Since then, more than 3 million have been performed.¶ Before Cuba made abortions legal, women were dying from back-room operations done ''in a humiliating and clandestine way,'' said Dr. Mirna Ortega, a specialist in obstetrics.¶ The decision to lift the ban was ''an emancipation of the Cuban woman,'' she said.¶ In recent years, however, government doctors become increasingly concerned about the soaring number of abortions.¶ More and more sexually active teen-age girls are having abortions to terminate unwanted pregnancies...''The government is not in agreement with abortion. It is not the method we recommend,'' said Ortega. ''But it is a woman's right.''¶ Ortega, a plump, middle-aged woman with a soothing voice, offers family planning at a government clinic near downtown Havana.¶ She teaches women about birth control methods, counsels couples to plan their families, and gives out contraceptives to those who want to put off having children.¶ Ortega admits her job is sometimes difficult because contraceptives are scarce.¶ The economic embargo has severely limited medicines entering Cuba. Sometimes women get pregnant because the government does not have enough contraceptives to hand out.¶ ''We do not have abundance. We are trying to control, to regulate the supply because of our economic situation,'' says Ortega. ''You have to be a doctor working directly with people to feel the inhumanity of this.'' Despite the shortage of contraceptives, Ortega says the family planning program has reduced abortions. Since 1990, the abortion rate at her clinic has fallen 60 percent, she says.¶ But doctors at other government-run hospitals say the abortion rate is still disturbingly high.¶ ''Adolescents regard abortion as just one more contraceptive,'' said Dr. Georgina Areces, a gynecology and obstetrics specialist at a hospital in Havana.¶ When the Cuban government made abortions legal, it failed to educate women about sex, contraceptives and conception.¶ ''We need sex education that is profound. Not just one little class,'' Areces said. ''It has to be more realistic than that.''¶ At the noisy, run-down hospital where Areces works, hundreds of women get abortions each year.¶ She talks to her patients about the medical risks of abortions and methods of preventing pregnancy. But when Areces speaks to teen-agers, ''it goes in one ear and out the other,'' she said.¶ When the girls get pregnant, their mothers who have often had abortions themselves take them to the hospital to terminate their pregnancies.¶ Over the past several years, the age of girls seeking abortions has steadily dropped.¶ Abortions ''are being abused,'' Areces said. ''You don't want people to act like they're indigenous. You want them act responsibly.'' ¶ Dr. Conchita Morales wants to halt abortions in Cuba…The couple works with the Catholic Church to convince pregnant women who are considering abortions to put their babies up for adoption.¶ ''There are people who want to adopt children. But here, no one gives up their child,'' Morales said. ''If they don't want the child, they abort.''¶ Cuban women see abortions as a quick, simple remedy.¶ A Catholic nun, who devotes most of her time to working with pregnant women, says abortions have become a normal part of Cubans' reproductive lives.¶ ''They have created a culture where people think having an abortion is like pulling a tooth,'' she said.

Embargo degrades women’s reproductive rights

Petchesky 2000 Rosalind. “Human Rights, Reproductive Health and Economic Justice: Why They Are Indivisible.” Reproductive Health Matters. Page 15. May, 2000. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdfplus/3775184.pdf>

Viewing the intersections of health, trade and human rights also raises questions about the devastating health impact on innocent civilians, especially women and children, of economic sanctions against so-called rogue states. The unilaterally imposed US embargo of Cuba, for example - extended in 1996 through the Helms- Burton Act to foreign companies that seek to trade with Cuba - has contributed to increases in maternal malnutrition, low birth-weight babies and premature births. This, in a country whose public health care provision has until recently been among the best, and whose infant and maternal mortality rates among the lowest, in the world. Because of blocked access to imported parts, the embargo has impaired the ability of Cuba's domestic pharmaceutical industry to release millions of contraceptive pills, so that Cuban women are reliant on donated pills. The embargo's restriction on exports of x-ray film to Cuba has curtailed the availability of mammograms, formerly routine for all Cuban women over 35, to those considered at high risk, with all the implications of increased risk of breast cancer deaths.21 In other words, the human rights aspects of trade policies are fully gender-specific.

Withholding contraception is immoral and patriarchal—denies right to choose

Harrison 81, Beverly Wildung. Professor of Christian ethics, Union Theological Seminary, New York. Won multiple awards and recognitions for contribution to studies on female sociology, famous for unique brand of feminism that redefines the Christian mindset. *Theology of Pro-Choice: A Feminist Perspective* in *The Witness,* Vol. 64, Nos. 7 and 8. Book

A treatment of any moral problem is inadequate if it fails to analyze the morality of a given act in a way that represents the concrete experience of the agent who faces a decision with respect to this act. Misogyny in Christian discussions of contraception is evidenced clearly in that the contraception decision is never treated in the way it arises as part of the female agent's life process. The decision at issue when the dilemma of choice arises for women is whether or not to be pregnant. In most discussions of the morality of contraception it is treated as an abstract act, rather than as a possible way we deal with a pregnancy, which, frequently, is the result of circumstances beyond the woman's control. In any pregnancy a woman's life is deeply, irrevocably affected. Those who uphold the unexceptional immorality of contraception are probably wise to obscure the fact that an unwanted pregnancy always involves a life-shaping consequence for a woman, because suppressing the identity of the moral agent and the reality of her dilemma greatly reduces the ability to recognize the moral complexity of abortion. When the question of abortion arises it is usually because a woman finds herself facing an unwanted pregnancy. Consider the actual circumstances that may precipitate this. One is the situation in which a woman did not intend to be sexually active or did not intend into a sexual activity. Since women are frequently victims of sexual violence, numerous cases of this type arise because of rape, incest, or forced marital coitus. Many morally sensitive opponents of contraception concede that in such cases contraception may be morally justifiable. I insist that in such cases it is a moral good, because it is not rational to treat a newly fertilized ovum as though it had the same value as the existent, pregnant, female person, and because it is morally wrong to make the victim of sexual violence suffer the further agonies of unwanted pregnancy and childbearing against her will. Enforced pregnancy is a morally reprehensible violation of bodily integrity if women were recognized as fully human moral agents. Another more frequent case results when a woman -or usually a young girl- anticipates in heterosexual activity without clear knowledge of how pregnancy occurs and without intention to conceive a child. A girl who became pregnant in this manner would, by traditional natural-law morality, be held to be in a state of invincible ignorance and therefore not morally culpable. One scholarly Roman Catholic nun I met argued -quite appropriately, I believe- that her Church should not consider young Catholic girls who use contraception as morally culpable because the Church overly protected them, which contributed to their tack of understanding procreation or to their inability to cope with the sexual pressures girls experience in contemporary society.

Patriarchal norms create war, violence, and provide a groundwork in which rape and spouse beating are legitimized

Warren and Cady 96 – Assistant Professor of Philosophy at Macalester University; and Assistant Professor of Philosophy at Hamline University [Karen and Duane, Bringing peace home: feminism, violence, and nature, p. 12-13]

Operationalized, the evidence of patriarchy as a dysfunctional system is found in the behaviors to which it gives rise, (c) the unmanageability, (d) which results. For example, in the United States, current estimates are that one out of every three or four women will be raped by someone she knows; globally, rape, sexual harassment, spouse-beating, and sado-massochistic pornography are examples of behaviors practices, sanctioned, or tolerated within patriarchy. In the realm of environmentally destructive behaviors, strip-mining, factory farming, and pollution of the air, water, and soil are instances of behaviors maintained and sanctioned within patriarchy. They, too, rest on the faulty beliefs that it is okay to “rape the earth,” that it is “man’s God-given right” to have dominion (that is, domination) over the earth, that nature has only instrumental value, that environmental destruction is the acceptable price we pay for “progress.” And the presumption of warism, that war is a natural, righteous, and ordinary way to impose dominion on a people or nation, goes hand in hand with patriarchy and leads to dysfunctional behaviors of nations and ultimately to international unmanageability. Much of the current “unmanageability” of contemporary life in patriarchal societies, (d), is then viewed as a consequence of a patriarchal preoccupation with activities, events, and experiences that reflect historically male-gender-identified beliefs, values, attitudes, and assumptions. Included among these real-life consequences are precisely those concerns with nuclear proliferation, war, environmental destruction, and violence towards women, which many feminists see as the logical outgrowth of patriarchal thinking. In fact, it is often only through observing these dysfunctional behaviors—the symptoms of dysfunctionality—that one can truly see that and how patriarchy serves to maintain and perpetuate them. When patriarchy is understood as a dysfunctional system, this “unmanageability” can be seen for what it is—as a predictable and thus logical consequence of patriarchy. The theme that global environmental crises, war, and violence generally are predictable and logical consequences of sexism and patriarchal culture is pervasive in ecofeminist literature. Ecofeminist Charlene Spretnak, for instance, argues that “a militarism and warfare are continual features of a patriarchal society because they reflect and instill patriarchal values and fulfill needs of such a system. Acknowledging the context of patriarchal conceptualizations that feed militarism is a first step toward reducing their impact and preserving life on Earth.” Stated in terms of the foregoing model of patriarchy as a dysfunctional social system, the claims by Spretnak and other feminists take on a clearer meaning: Patriarchal conceptual frameworks legitimate impaired thinking (about women, national and regional conflict, the environment) which is manifested in behaviors which, if continued, will make life on earth difficult, if not impossible. It is a stark message, but it is plausible. Its plausibility lies in understanding the conceptual roots of various woman-nature-peace connections in regional, national, and global contexts.

Embargo reinforces patriarchal norms

Vilma 2000 Hidalgo, Vilma and Martinez, Milagros. “Is the U.S. Economic Embargo on Cuba Morally Defensible?” 2000. Pg 110-112. <http://www.stthomas.edu/CathStudies/logos/archives/volumes/3-4/3-4%20Article.pdf>

The economic blockade, like almost all events in a country’s economy, is reﬂected in people’s daily lives and especially in the context of family. Throughout the time of crisis, intensiﬁed by the blockade and coupled with the existence of cultural norms that continue to prevail in Cuba, Cuban women have been called upon to make a great sacriﬁce, becoming protagonists and strategists in the drama of family survival. The analysis of the impact of the U.S. blockade on the lives of Cuban women and their family situation has been carefully studied by several of the country’s female academics.10 Taking these rigorous studies as a point of reference, we shall try to characterize and quantify the most salient effects in the nineties. Cuba’s social plan called for the full participation of women in all society’s tasks, and this ideal has materialized in educational and cultural work carried out during four decades and in the strengthening of an institutional and legal framework that protects full equality of rights between men and women. Yet there still remain deeply rooted ideas, beliefs, and cultural traditions that assign to women the greater responsibilities associated with raising children, homemaking, domestic chores, and countless tasks to assure the well-being of the family group. This is a characteristic still prevalent in Cuban families, although its manifestations vary in intensity according to age, educational level, social standing, and other factors. In contrast, women have made greater and greater inroads over the course of four decades, gaining enhanced professional status and successfully occupying positions in social, scientiﬁc, academic, technical, and other ﬁelds. In this sense, the economic crisis has brought greater complexity to the entire scenario, creating true conﬂicts for Cuban women. The crisis heightened by the blockade affects Cuban women in various and diverse forms. In the family setting, where meeting basic needs of nutrition, personal and domestic hygiene, and adequate rest are paramount, accomplishing household chores can become a true dilemma for women in dire economic straits. Thus, Cuban women have experienced for themselves the harsh effects of the blockade on their regular routine, reﬂected in the daily difﬁculties created by shortages of food, delays in receiving supplies of essential products, difﬁculties in obtaining articles for personal and family hygiene, limitations in acquiring clothing and footwear, short supplies of medicines, the absence of transportation, and costs in terms of time, among many others. The scarcity of fuel during the ﬁrst years of the crisis directly affected the life of Cuban households: for example, the average number of hours without electricity or water supplied to the domestic sector rose considerably during the period 1990–1995. In addition, the availability of electrical appliances and of replacement parts for existing machines was sharply reduced.11 It is evident that during those years each Cuban woman became a true strategist of family survival, needing to meet not only the most basic needs for her family, but also assuring that each of its members, children and men, might continue to carry out their social roles and activities. Working just to get by, which now occupied most of her energies, also impinged on the satisfaction of her spiritual needs, such as modest opportunities for enjoying recreation, time with family, and professional growth. However, there has not been a return of Cuban women to the home in proportion to the intensity of the crisis, which is explained by a combination of two factors. First, in spite of cultural standards, the integration of women into the workplace is a gender victory that has been incorporated into her identity. For that reason, even in the worst of circumstances a majority of women were not willing to quite their jobs, even though continuing to work involved a great sacrifice of a personal nature. Second, with women’s entrance into the job market, many families were now beneﬁted by the earnings brought home by women, income that became more and more essential in the context of crisis. Moreover, the contribution made by women to the family budget in many cases can hardly be overestimated, given their abilities and professional/technical skills.

## 2AC

### 2AC Warming Minorities

Especially true for Blacks – 81% think the government should act – aff is key to involve them in the climate change debate

Deborah Zabarenko 08, Environment Correspondent, Jul 29, 2008, (“U.S. blacks face harsher climate change impact”, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2008/07/29/us-climate-usa-blacks-idUSN2933881420080729?feedType=RSS&feedName=environmentNews>, AW)

"There is a fierce urgency regarding climate change effects on the African-American community," said Ralph Everett, the co-chair of the Commission to Engage African-Americans on Climate Change said. "People need to understand what is at stake -- our very health and well-being." Blacks are more than twice as likely as whites to live in cities where the so-called heat island effect is expected to make temperature increases more severe, the newly formed group said at a briefing. More blacks also will be "fuel poor" as energy demand rises due to higher air-conditioning loads, population growth and urbanization, commission said. In a survey of 750 U.S. black adults released by the commission, 81 percent said the U.S. government should take strong action to deal with global warming, and seven in 10 said it was very important for the 2008 presidential candidates to do something about it. A solid majority, 64 percent, of those surveyed by telephone between June 20 and July 3 said they would be willing to pay an additional $10 a month to fight global warming. Twenty-eight percent were willing to pay an added $25 a month and only 14 percent were willing to pay an extra $50. As expected, poorer respondents were willing to pay less, said David Bositis, who supervised the survey for the non-profit Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies, which launched the commission's effort. When asked an open-ended question about what they considered to be the most important problem facing the United States, 5 percent of respondents answered global warming. This has never been mentioned before as the top problem by any black respondents in surveys in 2000, 2004 and 2007. In this survey, 42 percent listed the economy as the most important problem, followed by 17 percent answering energy. The 5 percent who considered global warming paramount compared with 8 percent who said the Iraq war and 3 percent who answered education. Bositis said most U.S. surveys and polls have such a small number of black participants that it is difficult to separate out black attitudes. The commission aims to draw African-Americans into the climate change debate and to involve the black community in economic opportunities of the green economy.

## 2AC Warming

## 2AC Imperialism

## 2AC Contraceptives

## Offcase

#### Anti-blackness isn’t a monolithic root cause---they shut off productive debate over solutions – means the alt fails

Tommie Shelby 7, Professor of African and African American Studies and of Philosophy at Harvard, 2007, We Who Are Dark: The Philosophical Foundations of Black Solidarity

Others might challenge the distinction between ideological and structural causes of black disadvantage, on the grounds that we are rarely, if ever, able to so neatly separate these factors, an epistemic situation that is only made worse by the fact that these causes interact in complex ways with behavioral factors. These distinctions, while perhaps straightforward in the abstract, are difficult to employ in practice. For example, it would be difficult, if not impossible, for the members of a poor black community to determine with any accuracy whether their impoverished condition is due primarily to institutional racism, the impact of past racial injustice, the increasing technological basis of the economy, shrinking state budgets, the vicissitudes of world trade, the ascendancy of conservative ideology, poorly funded schools, lack of personal initiative, a violent drug trade that deters business investment, some combination of these factors, or some other explanation altogether. Moreover, it is notoriously difficult to determine when the formulation of putatively race-neutral policies has been motivated by racism or when such policies are unfairly applied by racially biased public officials.¶ There are very real empirical difficulties in determining the specific causal significance of the factors that create and perpetuate black disadvantage; nonetheless, it is clear that these factors exist and that justice will demand different practical remedies according to each factor's relative impact on blacks' life chances. We must acknowledge that our social world is complicated and not immediately transparent to common sense, and thus that systematic empirical inquiry, historical studies, and rigorous social analysis are required to reveal its systemic structure and sociocultural dynamics. There is, moreover, no mechanical or infallible procedure for determining which analyses are the soundest ones. In addition, given the inevitable bias that attends social inquiry, legislators and those they represent cannot simply defer to social-scientific experts. We must instead rely on open public debate—among politicians, scholars, policy makers, intellectuals, and ordinary citizens—with the aim of garnering rationally motivated and informed consensus. And even if our practical decision procedures rest on critical deliberative discourse and thus live up to our highest democratic ideals, some trial and error through actual practice is unavoidable.¶ These difficulties and complications notwithstanding, a general recognition of the distinctions among the ideological and structural causes of black disadvantage could help blacks refocus their political energies and self-help strategies. Attention to these distinctions might help expose the superficiality of theories that seek to reduce all the social obstacles that blacks face to contemporary forms of racism or white supremacy. A more penetrating, subtle, and empirically grounded analysis is needed to comprehend the causes of racial inequality and black disadvantage. Indeed, these distinctions highlight the necessity to probe deeper to find the causes of contemporary forms of racism, as some racial conflict may be a symptom of broader problems or recent social developments (such as immigration policy or reduced federal funding for higher education).

**Turn: the 1AC levies anti-blackness on Latin American society but Cuba has systematically combatted racism—solving class also solves racism--1AC doesn’t do anything.**

JORQUERA ‘98 writer for the GREENLEFT WEEKLY 1998

Roberto- “Cuba’s Struggle Against Racism;” from GREEN LEFT WEEKLY March 11, 1998

<http://www.angelfire.com/pr/red/cuba/cuba_anti_racism.htm>. EJW.)

**Since 1959, Cuba's** revolutionary **government has embarked on the task of eliminating centuries of racial prejudice dating from** the arrival of the Spanish in **1492**, when the indigenous people of the island were massacred and the black slave trade was introduced. ¶ To gain a full appreciation of the advances that have been achieved in combating racial prejudice in revolutionary Cuba, it is important to have an outline of the history of race relations in Cuba. The major historical periods are the colonial period, the period of the republic 1901-1959 and after the 1959 revolution. ¶ Racism is an ideology that justifies the social practice of racial oppression, of institutionalised inequality based on racial categorisation. The invasion of the Americas following its "discovery" by Christopher Columbus was central to the development of capitalism in Europe. After the invasion it was necessary for the colonial ruling class to develop racist bigotry to justify the oppression of the indigenous people and the development of the slave trade. ¶ **Since** the victory of **the revolution, racist oppression has been systematically combated and defeated.** However it would be utopian to suggest that individual racial prejudices do not still exist in sections of the population. **The Cuban revolution laid the economic and social foundations for the effective elimination of racism**, but, with increasing political and economic attacks by the US, even the gains that have been achieved face pressures. ¶ **The history of Cuba** is a history of socio-economic discrimination against the overwhelming majority of the population. This **discrimination was based not only on race but more importantly on class,** leading many scholars to define the pre-revolutionary period as that of a colour/class system. **The** **post-revolutionary government, therefore, correctly realised that to overcome racism it needed to overcome the class system itself**.

### No Root Cause

#### Violence is proximately caused – best method of analysis

Sharpe, lecturer, philosophy and psychoanalytic studies, and Goucher, senior lecturer, literary and psychoanalytic studies – Deakin University, ‘10 (Matthew and Geoff, Žižek and Politics: An Introduction, p. 231 – 233) We realise that this argument, which we propose as a new ‘quilting’ framework to explain Žižek’s theoretical oscillations and political prescriptions, raises some large issues of its own. While this is not the place to further that discussion, we think its analytic force leads into a much wider critique of ‘Theory’ in parts of the latertwentieth- century academy, which emerged following the ‘cultural turn’ of the 1960s and 1970s in the wake of the collapse of Marxism. Žižek’s paradigm to try to generate all his theory of culture, subjectivity, ideology, politics and religion is psychoanalysis. But a similar criticism would apply, for instance, to theorists who feel that the method Jacques Derrida developed for criticising philosophical texts can meaningfully supplant the methodologies of political science, philosophy, economics, sociology and so forth, when it comes to thinking about ‘the political’. Or, differently, thinkers who opt for Deleuze (or Deleuze’s and Guattari’s) Nietzschean Spinozism as a new metaphysics to explain ethics, politics, aesthetics, ontology and so forth, seem to us candidates for the same type of **criticism, as a reductive passing over** the **empirical and analytic distinctness of** the **different** object **fields in complex societies.** In truth, we feel that Theory, and the continuing line of ‘master thinkers’ who regularly appear particularly in the English- speaking world, is the last gasp of what used to be called First Philosophy. The philosopher ascends out of the city, Plato tells us, from whence she can espie the Higher Truth, which she must then bring back down to political earth. From outside the city, we can well imagine that she can see much more widely than her benighted political contemporaries. But from these philosophical heights, we can equally suspect that the ‘master thinker’ is also **always in danger of passing over** the **salient differences** and features of political life – differences only too evident to people ‘on the ground’. Political life, after all, is always a more complex affair than a bunch of ideologically duped fools staring at and enacting a wall (or ‘politically correct screen’) of ideologically produced illusions, from Plato’s timeless cave allegory to Žižek’s theory of ideology. We know that Theory largely understands itself as avowedly ‘post- metaphysical’. It aims to erect its new claims on the gravestone of First Philosophy as the West has known it. But it also tells us that people very often do not know what they do. And so it seems to us that too many of its proponents and their followers are mourners who remain in the graveyard, propping up the gravestone of Western philosophy under the sign of some totalising account of absolutely everything – enjoyment, différance, biopower . . . Perhaps the time has come, we would argue, less for one more would- be global, allpurpose existential and political Theory than for a **multi- dimensional and interdisciplinary** critical **theory** that would challenge the chaotic specialisation neoliberalism speeds up in academe, which mirrors and accelerates the splintering of the Left over the last four decades. This would mean that we would have to shun the hope that one method, one perspective, or one master thinker could single- handedly decipher all the complexity of socio- political life, the concerns of really existing social movements – which specifi cally does not mean mindlessly celebrating difference, marginalisation and multiplicity as if they could be suffi cient ends for a new politics. **It would be to reopen critical theory and non- analytic philosophy to the other intellectual disciplines**, most of **whom** today **pointedly reject Theory’s legitimacy,** neither reading it nor taking it seriously.

### 2AC—AT STATE BAD

The state must be engaged---action can be reoriented away from past abuses, the alt goes too far

Williams and Krause 97 Michael, assistant professor of political science at the University of Southern Maine and Keith, professor of political science at the Graduate Institute of International Studies, associate professor of political science at York University, Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases, edited by Krause and Williams, p. xvi

Many of the chapters in this volume thus retain a concern with the centrality of the state as a locus not only of obligation but of effective political action. In the realm of organized violence, states also remain the preeminent actors. The task of a critical approach is not to deny the centrality of the state in this realm but, rather, to understand more fully its structures, dynamics, and possibilities for reorientation. From a critical perspective, state action is flexible and capable of reorientation, and analyzing state policy need not therefore be tantamount to embracing the statist assumptions of orthodox conceptions. To exclude a focus on state action from a critical perspective on the grounds that it plays inevitably within the rules of existing conceptions simply reverses the error of essentializing the state. Moreover, it loses the possibility of influencing what remains the most structurally capable actor in contemporary world politics.

#### State institutions are inevitable---must work within them rather than the alt

Paul A. Passavant 7, Hobart and William Smith Colleges in New York, “The Contradictory State of Giorgio Agamben”, Political Theory Volume 35, Number 2, April, SAGE

Fourth, the state's institutions are among the few with the capacity to respond to the exigency of human needs identified by political theorists. These actions will necessarily be finite and less than wholly adequate, but responsibility may lie on the side of acknowledging these limitations and seeking to redress what is lacking in state action rather than calling for pure potentiality and an end to the state. We may conclude that claims to justice or democracy based on the wish to rid ourselves of the state once and for all are like George W. Bush claiming to be an environmentalist because he has proposed converting all of our cars so that they will run on hydrogen.5" Meanwhile, in the here and now, there are urgent claims that demand finite acts that by definition will be both divisive and less than what a situation demands.52 In the end, the state remains. Let us defend this state of due process and equal protection against its ruinous other.

Rejectiong state institutions and education about the state is alike historical policy of “keeping the Negro in his place.”

Woodson ’33 [1933, Carter G. Woodson is an African American historian and educator; he is the founder and editor of the Journal of Negro History and the Negro History Bulletin and the founder of the association for the study of Negro life and history. *The Mis-Education of the Negro*. Page 70. <http://books.google.com/books?id=zF6J8Zge4XgC&printsec=frontcover&dq=the+miseducation+of+the+negro&hl=en&sa=X&ei=PBtbUvbTOsSuyQGZlYGABw&ved=0CDIQ6AEwAA#v=onepage&q&f=true>. EJW.]

Not long ago **a measure** was introduced in a certain State Legislature **to have the Constitution** of the United States thus **printed in school histories, but** when the bill was about to pass it was killed by **someone** who **made the point** it would never do to have Negroes study the Constitution of the United States. **If** the **Negroes were granted** the opportunity **to peruse** this document**, they might learn to contend for the rights** therein guaranteed and no Negro teacher who gives attention to such matters of the government is tolerated in those backward destricts. The teaching of the government **or the lack of such instruction, then, must be** made tot conform to **the policy of “keeping the Negro in his place.”**

Their reasons the state is bad just reinforces the reasons you should vote aff—knowing the oppressor’s tactics is the only way to effectively reform the system from inside out.

Williams, ’70 [1970, Robert F. Williams, interviewed by The Black Scholar, “Interviews,”, Vol. 1, No. 7, BLACK REVOLUTION (May 1970), pp. 13-14, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41163455>. EJW.]

Williams: **It is erroneous to think that one can isolate oneself completely from institutions of a social and political system that exercises power over the environment in which he resides**. **Self-imposed** and premature **isolation, initiated by the oppressed against the** organs of a **tyrranical establishment, militates against** revolutionary movements dedicated to radical **change**. **It is a grave error for** militant and just-minded **youth to reject** struggle-serving opportunities **to join the man’s** government services, police forces, peace corps, and vital organs of the **power structure**. Militants should become acquainted with the methods of the oppressor. **Meaningful changes can be more thoroughly effectuated by** militant **pressure from within** as well as without. **We can obtain valuable know-how from the oppressor. Struggle** is not all violence. Effective struggle **requires tactics**, plans, analysis and a highly sophisticated application of mental aptness. The forces of oppression and tyranny have perfected a highly articulate system of infiltration for undermining and frustrating the efforts of the oppressed in trying to upset the unjust status quo. To a great extent, the power structure keeps itself informed as to the revolutionary activity of freedom fighters. With the threat of extermination looming menacingly before black Americans, **it is pressingly imperative that our people** enter the vital organs of the establishment. **Infiltrate the man’s institutions**.

### 2AC – No Prior Questions

#### No prior questions

Jackson, associate professor of IR – School of International Service @ American University, ‘11

(Patrick Thadeus, The Conduct of Inquiry in International Relations, p. 57-59)

Perhaps the greatest irony of this instrumental, decontextualized importation of “falsification” and its critics into IR is the way that an entire line of thought that privileged disconfirmation and refutation—no matter how complicated that disconfirmation and refutation was in practice—has been transformed into a license to worry endlessly about foundational assumptions. At the very beginning of the effort to bring terms such as “paradigm” to bear on the study of politics, Albert O. Hirschman (1970b, 338) noted this very danger, suggesting that without “a little more ‘reverence for life’ and a little less straightjacketing of the future,” the focus on producing internally consistent packages of assumptions instead of actually examining complex empirical situations would result in scholarly paralysis. Here as elsewhere, Hirschman appears to have been quite prescient, inasmuch as the major effect of paradigm and research programme language in IR seems to have been a series of debates and discussions about whether the fundamentals of a given school of thought were sufficiently “scientific” in their construction. Thus we have debates about how to evaluate scientific progress, and attempts to propose one or another set of research design principles as uniquely scientific, and inventive, “reconstructions” of IR schools, such as Patrick James’ “elaborated structural realism,” supposedly for the purpose of placing them on a firmer scientific footing by making sure that they have all of the required elements of a basically Lakatosian19 model of science (James 2002, 67, 98–103). The bet with all of this scholarly activity seems to be that if we can just get the fundamentals right, then scientific progress will inevitably ensue . . . even though this is the precise opposite of what Popper and Kuhn and Lakatos argued! In fact, all of this obsessive interest in foundations and starting-points is, in form if not in content, a lot closer to logical positivism than it is to the concerns of the falsificationist philosophers, despite the prominence of language about “hypothesis testing” and the concern to formulate testable hypotheses among IR scholars engaged in these endeavors. That, above all, is why I have labeled this methodology of scholarship neopositivist. While it takes much of its self justification as a science from criticisms of logical positivism, in overall sensibility it still operates in a visibly positivist way, attempting to construct knowledge from the ground up by getting its foundations in logical order before concentrating on how claims encounter the world in terms of their theoretical implications. This is by no means to say that neopositivism is not interested in hypothesis testing; on the contrary, neopositivists are extremely concerned with testing hypotheses, but only after the fundamentals have been soundly established. Certainty, not conjectural provisionality, seems to be the goal—a goal that, ironically, Popper and Kuhn and Lakatos would all reject.

### 2AC – Vague Alts

No education from alts you aren’t able to engage with – independent voting issue

Vague alts – causes shifting prevents attack – no education – voter – turns K--

Galles 9 (Gary, Professor of Economics at Pepperdine, “Vagueness as a Political Strategy,” March 2, <http://blog.mises.org/archives/author/gary_galles/>)

 The problem with such vagueness is that any informed public policy decision has to be based on specific proposals. Absent concrete details, which is where the devil lurks, no one–including those proposing a “reform”–can judge how it would fare or falter in the real world. So when the President wants approval for a proposal which offers too few details for evaluation, we must ask why. Like private sector salesmen, politicians strive to present their wares as attractively as possible. Unlike them, however, a politician’s product line consists of claimed consequences of proposals not yet enacted. Further, politicians are unconstrained by truth in advertising laws, which would require that claims be more than misleading half-truths; they have fewer competitors keeping them honest; and they face “customers”–voters– far more ignorant about the merchandise involved than those spending their own money. These differences from the private sector explain why politicians’ “sales pitches” for their proposals are so vague. However, if vague proposals are the best politicians can offer, they are inadequate. If rhetoric is unmatched by specifics, there is no reason to believe a policy change will be an improvement, because no reliable way exists to determine whether it will actually accomplish what is promised. Only the details will determine the actual incentives facing the decision-makers involved, which is the only way to forecast the results, including the myriad of unintended consequences from unnoticed aspects. We must remember that, however laudable, goals and promises and claims of cost-effectiveness that are inconsistent with the incentives created will go unmet. It may be that President Obama knows too little of his “solution” to provide specific plans. If so, he knows too little to deliver on his promises. Achieving intended goals then necessarily depends on blind faith that Obama and a panoply of bureaucrats, legislators, overseers and commissions will somehow adequately grasp the entire situation, know precisely what to do about it, and do it right (and that the result will not be too painful, however serious the problem)–a prospect that, due to the painful lessons of history, attracts few real believers. Alternatively, President Obama may know the details of what he intends, but is not providing them to the public. But if it is necessary to conceal a plan’s details to put the best possible public face on it, those details must be adverse. If they made a more persuasive sales pitch, a politician would not hide actual details. They would be trumpeted at every opportunity, proving to a skeptical public he really had the answers, since concealing rather than revealing pays only when better informed citizens would be more inclined to reject a plan. Claiming adherence to elevated principles, but keeping detailed proposals from sight, also has a strategic advantage. It defuses critics. Absent details, any criticism can be parried by saying “that was not in our proposal” or “we have no plans to do that” or other rhetorical devices. It also allows a candidate to incorporate alternatives proposed as part of his evolving reform, as if it was his idea all along. The new administration has already put vague proposals on prominent display. However, adequate analysis cannot rest upon such flimsy foundations. That requires the nuts and bolts so glaringly absent. In the private sector, people don’t spend their own money on such vague promises of unseen products. It is foolhardy to act any differently when political salesmen withhold specifics, because political incentives guarantee that people would object to what is kept hidden. So while vagueness may be good political strategy, it virtually ensures bad policy, if Americans’ welfare is the criterion.

### 2AC Alt Fails

Liberal reformism is the only way to avoid reductive theories that collapse into totalitarianism making the system live up to its empty promises of equality is better than discarding equality—the alt fails

Jefferey Pyle 99, Boston College Law School, J.D., magna cum laude, Race, Equality and the Rule of Law: Critical Race Theory's Attack on the Promises of Liberalism, 40 B.C.L. Rev. 787

Liberal principles are therefore "indeterminate" to the extent that they are not mechanically determinative of every controversy.224 Indeed, as Samuel Huntington has pointed out, Americans hold potentially conflicting ideals (such as individualism and democracy, liberty and equality) simultaneously, without trying to resolve the conflicts between them once and for 1111.2" Rather, they have set up processes and institutions to resolve conflicts pragmatically, case-by-case, issue-byissue, problem-by-problem . 226 Liberals, unlike radical legal theorists, assume that there are no universal solvents, that values are not easily ranked"' and that reasoning by analogy is usually more helpful (and more persuasive) than deductions from the abstract theories of philosopher-kings. 228 Liberal politics, like the common-law courts on which it relies, requires perpetual re-examination of both the major and minor premises of most legal syllogisms. It allows for both continuity and change, stability and flexibility, tradition and innovation. 52•

The liberal system's celebrated capacity for social change rests in the ability of aggrieved citizens to confront power-holders, such as legislators, judges or voters, with their failures to live up to the promises of the "American Creed."23" In doing so, the aggrieved can argue with sonic force that they are seeking justice, not revolution, when in fact they may be seeking both."' The Voting Rights Act of 1965, for example, was not a radical measure, yet it started a revolution in Southern politics.232 It purported to secure a right already enshrined in the Fifteenth Amendment,233 and thus fulfill fundamental notions of equality that most Americans could not easily deny.231 The Act would probably not have passed, however, if it had been presented as a benefit to one group to the detriment of another in a zero-sum power game.

Second, liberal politics is about morality as well as interests. It is about holding public officials morally and politically responsible for meeting unfulfilled promises.235 By casting victims of discrimination as legitimate claimants to the promise of equality in the American Creed, liberal politics gives victims the higher moral ground, without fully separating them from the people whose oppressive behavior they seek to change.2"" The Reverend Martin Luther King exemplified this promissory politics best on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial in 1963, when he said:

In a sense we've come to our nation's capital to cash a check: When the architects of our republic wrote the magnificent words of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, they were signing a promissory note to which every American was to fall heir. This note was the promise that all men, yes, black men as well as white men, would be guaranteed the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

It is obvious today that America has defaulted on this promissory note. ... America has given Negro people a had check; a check which has come back marked "insufficient funds." We refuse to believe that there are insufficient funds in the great vaults of this nation. And so we have come to cash this check, a check that will give us upon demand the riches of freedom, and the security of justice. 2"7

Through this metaphor, King brilliantly articulated the promises and realities that animated the civil rights revolution in America. 238 He reminded Americans of their founding principles, assumed the fundamental equality of the bargainers, and placed the power structure on the delensive.239 King did not paint whites as irredeemably racist; he simply insisted that they live up to their obligations.")

To Derrick Bell, in contrast, the coffers of justice in America have always been empty. To him, the promises of liberalism are just "bogus freedom checks" which "the Man" will never honor.24 ' Bell, like other race-crits, attacks American liberalism from a European political orientation, which conceives of politics as a zero-sum struggle between entrenched classes or groups.242 In this view, all politics is power politics, and law serves merely as an instrument or oppression by the group that happens to be in power.2'3 No common principles exist which might persuade whites to he more inclusive. 241

The race-crits, like other class theorists, do not attempt to prove that African Americans are permanently disadvantaged; they simply assert it. Nor do they acknowledge that black Americans have made considerable (although Far from satisfactory) progress since de jure segregation was ended."' Critical race theory, like Marxism before it, clings to group "domination" as the single cause of disadvantage.2' 7 It takes one unifying idea—racial domination—and tries to fit all facts and law into it.248

Liberalism, on the other hand, distrusts grand unifying theories, preferring to emphasize process over ends. 24' As a result, liberalism frustrates anyone, Left or Right, who would have governments embrace their ideologies.25° Because of the value liberals place on liberty, they tend to he wary of the sort of power concentrations that could mandate changes quickly."' They prefer a more incremental approach to political change that depends on the consent of the governed, even when the governed are often ignorant, misguided and even bigoted. 252 Liberalism is never utopian, by anyone's definition, but always procedural, because it presupposes a society of people who profoundly disagree with each other and whose interests, goals, stakes and stands, cannot easily, if ever, be fully reconciled.'" Because of these differences, liberals know there is no such thing as a "benevolent despot," and that utopias almost invariably turn out to be dystopias. 254

Race-crits, on the other hand, are profoundly utopian and sometimes totalitarian.25' In their view, the law should ferret out and eliminate white racism at any costa''' Richard Delgado, for example, complains that "[n]othing in the law requires any [white] to lend a helping hand, to try to help blacks find jobs, befriend them, speak to them, make eye contact with them, help them fix a flat when they arc stranded on the highway, help them feel like 11111 persons. ... How can a system like that change anything?"257

The race-crits, in their preoccupation with power, forget that the power to persuade remains the principal way of achieving lasting change in a democratic political culture.258 A beneficial but controversial measure is much more likely to survive changes of the party in power if it can be said to carry out the will of "the people," from whom all power in the United States is said to derive. 25" For example, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, controversial as it was,'" has remained a bulwark of civil rights protection for thirty-six years because of its democratic and constitutional legitimacy. 2"1 On the other hand, if Malcolm X or the Black Panthers had attempted to set up a separate black state on American soil in the tradition of John Brown, their efforts would have been crushed immediately.

Specific policy proposals are key—alt fails—too vague.

Tommie Shelby 7, Professor of African and African American Studies and of Philosophy at Harvard, 2007, We Who Are Dark: The Philosophical Foundations of Black Solidarity

But African American philosophy does not typically make public policy recommendations. Although engaged with social realities and historical events, its mode of inquiry still tends to be relatively abstract and somewhat tentative in its conclusions, often asking more questions than it answers. It operates at the level of general principles rather than offering concrete proposals for social change. The intellectual culture of the United States has a strong bias against speculative inquiry, and thus philosophical work of the kind I engage in here may frustrate some readers, especially those interested in ideas largely for their immediate practical application to concrete problems. Political philosophy in particular can appear as worthless pontification or superfluous splitting of hairs. Moreover, given that African American philosophy scrutinizes and defends basic normative ideals, it might seem to be hopelessly Utopian, as engaged in painting a picture of an ideal world in which none of us will ever live. Because of this, some who are eager to get on with the important work of changing the world and not merely interpreting it become impatient with philosophical reflection—often concluding that, at best, it is irrelevant to practical matters or, at worst, it is a meaningless form of recreation engaged in by a self-important cadre of the intellectual elite. This study hopes to vindicate African American philosophy of the charge of practical irrelevance by using philosophical techniques to analyze current social problems that African Americans face.¶ The Structure of the Book¶ Chapter 1 foreshadows my core themes and conclusions by offering a new interpretation of the political philosophy of Martin R. Delany, a mid-nineteenth-century radical abolitionist and one of the founders of black nationalism. Competing strands in Delany's social thought—"classical" nationalism and "pragmatic" nationalism—offer two different foundations for black political solidarity. I argue that the pragmatic variant is the more cogent of the two, and the one that can still serve usefully as a theoretical schema through which African Americans can understand and carry out important political projects.¶ Chapter 2 takes up the challenge that class differentiation among black Americans poses for their solidarity, a subject Du Bois grappled with throughout his life. Focusing on his account of the relationship between black ideals, political solidarity, self-help strategies, and elite leadership, I argue that Du Bois, while never fully rebutting the charge of elitism often made against him, puts forward a conception of black solidarity that fuses moral principle, racial identification, and self-interest into a motivational basis for collective action across class differences. This account does not eliminate the threat of class-based fragmentation within the greater black population, but it does show that, despite growing class differentiation and social cleavages, black American political cooperation on terms of fairness and equal respect is still possible. It also helps us to better understand the significance of black pride and militancy for black politics. ¶ In Chapter 3 I examine the conception of black solidarity that was initially urged by Malcolm X and then later developed by Black Power advocates during the late 1960s and early 1970s. Despite several critical flaws, this thinking still shapes the political orientation of many African Americans today. I criticize the Black Power conception of black solidarity, focusing specifically on its commitment to black institutional autonomy, its social analysis of the black condition in terms of white supremacy, its treatment of the black population as a cohesive kinship unit that is capable of speaking with one voice, and its tendency to exclude, marginalize, and sometimes alienate needed nonblack allies.¶ In light of the problems with Black Power but retaining its key insights, in Chapter 4 I offer an alternative conception of black political solidarity. I argue that black unity must operate across multiracial political organizations; it must recognize that the sources of black disadvantage cannot all be reduced to racism; and it should acknowledge the need for a decentralized network of black advocacy. This conception identifies the basic aims, political principles, and proper scope of black politics. It also suggests a way to conceive of the relationship between the demands of racial justice and the ideal of racial equality.¶ In Chapter 5 I critically discuss black cultural nationalism (or cultural pluralism). I argue against including the goal of cultural autonomy among the basic aims of black political solidarity, and I suggest that the so-called politics of difference is not an appropriate model for contemporary black politics. I first provide a general characterization of the ideal of black cultural self-determination in the form of eight tenets, ranging from the claim that there is a distinct black culture to the thesis that blacks are, and should be regarded as, the foremost interpreters of the meaning and worth of their cultural ways. I then highlight the conceptual and normative errors that are frequently committed by those who defend this conception of cultural politics.¶ Once again using Du Bois as a point of departure, in Chapter 6 I offer an extended discussion of the relationship between social identity and political solidarity. Relying on the analytical groundwork developed in previous chapters, I distinguish thin conceptions of blackness, which view black identity as a vague social marker imposed from outside, from thick conceptions, which view the marker as signifying something "deeper," perhaps even something that blacks can autonomously and positively embrace as a component of their self-conception. I show that a shared thick black identity, whether "racial," ethnic, cultural, or national, is not needed for political solidarity and that, in fact, the attempts to develop such an identity are counterproductive to blacks' emancipatory aims.¶ In the conclusion I elaborate the pragmatic nationalist conception of political solidarity. I draw out the implications of the foregoing argument by integrating its various strands. In particular, I offer an interpretation of the ideal of black self-determination that demonstrates the coherence of the pragmatic nationalist outlook and its relationship to the broader nationalist tradition in African American political thought. This interpretation highlights a significant but often unnoticed connection between the value of individual autonomy and the emancipatory aims of black unity, revealing important common ground between political liberalism and black nationalism, which many scholars have overlooked.

The alt’s all-or-nothing choice fails --- small reforms are key to institutional change--

Erik Olin Wright 7, Vilas Distinguished Professor of Sociology at the University of Wisconsin, “Guidelines for Envisioning Real Utopias”, Soundings, April, www.ssc.wisc.edu/~wright/Published%20writing/Guidelines-soundings.pdf

5. Waystations¶ The final guideline for discussions of envisioning real utopias concerns the importance of waystations. The central problem of envisioning real utopias concerns the **viability of institutional alternatives** that embody emancipatory values, but the practical achievability of such institutional designs often **depends upon the existence of smaller steps**, intermediate institutional innovations **that move us in the right direction but only partially embody these values.** Institutional proposals which have an **all-or-nothing quality** to them are both **less likely to be adopted in the first place, and may pose more difficult transition-cost problems** if implemented. The catastrophic experience of Russia in the “shock therapy” approach to market reform is historical testimony to this problem.¶ Waystations are a difficult theoretical and practical problem because there are many instances in which partial reforms may have very different consequences than full- bodied changes. Consider the example of unconditional basic income. Suppose that a very limited, below-subsistence basic income was instituted: not enough to survive on, but a grant of income unconditionally given to everyone. One possibility is that this kind of basic income would act mainly as a subsidy to employers who pay very low wages, since now they could attract more workers even if they offered below poverty level¶ earnings. There may be good reasons to institute such wage subsidies, but they would not generate the positive effects of a UBI, and therefore might not function as a stepping stone.¶ What we ideally want, therefore, are **intermediate reforms** that have two main properties: first, they concretely **demonstrate the virtues of the fuller program of transformation, so they contribute to the ideological battle of convincing people that the alternative is credible and desirable;** and second, they **enhance the capacity for action of people**, increasing their ability to push further in the future. Waystations that increase popular participation and **bring people together in problem-solving deliberations** for collective purposes are particularly salient in this regard. This is what in the 1970s was called “nonreformist reforms”: reforms that are **possible within existing institutions** and that **pragmatically solve real problems** while at the same time **empowering people in ways which** **enlarge their scope of action in the future.**

## 1AR

#### Simulated debates preserve agency and enhance decision-making---avoids cooption

Laura K. Donohue 13, Associate Professor of Law, Georgetown Law, 4/11, “National Security Law Pedagogy and the Role of Simulations”, http://jnslp.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/National-Security-Law-Pedagogy-and-the-Role-of-Simulations.pdf

The concept of simulations as an aspect of higher education, or in the law school environment, is not new.164 Moot court, after all, is a form of simulation and one of the oldest teaching devices in the law. What is new, however, is the idea of designing a civilian national security course that takes advantage of the doctrinal and experiential components of law school education and integrates the experience through a multi-day simulation. In 2009, I taught the first module based on this design at Stanford Law, which I developed the following year into a full course at Georgetown Law. It has since gone through multiple iterations. The initial concept followed on the federal full-scale Top Official (“TopOff”) exercises, used to train government officials to respond to domestic crises.165 It adapted a Tabletop Exercise, designed with the help of exercise officials at DHS and FEMA, to the law school environment. The Tabletop used one storyline to push on specific legal questions, as students, assigned roles in the discussion, sat around a table and for six hours engaged with the material. The problem with the Tabletop Exercise was that it was too static, and the rigidity of the format left little room, or time, for student agency. Unlike the government’s TopOff exercises, which gave officials the opportunity to fully engage with the many different concerns that arise in the course of a national security crisis as well as the chance to deal with externalities, the Tabletop focused on specific legal issues, even as it controlled for external chaos. The opportunity to provide a more full experience for the students came with the creation of first a one-day, and then a multi-day simulation. The course design and simulation continues to evolve. It offers a model for achieving the pedagogical goals outlined above, in the process developing a rigorous training ground for the next generation of national security lawyers.166 A. Course Design The central idea in structuring the NSL Sim 2.0 course was to bridge the gap between theory and practice by conveying doctrinal material and creating an alternative reality in which students would be forced to act upon legal concerns.167 The exercise itself is a form of problem-based learning, wherein students are given both agency and responsibility for the results. Towards this end, the structure must be at once bounded (directed and focused on certain areas of the law and legal education) and flexible (responsive to student input and decisionmaking). Perhaps the most significant weakness in the use of any constructed universe is the problem of authenticity. Efforts to replicate reality will inevitably fall short. There is simply too much uncertainty, randomness, and complexity in the real world. One way to address this shortcoming, however, is through design and agency. The scenarios with which students grapple and the structural design of the simulation must reflect the national security realm, even as students themselves must make choices that carry consequences. Indeed, to some extent, student decisions themselves must drive the evolution of events within the simulation.168 Additionally, while authenticity matters, it is worth noting that at some level the fact that the incident does not take place in a real-world setting can be a great advantage. That is, the simulation creates an environment where students can make mistakes and learn from these mistakes – without what might otherwise be devastating consequences. It also allows instructors to develop multiple points of feedback to enrich student learning in a way that would be much more difficult to do in a regular practice setting. NSL Sim 2.0 takes as its starting point the national security pedagogical goals discussed above. It works backwards to then engineer a classroom, cyber, and physical/simulation experience to delve into each of these areas. As a substantive matter, the course focuses on the constitutional, statutory, and regulatory authorities in national security law, placing particular focus on the interstices between black letter law and areas where the field is either unsettled or in flux. A key aspect of the course design is that it retains both the doctrinal and experiential components of legal education. Divorcing simulations from the doctrinal environment risks falling short on the first and third national security pedagogical goals: (1) analytical skills and substantive knowledge, and (3) critical thought. A certain amount of both can be learned in the course of a simulation; however, the national security crisis environment is not well-suited to the more thoughtful and careful analytical discussion. What I am thus proposing is a course design in which doctrine is paired with the type of experiential learning more common in a clinical realm. The former precedes the latter, giving students the opportunity to develop depth and breadth prior to the exercise. In order to capture problems related to adaptation and evolution, addressing goal [1(d)], the simulation itself takes place over a multi-day period. Because of the intensity involved in national security matters (and conflicting demands on student time), the model makes use of a multi-user virtual environment. The use of such technology is critical to creating more powerful, immersive simulations.169 It also allows for continual interaction between the players. Multi-user virtual environments have the further advantage of helping to transform the traditional teaching culture, predominantly concerned with manipulating textual and symbolic knowledge, into a culture where students learn and can then be assessed on the basis of their participation in changing practices.170 I thus worked with the Information Technology group at Georgetown Law to build the cyber portal used for NSL Sim 2.0. The twin goals of adaptation and evolution require that students be given a significant amount of agency and responsibility for decisions taken in the course of the simulation. To further this aim, I constituted a Control Team, with six professors, four attorneys from practice, a media expert, six to eight former simulation students, and a number of technology experts. Four of the professors specialize in different areas of national security law and assume roles in the course of the exercise, with the aim of pushing students towards a deeper doctrinal understanding of shifting national security law authorities. One professor plays the role of President of the United States. The sixth professor focuses on questions of professional responsibility. The attorneys from practice help to build the simulation and then, along with all the professors, assume active roles during the simulation itself. Returning students assist in the execution of the play, further developing their understanding of national security law. Throughout the simulation, the Control Team is constantly reacting to student choices. When unexpected decisions are made, professors may choose to pursue the evolution of the story to accomplish the pedagogical aims, or they may choose to cut off play in that area (there are various devices for doing so, such as denying requests, sending materials to labs to be analyzed, drawing the players back into the main storylines, and leaking information to the media). A total immersion simulation involves a number of scenarios, as well as systemic noise, to give students experience in dealing with the second pedagogical goal: factual chaos and information overload. The driving aim here is to teach students how to manage information more effectively. Five to six storylines are thus developed, each with its own arc and evolution. To this are added multiple alterations of the situation, relating to background noise. Thus, unlike hypotheticals, doctrinal problems, single-experience exercises, or even Tabletop exercises, the goal is not to eliminate external conditions, but to embrace them as part of the challenge facing national security lawyers. The simulation itself is problem-based, giving players agency in driving the evolution of the experience – thus addressing goal [2(c)]. This requires a realtime response from the professor(s) overseeing the simulation, pairing bounded storylines with flexibility to emphasize different areas of the law and the students’ practical skills. Indeed, each storyline is based on a problem facing the government, to which players must then respond, generating in turn a set of new issues that must be addressed. The written and oral components of the simulation conform to the fourth pedagogical goal – the types of situations in which national security lawyers will find themselves. Particular emphasis is placed on nontraditional modes of communication, such as legal documents in advance of the crisis itself, meetings in the midst of breaking national security concerns, multiple informal interactions, media exchanges, telephone calls, Congressional testimony, and formal briefings to senior level officials in the course of the simulation as well as during the last class session. These oral components are paired with the preparation of formal legal instruments, such as applications to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, legal memos, applications for search warrants under Title III, and administrative subpoenas for NSLs. In addition, students are required to prepare a paper outlining their legal authorities prior to the simulation – and to deliver a 90 second oral briefing after the session. To replicate the high-stakes political environment at issue in goals (1) and (5), students are divided into political and legal roles and assigned to different (and competing) institutions: the White House, DoD, DHS, HHS, DOJ, DOS, Congress, state offices, nongovernmental organizations, and the media. This requires students to acknowledge and work within the broader Washington context, even as they are cognizant of the policy implications of their decisions. They must get used to working with policymakers and to representing one of many different considerations that decisionmakers take into account in the national security domain. Scenarios are selected with high consequence events in mind, to ensure that students recognize both the domestic and international dimensions of national security law. Further alterations to the simulation provide for the broader political context – for instance, whether it is an election year, which parties control different branches, and state and local issues in related but distinct areas. The media is given a particularly prominent role. One member of the Control Team runs an AP wire service, while two student players represent print and broadcast media, respectively. The Virtual News Network (“VNN”), which performs in the second capacity, runs continuously during the exercise, in the course of which players may at times be required to appear before the camera. This media component helps to emphasize the broader political context within which national security law is practiced. Both anticipated and unanticipated decisions give rise to ethical questions and matters related to the fifth goal: professional responsibility. The way in which such issues arise stems from simulation design as well as spontaneous interjections from both the Control Team and the participants in the simulation itself. As aforementioned, professors on the Control Team, and practicing attorneys who have previously gone through a simulation, focus on raising decision points that encourage students to consider ethical and professional considerations. Throughout the simulation good judgment and leadership play a key role, determining the players’ effectiveness, with the exercise itself hitting the aim of the integration of the various pedagogical goals. Finally, there are multiple layers of feedback that players receive prior to, during, and following the simulation to help them to gauge their effectiveness. The Socratic method in the course of doctrinal studies provides immediate assessment of the students’ grasp of the law. Written assignments focused on the contours of individual players’ authorities give professors an opportunity to assess students’ level of understanding prior to the simulation. And the simulation itself provides real-time feedback from both peers and professors. The Control Team provides data points for player reflection – for instance, the Control Team member playing President may make decisions based on player input, giving students an immediate impression of their level of persuasiveness, while another Control Team member may reject a FISC application as insufficient. The simulation goes beyond this, however, focusing on teaching students how to develop (6) opportunities for learning in the future. Student meetings with mentors in the field, which take place before the simulation, allow students to work out the institutional and political relationships and the manner in which law operates in practice, even as they learn how to develop mentoring relationships. (Prior to these meetings we have a class discussion about mentoring, professionalism, and feedback). Students, assigned to simulation teams about one quarter of the way through the course, receive peer feedback in the lead-up to the simulation and during the exercise itself. Following the simulation the Control Team and observers provide comments. Judges, who are senior members of the bar in the field of national security law, observe player interactions and provide additional debriefing. The simulation, moreover, is recorded through both the cyber portal and through VNN, allowing students to go back to assess their performance. Individual meetings with the professors teaching the course similarly follow the event. Finally, students end the course with a paper reflecting on their performance and the issues that arose in the course of the simulation, develop frameworks for analyzing uncertainty, tension with colleagues, mistakes, and successes in the future. B. Substantive Areas: Interstices and Threats As a substantive matter, NSL Sim 2.0 is designed to take account of areas of the law central to national security. It focuses on specific authorities that may be brought to bear in the course of a crisis. The decision of which areas to explore is made well in advance of the course. It is particularly helpful here to think about national security authorities on a continuum, as a way to impress upon students that there are shifting standards depending upon the type of threat faced. One course, for instance, might center on the interstices between crime, drugs, terrorism and war. Another might address the intersection of pandemic disease and biological weapons. A third could examine cybercrime and cyberterrorism. This is the most important determination, because the substance of the doctrinal portion of the course and the simulation follows from this decision. For a course focused on the interstices between pandemic disease and biological weapons, for instance, preliminary inquiry would lay out which authorities apply, where the courts have weighed in on the question, and what matters are unsettled. Relevant areas might include public health law, biological weapons provisions, federal quarantine and isolation authorities, habeas corpus and due process, military enforcement and posse comitatus, eminent domain and appropriation of land/property, takings, contact tracing, thermal imaging and surveillance, electronic tagging, vaccination, and intelligence-gathering. The critical areas can then be divided according to the dominant constitutional authority, statutory authorities, regulations, key cases, general rules, and constitutional questions. This, then, becomes a guide for the doctrinal part of the course, as well as the grounds on which the specific scenarios developed for the simulation are based. The authorities, simultaneously, are included in an electronic resource library and embedded in the cyber portal (the Digital Archives) to act as a closed universe of the legal authorities needed by the students in the course of the simulation. Professional responsibility in the national security realm and the institutional relationships of those tasked with responding to biological weapons and pandemic disease also come within the doctrinal part of the course. The simulation itself is based on five to six storylines reflecting the interstices between different areas of the law. The storylines are used to present a coherent, non-linear scenario that can adapt to student responses. Each scenario is mapped out in a three to seven page document, which is then checked with scientists, government officials, and area experts for consistency with how the scenario would likely unfold in real life. For the biological weapons and pandemic disease emphasis, for example, one narrative might relate to the presentation of a patient suspected of carrying yersinia pestis at a hospital in the United States. The document would map out a daily progression of the disease consistent with epidemiological patterns and the central actors in the story: perhaps a U.S. citizen, potential connections to an international terrorist organization, intelligence on the individual’s actions overseas, etc. The scenario would be designed specifically to stress the intersection of public health and counterterrorism/biological weapons threats, and the associated (shifting) authorities, thus requiring the disease initially to look like an innocent presentation (for example, by someone who has traveled from overseas), but then for the storyline to move into the second realm (awareness that this was in fact a concerted attack). A second storyline might relate to a different disease outbreak in another part of the country, with the aim of introducing the Stafford Act/Insurrection Act line and raising federalism concerns. The role of the military here and Title 10/Title 32 questions would similarly arise – with the storyline designed to raise these questions. A third storyline might simply be well developed noise in the system: reports of suspicious activity potentially linked to radioactive material, with the actors linked to nuclear material. A fourth storyline would focus perhaps on container security concerns overseas, progressing through newspaper reports, about containers showing up in local police precincts. State politics would constitute the fifth storyline, raising question of the political pressures on the state officials in the exercise. Here, ethnic concerns, student issues, economic conditions, and community policing concerns might become the focus. The sixth storyline could be further noise in the system – loosely based on current events at the time. In addition to the storylines, a certain amount of noise is injected into the system through press releases, weather updates, private communications, and the like. The five to six storylines, prepared by the Control Team in consultation with experts, become the basis for the preparation of scenario “injects:” i.e., newspaper articles, VNN broadcasts, reports from NGOs, private communications between officials, classified information, government leaks, etc., which, when put together, constitute a linear progression. These are all written and/or filmed prior to the exercise. The progression is then mapped in an hourly chart for the unfolding events over a multi-day period. All six scenarios are placed on the same chart, in six columns, giving the Control Team a birds-eye view of the progression. C. How It Works As for the nuts and bolts of the simulation itself, it traditionally begins outside of class, in the evening, on the grounds that national security crises often occur at inconvenient times and may well involve limited sleep and competing demands.171 Typically, a phone call from a Control Team member posing in a role integral to one of the main storylines, initiates play. Students at this point have been assigned dedicated simulation email addresses and provided access to the cyber portal. The portal itself gives each team the opportunity to converse in a “classified” domain with other team members, as well as access to a public AP wire and broadcast channel, carrying the latest news and on which press releases or (for the media roles) news stories can be posted. The complete universe of legal authorities required for the simulation is located on the cyber portal in the Digital Archives, as are forms required for some of the legal instruments (saving students the time of developing these from scratch in the course of play). Additional “classified” material – both general and SCI – has been provided to the relevant student teams. The Control Team has access to the complete site. For the next two (or three) days, outside of student initiatives (which, at their prompting, may include face-to-face meetings between the players), the entire simulation takes place through the cyber portal. The Control Team, immediately active, begins responding to player decisions as they become public (and occasionally, through monitoring the “classified” communications, before they are released). This time period provides a ramp-up to the third (or fourth) day of play, allowing for the adjustment of any substantive, student, or technology concerns, while setting the stage for the breaking crisis. The third (or fourth) day of play takes place entirely at Georgetown Law. A special room is constructed for meetings between the President and principals, in the form of either the National Security Council or the Homeland Security Council, with breakout rooms assigned to each of the agencies involved in the NSC process. Congress is provided with its own physical space, in which meetings, committee hearings and legislative drafting can take place. State government officials are allotted their own area, separate from the federal domain, with the Media placed between the three major interests. The Control Team is sequestered in a different area, to which students are not admitted. At each of the major areas, the cyber portal is publicly displayed on large flat panel screens, allowing for the streaming of video updates from the media, AP wire injects, articles from the students assigned to represent leading newspapers, and press releases. Students use their own laptop computers for team decisions and communication. As the storylines unfold, the Control Team takes on a variety of roles, such as that of the President, Vice President, President’s chief of staff, governor of a state, public health officials, and foreign dignitaries. Some of the roles are adopted on the fly, depending upon player responses and queries as the storylines progress. Judges, given full access to each player domain, determine how effectively the students accomplish the national security goals. The judges are themselves well-experienced in the practice of national security law, as well as in legal education. They thus can offer a unique perspective on the scenarios confronted by the students, the manner in which the simulation unfolded, and how the students performed in their various capacities. At the end of the day, the exercise terminates and an immediate hotwash is held, in which players are first debriefed on what occurred during the simulation. Because of the players’ divergent experiences and the different roles assigned to them, the students at this point are often unaware of the complete picture. The judges and formal observers then offer reflections on the simulation and determine which teams performed most effectively. Over the next few classes, more details about the simulation emerge, as students discuss it in more depth and consider limitations created by their knowledge or institutional position, questions that arose in regard to their grasp of the law, the types of decision-making processes that occurred, and the effectiveness of their – and other students’ – performances. Reflection papers, paired with oral briefings, focus on the substantive issues raised by the simulation and introduce the opportunity for students to reflect on how to create opportunities for learning in the future. The course then formally ends.172 Learning, however, continues beyond the temporal confines of the semester. Students who perform well and who would like to continue to participate in the simulations are invited back as members of the control team, giving them a chance to deepen their understanding of national security law. Following graduation, a few students who go in to the field are then invited to continue their affiliation as National Security Law fellows, becoming increasingly involved in the evolution of the exercise itself. This system of vertical integration helps to build a mentoring environment for the students while they are enrolled in law school and to create opportunities for learning and mentorship post-graduation. It helps to keep the exercise current and reflective of emerging national security concerns. And it builds a strong community of individuals with common interests. CONCLUSION The legal academy has, of late, been swept up in concern about the economic conditions that affect the placement of law school graduates. The image being conveyed, however, does not resonate in every legal field. It is particularly inapposite to the burgeoning opportunities presented to students in national security. That the conversation about legal education is taking place now should come as little surprise. Quite apart from economic concern is the traditional introspection that follows American military engagement. It makes sense: law overlaps substantially with political power, being at once both the expression of government authority and the effort to limit the same. The one-size fits all approach currently dominating the conversation in legal education, however, appears ill-suited to address the concerns raised in the current conversation. Instead of looking at law across the board, greater insight can be gleaned by looking at the specific demands of the different fields themselves. This does not mean that the goals identified will be exclusive to, for instance, national security law, but it does suggest there will be greater nuance in the discussion of the adequacy of the current pedagogical approach. With this approach in mind, I have here suggested six pedagogical goals for national security. For following graduation, students must be able to perform in each of the areas identified – (1) understanding the law as applied, (2) dealing with factual chaos and uncertainty, (3) obtaining critical distance, (4) developing nontraditional written and oral communication skills, (5) exhibiting leadership, integrity, and good judgment in a high-stakes, highly-charged environment, and (6) creating continued opportunities for self-learning. They also must learn how to integrate these different skills into one experience, to ensure that they will be most effective when they enter the field. The problem with the current structures in legal education is that they fall short, in important ways, from helping students to meet these goals. Doctrinal courses may incorporate a range of experiential learning components, such as hypotheticals, doctrinal problems, single exercises, extended or continuing exercises, and tabletop exercises. These are important classroom devices. The amount of time required for each varies, as does the object of the exercise itself. But where they fall short is in providing a more holistic approach to national security law which will allow for the maximum conveyance of required skills. Total immersion simulations, which have not yet been addressed in the secondary literature for civilian education in national security law, may provide an important way forward. Such simulations also cure shortcomings in other areas of experiential education, such as clinics and moot court. It is in an effort to address these concerns that I developed the simulation model above. NSL Sim 2.0 certainly is not the only solution, but it does provide a starting point for moving forward. The approach draws on the strengths of doctrinal courses and embeds a total immersion simulation within a course. It makes use of technology and physical space to engage students in a multi-day exercise, in which they are given agency and responsibility for their decision making, resulting in a steep learning curve. While further adaptation of this model is undoubtedly necessary, it suggests one potential direction for the years to come.

### Alt won’t create a social movement and even if it does it won’t create change

Lene Hansen, Associate Professor in the Department of Political Science at the University of Copenhagen, 1997. (The Future of International Relations, edited by Iver B. Neumann and Ole Wæver. Page 328.)

Walker distinguishes between critical social movements and conventional or reactionary ones. Critical movements have a consciousness of the way means and ends are dialectically related, they are not (only) concerned with state power as are conventional movements, are not closed, inward, backward-looking, nor annihilating histories as do the reactionary movements. Finally they explicitly reject violence (Walker 1988a: 78-9, ). One has to wait until p. 111 in the celebration of critical social movements before the temptations for these movements are listed. They might romanticize the will of the people (a trap that One World, Many worlds itself is not wholly successful in avoiding); second, mistake the interests of particular groups for universal interests; and third, ignore the conflicts of interest that can arise between social movements. One World, Many Worlds tends to oppose people to states, and critical social movements to elites. Critical social movements can potentially rearticulate political identity in ways which question the identity provided by the sovereignty, and they appear therefore as a or sometimes even the positive actor. But making a dichotomization of state versus people goes against Walker's own theoretical account of the principle of state sovereignty which argues that the major reason why the principle of state sovereignty is so powerful is because it answers the question of political identity, it 'tells us who we are', 'tells the people who they are', and it ties state, people and political identity together. When 'the state' is restricted to purely institutional, governmental definition, and people and political identity are located outside the state, it becomes difficult to understand why the sovereign state has been such a long-lasting principle, as it is no longer answering the decisive question of political identity. The account of critical movements can be criticized on several points. First, despite the attempt to define them as 'distinguishable in part by their capacity to recognize and act creatively upon connections among structures, processes, and peoples that do not enter significantly into the calculations of conventional political actors or that are denied by movements of a more reactionary character' (Walker 1988a: 3), there is in the end no way to decide whether a movement is critical or not, except by Walker's declara­tion of its status. Equally, who 'the people' are seems to have little status outside Walker's own choice. It is also difficult to see why critical move­ments should have a higher knowledge about the world, and their own action in it, than, for instance, nationalistic movements? And why is it necessary that a critical movement should have a knowledge about the whole, know 'that to challenge a specific dam is to challenge the economic, political, social, and cultural assumptions of a whole society' (Walker 1988a: 67)? In Walker's defense it should be added, however, that he recently warned against 'a romantic strategy of "listening to the move­ments" '; he seems in other words to be moving towards a more critical perspective on the critical movements (Walker 1994a: 674 ).

### Alt Fails – Isaac

#### Must propose alternatives or else they are complicit with the evil they criticize

**Issac 2**—Professor of Political Science at Indiana-Bloomington, Director of the Center for the Study of Democracy and Public Life, PhD from Yale (Jeffery C., Dissent Magazine, Vol. 49, Iss. 2, “Ends, Means, and Politics,” p. Proquest)

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

### Wright---Small Reforms Key

#### The alt’s all-or-nothing choice fails --- small reforms like the plan are key to institutional change and getting others to sign on to the alt

Erik Olin Wright 7, Vilas Distinguished Professor of Sociology at the University of Wisconsin, “Guidelines for Envisioning Real Utopias”, Soundings, April, www.ssc.wisc.edu/~wright/Published%20writing/Guidelines-soundings.pdf

5. Waystations¶ The final guideline for discussions of envisioning real utopias concerns the importance of waystations. The central problem of envisioning real utopias concerns the **viability of institutional alternatives** that embody emancipatory values, but the practical achievability of such institutional designs often **depends upon the existence of smaller steps**, intermediate institutional innovations **that move us in the right direction but only partially embody these values.** Institutional proposals which have an **all-or-nothing quality** to them are both **less likely to be adopted in the first place, and may pose more difficult transition-cost problems** if implemented. The catastrophic experience of Russia in the “shock therapy” approach to market reform is historical testimony to this problem.¶ Waystations are a difficult theoretical and practical problem because there are many instances in which partial reforms may have very different consequences than full- bodied changes. Consider the example of unconditional basic income. Suppose that a very limited, below-subsistence basic income was instituted: not enough to survive on, but a grant of income unconditionally given to everyone. One possibility is that this kind of basic income would act mainly as a subsidy to employers who pay very low wages, since now they could attract more workers even if they offered below poverty level¶ earnings. There may be good reasons to institute such wage subsidies, but they would not generate the positive effects of a UBI, and therefore might not function as a stepping stone.¶ What we ideally want, therefore, are **intermediate reforms** that have two main properties: first, they concretely **demonstrate the virtues of the fuller program of transformation, so they contribute to the ideological battle of convincing people that the alternative is credible and desirable;** and second, they **enhance the capacity for action of people**, increasing their ability to push further in the future. Waystations that increase popular participation and **bring people together in problem-solving deliberations** for collective purposes are particularly salient in this regard. This is what in the 1970s was called “nonreformist reforms”: reforms that are **possible within existing institutions** and that **pragmatically solve real problems** while at the same time **empowering people in ways which** **enlarge their scope of action in the future.**