# Be Cool Mon….

Dr. Martin Luther King 1963  “I Have a Dream”  conclusion

**In the words of the Reverend Martin Luther King…**

**When we allow freedom to ring –**

**when we let it ring from every city and every hamlet,**

**from every state and every city,**

**we will be able to speed up that day when all of God's children,**

**black men and white men,**

**Jews and Gentiles,**

**Protestants and Catholics,**

**will be able to join hands and sing in the words of the old Negro spiritual, "Free at last, Free at last, Great God a-mighty, We are free at last."**

**We agree with Doctor King that all people should be free.  Unfortunately, using lies and economic power, the United States Government has oppressed people both in Mexico and in the United States. Their tool of oppression is the brutal policy known as the War on Drugs.  Adina and I, therefore advocate to legalize marijuana, end the war on drugs, and to view addiction as a disease instead of as a crime. The goal of our advocacy is to end the mass incarceration of people of color in the United States and end the coercion and domination of Mexico facilitated by this policy.**

**Like Dr. King, we embrace AGAPE as our spiritual philosophy, and urge the judge to stand resolute with us in the face of this injustice.**

# Contention 1: Framing the Debate

**For 75 years, policy debate consisted of AFFs that attacked the Status Quo and the negative defended it. Critical Debating changed this as Negative teams started forcing the AFF to defend the institutions of the Status Quo. WE THINK THIS IS WRONG!!! We are Criticizing the Status Quo. We have framed our advocacy so that it can be interpreted in a policy context through the following sample plan text:**

#### The United States should substantially increase its economic engagement with Mexico by immediately stopping the War on Drugs and the mass incarceration of people of color and eliminating all Federal Laws and enforcement against the use or sale of marijuana.

**However, we do not defend ANY policies or even the EXISTENCE of the USFG other than the idea that it should END the War on Drugs and the prohibition of marijuana.**

**Our Framework is that this round is a contest to directly answer the “SHOULD” question asked by the topic. Within this framework, we propose this specific example of the resolutional question --**

**Should the War on Drugs and the prohibition of Marijuanna be ended?**

**If we prove that this should be answered in the AFFIRMATIVE, then that is how you vote.**

**The role of the ballot is to answer this question – PERIOD. We do not believe that ANYTHING happens when the judge fills out the ballot other than one team winning and one team losing.**

**In our framework, ALL negative alternatives must be competitive. If our advocacy can coexist OR precede any negative alternative, you vote AFFIRMATIVE. We do NOT have to defend anything in the status quo at all.**

**You should accept this framework for 3 reasons:**

1. **It is the AFF right to define a framework**

Timothy O’Donnell 2004 “And the Twain Shall Meet: Affirmative Framework Choice and the Future of Debate” (Timothy M. O’Donnell is the Director of Debate, University of Mary Washington) <http://groups.wfu.edu/debate/MiscSites/DRGArticles/DRGArtiarticlesIndex.htm>

There are several reasons why the affirmative should get to choose the framework for the debate. First, AFC preserves the value of the first affirmative constructive speech. This speech is the starting point for the debate. It is a function of necessity. The debate must begin somewhere if it is to begin at all. Failure to grant AFC is a denial of the service rendered by the affirmative team’s labor when they crafted this speech. Further, if the affirmative does not get to pick the starting point, the opening speech act is essentially rendered meaningless while the rest of the debate becomes a debate about what we should be debating about. History is instructive here. The brief and undistinguished life of both counter warrants and plan-plan have amply demonstrated the chaos that results when the negative refuses to engage the affirmative on its chosen starting point.

1. **This Framework is the MOST realistic – Nothing actually happens due to judges signing ballots. Our burden is to present a prima facie case – if we do so, vote AFF.**

Ozminkowski, Mariusz (2012-08-08). Debate & Dialogue: The Essentials of Argumentation (pp. 18-19). . Kindle Edition.

Meeting the burden of proof is known as establishing a prima facie case. Prima facie is defined as an argument that is sufficient to raise a reasonable question and doubt regarding the status quo. We could say that prima facie means a fully developed argument strong enough to justify a change in beliefs or policies. As with many other concepts in argumentation, this also has an equivalent in law.

1. **This Framework maximizes critical thinking – It forces the negative to directly answer the our advocacy instead of presenting generic social criticisms that represent their pre-existing beliefs. That approach destroys critical thinking, which kills education and social values.**

Keller, et. al, 01 – Asst. professor School of Social Service Administration U. of Chicago (Thomas E., James K., and Tracly K., Asst. professor School of Social Service Administration U. of Chicago, professor of Social Work, and doctoral student School of Social Work, “Student debates in policy courses: promoting policy practice skills and knowledge through active learning,” Journal of Social Work Education, Spr/Summer 2001, EBSCOhost)

Developing policy practice skills seems to share much in common with developing capacities for critical thinking. R.W. Paul (as cited in Gambrill, 1997) states that critical thinkers acknowledge the imperative to argue from opposing points of view and to seek to identify weakness and limitations in one's own position. Critical thinkers are aware that there are many legitimate points of view, each of which (when thought through) may yield some level of insight. (p. 126) John Dewey, the philosopher and educational reformer, suggested that the initial advance in the development of reflective thought occurs in the transition from holding fixed, static ideas to an attitude of doubt and questioning engendered by exposure to alternative views in social discourse (Baker, 1955, pp. 36-40). Doubt, confusion, and conflict resulting from discussion of diverse perspectives "force comparison, selection, and reformulation of ideas and meanings" (Baker, 1955, p. 45). Subsequent educational theorists have contended that learning requires openness to divergent ideas in combination with the ability to synthesize disparate views into a purposeful resolution (Kolb, 1984; Perry, 1970). On the one hand, clinging to the certainty of one's beliefs risks dogmatism, rigidity, and the inability to learn from new experiences

**Negative Strategies that AVOID clash based on pure belief inevitably lead to evil**

Lukianoff, Greg (2012-10-23). Unlearning Liberty: Campus Censorship and the End of American Debate (Kindle Locations 577-586). Encounter Books. Kindle Edition.

Having pure intentions, steadfast goals, and an unwillingness to consider that you might be wrong is the formula for some of the worst evils mankind has ever wrought upon one another, from inquisitions to the twentieth century’s disastrous experiments with totalitarian utopias. As pushy as those of us who defend civil liberties may seem, the right to freedom of speech and freedom of conscience rests on a deep-seated humility:

NEXT-

Howard Gabennesch Skeptical Inquirer Volume 30.2, March / April 2006 <http://www.csicop.org/si/show/critical_thinking_what_is_it_good_for_in_fact_what_is_it/>

Is critical thinking worth the costs? Consider for a moment how costly uncritical thinking can be. Stephen Jay Gould (1997, x, xii) calls attention to two precious human potentials that together constitute “the most powerful joint instrument for good that our planet has ever known”: Only two possible escapes can save us from the organized mayhem of our dark potentialities-the side of human nature that has given us crusades, witch hunts, enslavements, and holocausts. Moral decency provides one necessary ingredient, but not nearly enough. The second foundation must come from the rational side of our mentality. For, unless we rigorously use human reason . . . we will lose out to the frightening forces of irrationality, romanticism, uncompromising “true” belief, and the apparent resulting inevitability of mob action . . . Skepticism is the agent of reason against organized irrationalism-and is therefore one of the keys to human social and civic decency. According to this striking claim, critical thinking is one of the most important resources a society could develop. This is because bad things do not emanate only from bad people. Bad things can also occur because of the mistaken thinking of decent people. Even when a bad idea originates with a psychopath, the real danger occurs when it is accepted by the gullible and condoned by the sincere who have little more than a child’s understanding of what intellectual due process entails. It is likely that an important link exists between critical thinking, broadly defined, and democracy itself. The American jurist Learned Hand (1952, 190) described this connection as follows:Liberty lies in the hearts of men and women; when it dies there, no constitution, no law, no court can save it . . . . The spirit of liberty is the spirit which is not too sure that it is right; the spirit of liberty is the spirit which seeks to understand the minds of other men and women; the spirit of liberty is the spirit which weighs their interest alongside its own without bias.

So by cultivating genuine critical thinking, we strengthen the crucial underpinnings of democracy (Kuhn 2003). People who are careful about the truth are less likely to be fooled by the ideologies that justify illiberal practices or promise simple solutions. Moreover, such people are more likely to recognize the value of intellectual and ideological diversity-they understand that the truth comes in pieces and is unlikely to be found all in one place. They are the best counterweight to true believers of all stripes. Ultimately, intellectual due process is no less integral to democracy than is due process of law. Within a democracy, the social world remains a deceptive place-for the sophisticated and the innocent alike. The tendency of leaders and large numbers of citizens to underestimate this fact is a source of enormous human misery.

# Contention 2 – The United States federal government has systematically lied in order to sustain the federal prohibition of Marjuanna

Dr Sanjay Gupta 08.08.13 CNN Online Why I changed my mind on weed By Dr. Sanjay Gupta, CNN Chief Medical Correspondent

(CNN) - Over the last year, I have been working on a new documentary called "Weed." The title "Weed" may sound cavalier, but the content is not.

I traveled around the world to interview medical leaders, experts, growers and patients. I spoke candidly to them, asking tough questions. What I found was stunning.

Long before I began this project, I had steadily reviewed the scientific literature on medical marijuana from the United States and thought it was fairly unimpressive. Reading these papers five years ago, it was hard to make a case for medicinal marijuana. I even wrote about this in a TIME magazine article, back in 2009, titled "Why I would Vote No on Pot."

Well, I am here to apologize.

I apologize because I didn't look hard enough, until now. I didn't look far enough. I didn't review papers from smaller labs in other countries doing some remarkable research, and I was too dismissive of the loud chorus of legitimate patients whose symptoms improved on cannabis.

Instead, I lumped them with the high-visibility malingerers, just looking to get high. I mistakenly believed the Drug Enforcement Agency listed marijuana as a schedule 1 substance because of sound scientific proof. Surely, they must have quality reasoning as to why marijuana is in the category of the most dangerous drugs that have "no accepted medicinal use and a high potential for abuse."

They didn't have the science to support that claim, and I now know that when it comes to marijuana neither of those things are true. It doesn't have a high potential for abuse, and there are very legitimate medical applications. In fact, sometimes marijuana is the only thing that works. Take the case of Charlotte Figi, who I met in Colorado. She started having seizures soon after birth. By age 3, she was having 300 a week, despite being on seven different medications. Medical marijuana has calmed her brain, limiting her seizures to 2 or 3 per month.

I have seen more patients like Charlotte first hand, spent time with them and come to the realization that it is irresponsible not to provide the best care we can as a medical community, care that could involve marijuana.

We have been terribly and systematically misled for nearly 70 years in the United States, and I apologize for my own role in that.

# Advantage 1 – END the structural racism of the New Jim Crow

#### Marijuana prosecution is dramatically biased against African Americans

Tony Newman Huffington Post 11/21/2011

According to the federal government's own yearly research surveys, African Americans use and sell drugs at similar rates at whites -- yet African Americans are arrested for drugs at 13 times the rate of whites.

While it is clear that drug misuse of both illicit and legal drugs can ruin lives and cause incredible pain, it is also clear that the drug war causes even more damage than drug misuse itself -- especially in African American communities.

#### Marijuanna Laws lead to a crushing cycle of discrimination

Tony Newman Huffington Post 11/21/2011

As Michele Alexander describes in her renowned book, The New Jim Crow, the war on drugs has had a devastating impact on African American communities, on a scale entirely out of proportion with the actual levels of criminal activity taking place within these communities. People of color are classified as "criminals," permanently trapping them in a second-class status and allowing a whole range of legal discrimination (in **employment, housing, education**, public benefits, **voting rights**, jury duty and so forth).

#### The Impact has been incredible

Alexander, Michelle (2012-01-16). The New Jim Crow (p. 224). New Press, The. Kindle Edition. (Michelle Alexander is a black civil rights activist, graduate of Stanford Law School and associate professor of law at Ohio State U.)

The impact of the drug war has been astounding. In less than thirty years, the U.S penal population exploded from around 300,000 to more than 2 million, with drug convictions accounting for the majority of the increase. 7 The United States now has the highest rate of incarceration in the world, dwarfing the rates of nearly every developed country, even surpassing those in highly repressive regimes like Russia, China, and Iran. In Germany, 93 people are in prison for every 100,000 adults and children. In the United States, the rate is roughly eight times that, or 750 per 100,000.8 The racial dimension of mass incarceration is its most striking feature. No other country in the world imprisons so many of its racial or ethnic minorities. The United States imprisons a larger percentage of its black population than South Africa did at the height of apartheid. In Washington, D.C., our nation’s capitol, it is estimated that three out of four young black men (and nearly all those in the poorest neighborhoods) can expect to serve time in prison. 9 Similar rates of incarceration can be found in black communities across America. These stark racial disparities cannot be explained by rates of drug crime. Studies show that people of all colors use and sell illegal drugs at remarkably similar rates. 10 If there are significant differences in the surveys to be found, they frequently suggest that whites, particularly white youth, are more likely to engage in drug crime than people of color. 11 That is not what one would guess, however, when entering our nation’s prisons and jails, which are overflowing with black and brown drug offenders. In some states, black men have been admitted to prison on drug charges at rates twenty to fifty times greater than those of white men. 12

#### Stopping the war on drugs is the MOST Important step in combating racism

JOHN MCWHORTER August 27, 2013 Wall Street Journal Online “A Better Way to Honor Dr. King's Dream The goal of the civil-rights movement was opportunity—not a 'post-racial' society Mr. McWhorter teaches linguistics and American Studies at Columbia University.

Along these lines, the term "institutional racism," which the Black Power movement injected into the lexicon in the late 1960s, is more damaging to the black psyche than the n-word or any crude jokes about plantations or food stamps. The term encourages blacks to think of society—in which inequality, while real, is complex and faceless—as actively and reprehensibly racist in the same way that Archie Bunker was. The result is visceral bitterness toward something that can't feel or think. Equally distracting is the notion that America needs a "conversation" about race, one in which whites submit to a lesson from blacks about so-called institutional racism. "Those who hope that the Negro needed to blow off steam and will now be content will have a rude awakening," King told us in his speech. What we awaken to now is the rudeness of idle talk, of those who blow off steam by demanding a "conversation" that will not bear fruit—look no further than President Clinton's national effort on that front in the late 1990s—and in any case wouldn't provide greater opportunity to any poor person. The "conversation" idea is fundamentally passive because it assumes that what black people need most is for white people to think better of them and more about them. So why does it command such allegiance among blacks? Because it channels the idea that our most urgent task is to speak truth to power, rather than to help black people who need it. Too many suppose that the two tasks are still the same as they were in 1963, when the reality is now quite different. The "conversation" illusion is also why black America is more disturbed by whites killing blacks than by blacks killing blacks. Commentators who claim that black leaders ignore black-on-black crime miss the fact that black communities have long organized Stop the Violence forums to get citizens involved in stopping crime in their neighborhoods. Yet many black people are indeed angrier at one George Zimmerman for killing Trayvon Martin than at the thousands of black boys who murder one another year after year. This is because we have been taught that our main task is uncovering racism rather than concretely addressing the things that make life hardest for the most blacks.¶ Today's struggle should focus on three priorities. First, the war on drugs, a policy that unnecessarily tears apart black families and neighborhoods. Second, community colleges and vocational education, which are invaluable in helping black Americans get ahead. And third, the AIDS and obesity epidemics, which are ravaging black communities. The only reason why ideas like "institutional racism" and "a conversation about race" seem more compelling is because they are more morally dramatic. Drama is not what will make a difference in black lives. "We will not be satisfied until justice rolls down like waters and righteousness like a mighty stream," King said. But if justice is an America without racism of any kind, then we will never be satisfied.

#### The Affirmative ADVOCACY is a necessary first step to ANY social action against racism

Alexander, Michelle (2012-01-16). The New Jim Crow (p. 14). New Press, The. Kindle Edition.

With the benefit of hindsight, surely we can see that piecemeal policy reform or litigation alone would have been a futile approach to dismantling Jim Crow segregation. While those strategies certainly had their place, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the concomitant cultural shift would never have occurred without the cultivation of a critical political consciousness in the African American community and the widespread, strategic activism that flowed from it. Likewise, the notion that the New Jim Crow can ever be dismantled through traditional litigation and policy-reform strategies that are wholly disconnected from a major social movement seems fundamentally misguided. Such a movement is impossible, though, if those most committed to abolishing racial hierarchy continue to talk and behave as if a state-sponsored racial caste system no longer exists. If we continue to tell ourselves the popular myths about racial progress or, worse yet, if we say to ourselves that the problem of mass incarceration is just too big, too daunting for us to do anything about and that we should instead direct our energies to battles that might be more easily won, history will judge us harshly. A human rights nightmare is occurring on our watch. A new social consensus must be forged about race and the role of race in defining the basic structure of our society, if we hope ever to abolish the New Jim Crow. This new consensus must begin with dialogue, a conversation that fosters a critical consciousness, a key prerequisite to effective social action**.**

#### This advocacy is true to the legacy of Dr. King and can finally help achieve his vision of Agape

Michelle Alexander PRX July 2, 2012 “Transcript for the Continuous Version version of On the Other Side of the Myth: A Conversation with Michelle Alexander and Tim Wise”

I don't think it’s wrong to point out the utter irrationality of the system and how it works to the disadvantage of the people who are white as well as those who are non-white. I think it is useful to do so important to do so but ultimately I think if we are going to achieve truly transformational change we are going to have to build a new moral consensus and it may be the case that creating a new moral consensus is really more of a spiritual project than a political one. I don't think its coincidence that Reverend Martin Luther King Jr. wove in religion and spirituality throughout virtually all of the speeches that he gave. He was making a moral appeal to the United States he wasn't arguing that it is too expensive for us to maintain separate water fountains. He was arguing that it is killing the soul of the nation and that we are all one people all god's children and those appeals to me are the ones that create moments that are genuinely transformational and it doesn't of course require everyone of subscribing to a particular religion but I think it does require us to find ways to acknowledge the oneness of us all. How we are deeply interconnected not just in an economic or a political sense or even in a social sense but that there is something deeper and more profound about our connection to each other as humans that have to be honored and acknowledged and in fact when we fail to honor or acknowledge that connection is when we feel that impulse to rationalize, it is when that basic human connection is denied that spiritual connection is denied is when we find ourselves needing to explain ourselves in rationalized systems of gross inequality or systems that are putting others at an enormous disadvantage or causing suffering.

**Only an AFFIRMATIVE BALLOT can make make real progress towards social justice**

Alexander, Michelle (2012-01-16). The New Jim Crow (p. 9). New Press, The.

This book argues that mass incarceration is, metaphorically, the New Jim Crow and that all those who care about social justice should fully commit themselves to dismantling this new racial caste system. Mass incarceration— not attacks on affirmative action or lax civil rights enforcement— is the most damaging manifestation of the backlash against the Civil Rights Movement. The popular narrative that emphasizes the death of slavery and Jim Crow and celebrates the nation’s “triumph over race” with the election of Barack Obama, is dangerously misguided. The colorblind public consensus that prevails in America today— i.e., the widespread belief that race no longer matters— has blinded us to the realities of race in our society and facilitated the emergence of a new caste system.

**Howard Woodridge sums up our position in 2011**

Howard Wooldridge SEPTEMBER 24, 2011 classicalvalues.com “The Most Destructive, Dysfunctional & Immoral Domestic Policy Since Slavery & Jim Crow” (Howard Wooldridge is a Retired Police Detective)

Modern Prohibition/**The War on Drugs is the most destructive, dysfunctional & immoral domestic policy since slavery & Jim Crow**. He ought to know. Now you know.

# Advantage 2 – The US Led War on Drugs is a failed policy that is crushing Mexican society

#### The War on drugs has FAILED in the US

Tony Newman Huffington Post 11/22/2011

While the Drug Czar talks about a "balanced" approach, the reality is that U.S. still spends two-thirds of the $50 billion-a-year "drug control" budget on enforcement, guns, jails and interdiction -- about the same proportion as under Bush and previous administrations. And, despite the new rhetoric about a "public health approach," the vast majority of people who have a drug problem still can't get treatment.

The reality is that despite the 40-year-old, $1 trillion drug war, our society is swimming in drugs.

#### The War on drugs has FAILED in Mexico

Helen Redmond July 2013 ISR.org “The political economy of Mexico’s drug war”

There is a worldwide consensus that the war on drugs has failed. In 1998, the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) held a meeting titled, “A Drug-Free World: We Can Do It.” We didn’t do it. Fifty years after the war on drugs was declared the number of drug users hasn’t declined. Over 230,000 million people around the world—1 in 20—used illicit drugs in 2011, according the UNODC’s own statistics.85 Drug prices are stable and the purity of some drugs has actually increased. Globally, the two most widely used substances are cannabis and amphetamine-type stimulants. The United States continues to be the largest market for illegal drugs in the world. By any measurement—number of users, availability of drugs, public safety, corruption, money laundering, or the dismantling of drug trafficking organizations—the war on drugs on both sides of the border is indisputably a lost cause.

**Next**

Zed Books forward to  "Politics, Neoliberalism and Violence in the New Narcoeconomy". June 14, 2012   **Peter Watt and Roberto Zepeda**

Mexico is a country in crisis. Capitalizing on weakened public institutions, widespread unemployment, a state of lawlessness and the strengthening of links between Mexican and Colombian drug cartels, narcotrafficking in the country has flourished during the post-1982 neoliberal era. In fact, it has become one of Mexico's biggest source of revenue, as well as its most violent, with over 12,000 drug-related executions in 2011 alone. In response, Mexican president Felipe Calderón, armed with millions of dollars in US military aid, has launched a crackdown, ostensibly to combat organised crime. Despite this, human rights violations have increased, as has the murder rate, making Ciudad Juárez on the northern border the most dangerous city on the planet.

#### The War on Drugs is FUNDAMENTALLY a U.S. Federal Policy of Coercion towards Mexico

Helen Redmond July 2013 ISR.org “The political economy of Mexico’s drug war”

The drug warriors in Mexico are junior partners in the war on drugs. It is on the other side of the border, thousands of miles away in Washington, DC and Langley, Virginia where the senior partners call the shots. The drug warriors in the White House, the Congress, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF), and Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) have blood on their hands, too. For almost a century, American politicians and federal antidrug agencies have dictated drug policy to their neighbor. Coercing Mexico to enforce total drug prohibition has been a central and enduring source of tension between the two countries.

#### This policy has cost tens of thousands of lives in Mexico alone

#### Helen Redmond July **2013** ISR.org “The political economy of Mexico’s drug war”

#### THE MEXICAN drug war is a killing machine. The level of violence and slaughter is similar to conventional warfare. In just six years, 70,000 people have been killed, but some estimate the number is a staggering 120,000.1 More than 20,000 people have disappeared and a quarter of a million have been displaced.2 A major investigation into narcofosas(mass graves) in Mexico by the magazine Milenio found the corpses of 24,000 people.3 Entire cities and towns have erupted into war zones chock-full with military checkpoints and drug cartel roadblocks.

#### ONLY Legalization has any hope

The Raw Story June 5, 2013 Agence France-Presse

Ex-president Vicente Fox says Mexico should legalize marijuana to steal business back from violent drug cartels — and when it’s legal, he’s in (as a grower).¶ “Once it is legitimate and legal, of course, I do some farming. I can do it myself,” the conservative former leader said from his ranch in San Francisco del Rincon.¶ Fox, a former Coca-Cola executive who was president from 2000-2006, surprised many when he was among early voices in Mexico calling for illegal drugs to be legalized, seeing it as the only way to break the cycle of violent crime.¶ ads not by this site ¶ “Mexico should become an authorized producer, and export marijuana to places where it is already legal,” argued Fox, who is part of a group of former Latin American leaders pushing for drug legalization opposed by the United States.¶ **More than 70,000 people were killed in six years of drug-related violence** after ex-president Felipe Calderon launched an all-out war against the nation’s drug gangs upon taking office in December 2006, according to government data.¶ “This country’s incredibly serious problem — violence, crime and drugs — can be solved by legalizing drugs. Trying to solve it with repression or violence just fosters more violence,” Fox said.

#### The US War On Drugs Policy is classic Security Rhetoric, used to justify control over Mexicans and US citizens alike

Daniela Morales and Peter Watt   September 17, 2010  “Narcotrafficking in Mexico: Neoliberalism and a Militarized State”  upsidedownworld.com

The discourse of US politicians changed after the fall of the Berlin Wall; it's no longer Communism because in the 1980s they found another pretext – narcotrafficking – and following the attacks in New York in 2001 the justifications of the 'War on Drugs' became associated with themes like security, the terrorist threat from Islamic extremists, the left, guerrilla insurgents, those who are supposedly transporting Weapons of Mass Destruction through Latin America to mount an attack on the US. So when US politicians link all of that together they are planting the thought in the public mind that there is a terrorist threat from Mexico, from Colombia, leftist groups, left-leaning governments like those of Venezuela, Bolivia or Ecuador and they are associating them with narcotrafficking and it provides a very good pretext, particularly in the US where clearly there's little awareness of what's really going on. The discourse of the Cold War is being repeated but now under the pretext of narcotrafficking, terrorism, Chavismo.  Meanwhile, the US military is overstretched in the Middle East, but the preoccupation has to do with the fact that many Latin American countries are integrating with each other.

#### This rhetoric leads directly to facism

Neocleous 2008 (Mark, Professor of the Critique of Political Economy; Head of Department of Politics & History Brunel Univ, Critique of Security, 9)

A final introductory word on fascism. A number of writers have noted that there is a real Schmittan logic underpinning security politics: that casting an issue as one of ‘security’ tends to situate that issue within the logic of threat and decision, of friend and enemy, and so magnifies the dangers and ratchets up the strategic fears and insecurities that encourage the construction of a certain kind of political reason centered on the violent clampdown of the moment of decision. ‘Speaking and writing about security is never innocent’, says Jef Huysman, ‘it always risks contributing to the opening of a window of opportunity for a “fascist mobilization”’. Events since 11 September 2001, bear witness to this. It seems abundantly clear that any revival of fascism would now come through the mobilization of society in the name of security. This potential for fascist mobilization underlines once more that far from being a distinct political force outside of liberalism and capital, fascism is in fact liberal capitalism’s doppelganger. The lesson of the twentieth century is that the crises of liberalism, more often than not expressed as crises of liberalism, the fascist potential within liberal democracy has always been more dangerous than the fascist tendency against democracy. The critique of security being developed here is intended as a reminder of the authoritarian, reactionary and fascist potential within the capitalist order and one of its key political categories.

#### This equals dehumanization

Levin, Mark R. (2012-01-17). Ameritopia (p. 3). Simon & Schuster, Inc.. Kindle Edition.

TYRANNY, BROADLY DEFINED, is the use of power to dehumanize the individual and delegitimize his nature.

**This is the ultimate impact**

Berube 97 – [David M., Professor of Communication Studies at University of South Carolina., “NANOTECHNOLOGICAL PROLONGEVITY: The Down Side,” http://www.cas.sc.edu/engl/faculty/berube/prolong.htm]

This means-ends dispute is at the core of Montagu and Matson's treatise on the dehumanization of humanity. They warn[s]: "its destructive toll is already greater than that of any war, plague, famine, or natural calamity on record -- and its potential danger to the quality of life and the fabric of civilized society is beyond calculation. For that reason this sickness of the soul might well be called the Fifth Horseman of the Apocalypse.... Behind the genocide of the holocaust lay a dehumanized thought; beneath the menticide of deviants and dissidents... in the cuckoo's next of America, lies a dehumanized image of man... (Montagu & Matson, 1983, p. xi-xii). While it may never be possible to quantify the impact dehumanizing ethics may have had on humanity, it is safe to conclude the foundations of humanness offer great opportunities which would be foregone. When we calculate the actual losses and the virtual benefits, we approach a nearly inestimable value greater than any tools which we can currently use to measure it. Dehumanization is nuclear war, environmental apocalypse, and international genocide. When people become things, they become dispensable. When people are dispensable, any and every atrocity can be justified. Once justified, they seem to be inevitable for every epoch has evil and dehumanization is evil's most powerful weapon