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## 1

#### Desire creates the illusion of the self and the suffering that defines the human condition. Our only capacity is thus to affirm the extermination of this desire in the face of perpetual death and an impermanent reality

**DOLLIMORE 1998** (Jonathan Dollimore 1998 (Death, Desire and Loss in Western Culture, p 54-56.)

Siddhartha Gautama (560-477 BC) was a prince who, because of his high privilege, encountered suffering and death relatively late in life. Legend tells us that when he did eventually encounter them the trauma was the greater, and changed his life: he became Buddha, the Enlightened One. In the religion he founded, life is experienced as a permanent intrinsic unsatisfactoriness manifested as suffering (dukkha) and pain: birth is painful, old age is painful, sickness is painful, death is painful, sorrow, lamentation, dejection, and despair are painful. Contact with unpleasant things is painful, not getting what one wishes is painful. In short the five groups of grasping [the elements, skandbasy which make up a person] are painful. ('Sermon at Benares', in Burtt, p. 30) Everything about life involves suffering and dissatisfaction, a sense of lack. If we strive to overcome that lack we fail, and suffering becomes marked by a renewed craving, now intensified by an acute sense of loss. Suffering derives directly from the fact that everything that exists is radically mutable. In particular, happiness, if it is achieved, cannot last. Suffering haunts happiness from the outside and the inside. Where Buddhism differs from Western religions is in the full acceptance of mutability; happiness lies in achieving that acceptance. Suffering is perpetuated by, and inseparable from, ignorance, and mitigated by wisdom. The deepest ignorance is to fail to see, or to disavow, the fact that everything that exists is mutable and transient. The force of this position may be seen, again, in contrast with Christianity; for the Buddhist the source of suffering is ignorance rather than sin. And the real source of suffering is desire (kama) or craving (tanha, literally 'thirst'), both of which are intrinsic to, constitutive of, humankind. There is a Buddhist doctrine of 'conditioned arising' or 'dependent origination' which asserts that everything that exists is dependent on certain prevailing conditions; nothing is intrinsically self-sufficient, independent or stable. This is especially true of selfhood. Buddhism completely denies the idea of a transcendent or autonomous self so powerful in Western religion and philosophy. To believe that there is some essential inner self or consciousness which is the real me, ultimately identifiable apart from everything that happens to me, is an illusion: What we call a personality is just an individual stream of becoming; a cross-section of it at any given moment in an aggregate of the five skandhas which (as long as it continues) are in unstable and unceasing interaction with each other, (p. 86) There is no I. Even to believe in an I which possesses emotions (albeit helplessly) is mistaken. One of the problems with desire, and why it cannot make us happy, is that it presupposes a self which does not exist; at the core of our being we are empty. Everything that constitutes the individual is marked by the unsatisfactoriness and suffering which is dukkha. Nor is there such a thing as the soul. The person is only a fleeting series of discontinuous states held together by desire, by craving. When desire is extinguished the person is dissolved. Since life and suffering are synonymous, the extinction of desire is the goal of human endeavor. Until that happens we continue to exist through a series of rebirths. It is not death as such which is deplored, but rebirth; it is not death but rebirth which we must escape. So much so that in some early texts rebirth is described as 'redeath'. Desire perpetuates life, which is synonymous with suffering, and which leads to death. Desire perpetuates death; it keeps one dying. The self is merged with ultimate reality not by identifying the core of the self (soul/essence) with ultimate reality (God/the universal) but by extinguishing self into non-being (nirvana). This is the aspect of Buddhism which has fascinated Western philosophers like Schopenhauer and artists like Wagner; with whatever degree of misinterpretation, they have been drawn by the ideas of empowerment through renunciation, nullification and quiescence; of the apparent ability to move freely with the mutability and change which arc the apparent cause of suffering; of choosing freely not to pursue the illusion of freedom, in a sense to eliminate the illusion of self; of becoming discontinuous, mindless. Not to escape mutability but to become it; not to just go with the flow of endless change, but to become it. To achieve the state of nirvana - that is, a state of being which is essentially empty of desire and striving. The wisdom of Buddhism does not desire to transcend change or to affirm an essential ultimate relationship of self to the absolute and unchanging (Platonic forms, the Christian God); nor does the Buddhist desire to die or to cease to be (the death drive): he or she does not desire annihilation but rather learns how to cease desiring. Nirvana is the utter cessation of desire or craving; it means extinction.

#### There is no alternative—vote negative to reject the 1AC’s presentation—

#### A rejection of the cycle of desire allows us to have enlightened engagement with the world

**DAVIS 2004** (Bret W. Davis, 2004 (Department of Japanese Philosophy Kyoto University “Zen After Zarathustra: The Problem of the Will in the Confrontation Between Nietzsche and Buddhism” The Journal of Nietzsche Studies 28 (2004) 89-138, accessed through muse.edu)

The Vimalakirti Sutra tells us that the Buddha Lands are not somewhere else, but rather "the various kinds of living beings are themselves the Buddha Lands of the Bodhisattvas"; it is only that these beings do not yet see the purity of this world due to the impurity of their way of seeing.24 In learning to see that "form is none other than emptiness" and that "emptiness does not represent the extinction of form," one ceases to "yearn for nirvana" and to "loath this world," and is able to "enter the gate of nondualism."25 Nagarjuna tersely asserts this doctrine of nondualism when he writes: "The limits (i.e., realm) of nirvana are the limits [End Page 97] of samsara. Between the two, also, there is not the slightest difference whatsoever."26 Jay Garfield gives the following helpful interpretation of these enigmatic yet crucial lines. "To be in samsara is to see things as they appear to deluded consciousness and to interact with them accordingly. To be in nirvana, then, is to see those things as they are—as merely empty, dependent, impermanent, and nonsubstantial, but not to be somewhere else, seeing something else.... Nagarjuna is emphasizing that nirvana is not someplace else. It is a way of being here."27 The way things are here and now, according to Buddhism, is neither existence nor non-existence, but rather the middle way of dependent co-origination. When this dynamic process of interconnected becoming is radically thought through, according to Nagarjuna, there is no (substantial) "thing" that comes into and goes out of existence. And this means that each and every phenomenal event is marked by—in the words of his famous eightfold negation—"non-origination, non-extinction; non-destruction, non-permanence; non-identity, non-differentiation; non-coming (into being), non-going (out of being)."28 The "uncompounded" is thus not someplace else, but is this world of non-substantial becoming seen aright. According to Nagarjuna, the root of samsaric existence is the activity or disposition (Sk. samskâra) that compounds phenomena into reified forms, forms that we attach ourselves to and then suffer the loss (of control) of. The "wise one" who sees into this vicious circle, therefore, ceases to "act" in the sense of "to create compounds." But this cessation is presumably not a cessation of all "activity" as such; indeed, as Garfield puts it, by ceasing the activity of reification "we can achieve... a nirvana not found in an escape from the world but in an enlightened and awakened engagement with it."29 The right effort to attain nirvana is thus not a will to nothingness, but leads rather to the realization that there is nothing to "attain."30 Thus asamskrta refers not to an eternal realm outside the conditioned world of becoming, but to a more originary way of perceiving and dwelling in the world of dependent co-origination. This nondualism of samsara and nirvana, however, is not a simple identity. It is neither a dualism (since nirvana is not some other place outside this world), nor is it a sheer nothingness, a negation of existence as such. Yet the world reaffirmed is not simply the same as the initial world of "attachment" (P./Sk. upâdâna). Rather, nirvana implies a different way of being-in-this-world. Yet how can we characterize this difference? Negatively speaking, we may assume that enlightened action would not be driven by attachment, craving, or, presumably, the will to power. In following the return movement in Buddhism back toward a reaffirmative characterization of being-in-the-world, we must not loose sight of the importance of this initial moment of negation. The negation of these modes of "willful" being-in-the-world marks the radical difference between an enlightened "re-affirmation" and an ignorant craving for and attachment to life. Nirvana, as a "blowing out of the flame of craving and attachment," demands first of all a radical negation of the will. A reaffirmation of the world of activity [End Page 98] is made possible, however, only by way of a second—equally necessary—negation, namely, a negation of any sublated craving for and attachment to transcendent repose in the realm of nirvana. The event of nirvana thus paradoxically completes itself only in a movement through its own negation. Saigusa Mitsuyoshi writes that this dialectical movement toward reaffirmation through double negation can already be found in the early sutras. The Suttanipâta, for instance, often instructs us not only to discard "this world," but also to discard "that world" of the beyond. Saigusa interprets the first negation to signify the "negative" moment of nirvana, the "going forth" (Jp. ôsô) from this world of craving and ignorance, and the second negation to indicate a "positive" moment of "returning" (Jp. gensô) to compassionate activity within the world of conditioned existence. This movement of return, he adds, is not that of a one-dimensional circle, but rather that of a three-dimensional spiral.31 This dynamic dialectic of reaffirmation through double negation is clearly developed in the Mahayana tradition, as succinctly stated in the key phrase of the Heart Sutra: "form is emptiness; emptiness is form." Phenomenal beings (forms; Sk. rûpa) are emptied of any reified substantial essence (Sk. svabhâva); yet emptiness essentially empties itself into and as the eventful suchness of phenomenal be-ings in their dependent co-origination.

## 2

#### The modern world is inseparable from the colonial origins that gave birth to it—our foundational western logic is soaked with colonialist thought which must be resisted

Mignolo 5(Walter, Professor at Duke University, Joint Appointments in Cultural Anthropology and Romance Studies, “The Idea of Latin America,” pg 5)

How do these two entangled concepts, modernity and coloniality, work together as two sides of the same reality to shape the idea of “America” in the sixteenth century and of “Latin” America in the nineteenth? Modernity has been a term in use for the past thirty or forty years. In spite of differences in opinions and deﬁnitions, there are some basic agreements about its meaning. From the European perspective, modernity refers to a period in world history that has been traced back either to the European Renaissance and the “discovery” of America (this view is common among scholars from the South of Europe, Italy, Spain, and Portugal), or to the European Enlightenment (this view is held by scholars and intel-lectuals and assumed by the media in Anglo-Saxon countries – England, Germany, and Holland – and one Latin country, France). On the other side of the colonial difference, scholars and intellectu-als in the ex-Spanish and ex-Portuguese colonies in South America have been advancing the idea that the achievements of modernity go hand in hand with the violence of coloniality. The difference, to reiterate, **lies in which side of** each local **history is told**. O’Gorman’s “invention of America” theory was a turning point that put on the table a perspective that was absent and not recognized from the existing European and imperial narratives. Let’s agree that O’Gorman made visible a dimension of history that was occluded by the partial “discovery” narratives, and let’s also agree that it is an example of how things may look from the varied experiences of coloniality. America, as a concept, goes hand in hand with that of modernity, and both are the self-representation of imperial projects and global designs that originated in and were implemented by European actors and institutions. The invention of America was one of the nodal points that contributed to create the conditions for imperial European expansion and a lifestyle, in Europe, that served as a model for the achievements of humanity. Thus, the “discovery and conquest of America” is not just one more event in some long and linear historical chain from the creation of the world to the present, leaving behind all those who were not attentive enough to jump onto the bandwagon of modernity. Rather, it was a key turning point in world history: It was the moment in which the demands of modernity as the ﬁnal horizon of salvation began to require the imposition of a speciﬁc set of values that relied on the logic of coloniality for their implementation. The “invention of America” thesis offers, instead, a perspective from coloniality and, in consequence, reveals that the advances of modernity outside of Europe rely on a colonial matrix of power that includes the renaming of the lands appropriated and of the people inhabiting them, insofar as the diverse ethnic groups and civilizations in Tawantinsuyu and Anáhuac, as well as those from Africa, were reduced to “Indians” and “Blacks.” The idea of “America” and of “Latin” America could, of course, be accounted for within the philosophical framework of European modernity, even if that account is offered by Creoles of European descent dwelling in the colonies and embracing the Spanish or Portuguese view of events. What counts, however, is that the need for telling the part of the story that was not told requires a shift in the geography of reason and of understanding. “Coloniality,” therefore, points toward and intends to unveil an embedded logic that enforces control, domina-tion, and exploitation disguised in the language of salvation, progress, modernization, and being good for every one. The double register of modernity/coloniality has, perhaps, never been as clear as it has been recently under the administration of US president George W. Bush. Pedagogically, it is important for my argument to conceptualize “modernity/coloniality” as two sides of the same coin and not as two separate frames of mind: you cannot be modern without being colonial; and if you are on the colonial side of the spectrum you have to transact with modernity – you cannot ignore it. The very idea of America cannot be separated from coloniality: the entire continent emerged as such in the European consciousness as a massive extent of land to be appropriated and of people to be converted to Christianity, and whose labor could be exploited. Coloniality, as a term, is much less frequently heard than “moder-nity” and many people tend to confuse it with “colonialism.” The two words are related, of course. While “colonialism” refers to spe-ciﬁc historical periods and places of imperial domination (e.g., Spanish, Dutch, British, the US since the beginning of the twentieth century), “coloniality” refers to the logical structure of colonial domination underlying the Spanish, Dutch, British, and US control of the Atlantic economy and politics, and from there the control and management of almost the entire planet. In each of the particu-lar imperial periods of colonialism – whether led by Spain (mainly in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries) or by England (from the nineteenth century to World War II) or by the US (from the early twentieth century until now) – the same logic was maintained; only power changed hands.

#### This ideology perpetuates selective intervention—we pick and choose when and how to engage Latin America, doing so only with a self-serving concern for our own economic interests—we only care about Latin America when it’s useful to do so

Arceneaux and Pion-Berlin 2005 (Craig, David, “Transforming Latin America: The International and Domestic Origins of Change”, p.219-221)

Policy Implications Knowing when and why foreign forces matter to the conduct of events in Latin America takes on policy salience as well. As Latin America moves into the twenty-first century, it faces problems of considerable gravity: democracies that are weakly institutionalized, governments that perform poorly or not at all militaries that are asked to fill functional gaps, crime and insecurity that sweep through once relatively safe and secure communities, courts that fail to bring perpetrators to justice, poverty that reaches up and grabs vast portions of an erst-while middle class, double-digit unemployment rates, and indigenous populations at the very bottom who will not wait any longer for a slice of the pie. The political life spans of Latin America's leaders have grown progressively shorter as they either cannot or will not remedy these ills; worse still, they are sometimes part of the problem. It is always at times of great frustration and great need when the question is asked: what will the wealthier industrialized countries offer this beleaguered region? And specifically, what will the United States offer? The answer is not comforting, but it is at least more comprehensible once viewed through the lens of our framework. The United States is not likely to invest any significant resources or effort in a campaign of direct economic or social assistance targeted at in-need populations. This is not a bold prediction course; the foreign aid spigot was more or less turned off years ago and remains closed. Naturally there have been both ideological and fiscal changes in the United States in recent decades that can account for the diminished importance of foreign aid. But the problem goes beyond the hegemony of fiscal conservatism to one of general hegemonic attention and motivation. U.S. governments—-whether Democratic or Republican controlled—have very little interest in any of the aforementioned problems, and less interest still in doing anything about them. Their lack of interest derives from a perception that the burdens of the region's poor, its workers, its unemployed, its peasants, its pensioners indeed its average citizens, generate no imminent threats to U.S. national interests, and efforts to assist them generate no tangible benefits in return. These are low politics difficulties that do not reach out and grab the attention of powerful executives or lawmakers from the North. This view is not just a kind of bias toward the impoverished masses. The U.S. government demonstrates an equally indifferent attitude toward the elites. It refuses to commit significant attention, expertise, or sums of money to strengthen and reform Latin America's courts, legislatures, police units, defense ministries, and other institutions of the democratic state. Elites desperately need stronger institutions if they are to govern effectively. But however vital democratic deepening may be to Latin America's future, it just does not appear on Washington's radar screen because it too resides in the realm of low politics, meaning the stakes are appreciably lower for foreign states. Scholars can wax eloquent about how the afflictions of poverty, unemployment, crime, the environment, institutional decay, and human rights left unattended now will fester and create crises that will eventually harm U.S. interests. But the arguments fall on deaf ears to policy makers who view the long term as very long indeed and who are eager to discount the future costs to their current inaction. Unless Latin America's low politics problems can cause considerable and immediate angst at a national level within the United States, they will not become a political agenda item in Washington. Washington's attention deficit is selective, and issue sensitive. Within the high politics realm of economics, the United States is willing (with some misgivings) to work toward the creation of a free trade zone with its Latin American partners. It is ideologically predisposed to do so, and it envisions a short- to medium-term gain in the form of new, expanded, and unrestricted markets for U.S. exporters and investors. But it is much less willing to associate free trade with low politics reforms within Latin American states that would humanize the workplace, boost wages, or create jobs. In the longer term, assisting Latin American workers and unemployed should, in theory, rebound to the benefit of the United States by bolstering disposable incomes, which in turn would mean greater consumption of very competitive U.S. goods. Even though there is a logical linkage between these sets of issues, it is still perceived as an indirect and less urgent connection and one that Washington policy makers seldom make. They would rather place their bets on a free trade deal alone that quickly solidifies their nation's export earnings and profit remittances. Similar issue splits are visible elsewhere. The United States wants Latin American armed forces to leap into wars against guerrillas and terrorists but shows little concern that military immersion in these campaigns might have negative consequences for professionalism, democratic society, and civilian control in those countries. It devotes scant resources to help fully professionalize those forces and less still to equip civilians with the tools they need to institutionalize control over their soldiers. It wants its Southern neighbors to fight hard against transnational crime but will not help finance judicial reform that would allow Latin American courts to process their criminal caseloads more efficiently and prosecute more frequently, or help fund police reform to reduce the rampant corruption of those units. The United States visualizes the struggle against left-wing insurgents, terrorists, and their criminal associates as high-stakes contests of high politics that must be won to enhance its own national security and that of its allies in those struggles; it does not visualize improvements in Latin American civil-military relations or judicial and police systems in quite the same way. In not addressing the latter issues, the United States may be cutting off its nose to spite its face. Without low politics reforms to assist Latin American judges, police, investigators, soldiers, and their civilian managers, those groups will be less equipped to lend a hand in transnational struggles deemed vital by Washington. But so it goes. The hegemon's indifference to these groups and their problems persists, and the balance of influence remains tilted in the direction of domestic politics and away from the foreign. On these issues, Latin America is left to fend for itself, and only time will tell whether its independence proves to be a blessing or a curse.

#### This makes extermination of the Latin American other an imperative

Lander 2k (Edgardo, Professor of Social Sciences at the Universidad Central de Venezuela, “Eurocentrism and Colonialism in Latin American Social Thought”, Nepantla: Views from South, Vol. 1 Iss. 3, p. 519-532)

Political and social thought regarding Latin America has been historically characterized by a tension between the search for its specific attributes and an external view that has seen these lands from the narrow perspective of European experience. There has also been an opposition between the challenge of the rich potentialities of this New World and distress over its difference, which stands in contrast with the ideal represented by European culture and racial composition. Nonetheless, external colonial views and regrets because of the difference have been widely hegemonic. A brief revision of the texts of the first republican constitutions is enough to illustrate how liberals, in their attempt to transplant and install a replica of their understanding of the European or North American experience, almost completely ignore the specific cultural and historical conditions of the societies about which they legislate. When these conditions are considered, it is with the express purpose of doing away with them. The affliction because of the difference—the awkwardness of living in a continent that is not white, urban, cosmopolitan, and civilized— finds its best expression in positivism. Sharing the main assumptions and prejudices of nineteenth-century European thought (scientific racism, patriarchy, the idea of progress), positivism reaffirms the colonial discourse. The continent is imagined from a single voice, with a single subject: white, masculine, urban, cosmopolitan. The rest, the majority, is the “other,” barbarian, primitive, black, Indian, who has nothing to contribute to the future of these societies. It would be imperative to whiten, westernize, or exterminate that majority.

#### The alternative is to endorse a strategy of epistemic disobedience—only this delinking from Western though can break the illusion of progressive modernity and accurately portray colonialist domination—this is the only form of ethical engagement

Mignolo 12 (Walter, Professor at Duke University, Joint Appointments in Cultural Anthropology and Romance Studies, “Epistemic Disobedience and the Decolonial Option: A Manifesto,” Transmodernity: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World, 45-46)

But the basic formulation of decolonial delinking (e.g., desprendimiento) was advanced by Aníbal Quijano in his ground-breaking article “Colonialidad y modernidad/racionalidad” (1991) [Coloniality and modernity/rationality]. The argument was that, on the one hand, an analytic of the limits of Eurocentrism (as a hegemonic structure of knowledge and beliefs) is needed. But that analytic was considered necessary rather than sufficient. It was necessary, Quijano asserted, “desprenderse de las vinculaciones de la racionalidad-modernidad con la colonialidad, en primer término, y en definitiva con todo poder no constituido en la decisión libre de gentes libres” [“It is necessary to extricate oneself from the linkages between rationality/modernity and coloniality, first of all, and definitely from all power which is not constituted by free decisions made by free people”].4 “Desprenderse” means epistemic de-linking or, in other words, epistemic disobedience. Epistemic disobedience leads us to decolonial options as a set of projects that have in common the effects experienced by all the inhabitants of the globe that were at the receiving end of global designs to colonize the economy (appropriation of land and natural resources), authority (management by the Monarch, the State, or the Church), and police and military enforcement (coloniality of power), to colonize knowledges (languages, categories of thoughts, belief systems, etc.) and beings (subjectivity). “Delinking” is then necessary because there is no way out of the coloniality of power from within Western (Greek and Latin) categories of thought. Consequently, de-linking implies epistemic disobedience rather than the constant search for “newness” (e.g., as if Michel Foucault’s concept of racism and power were “better” or more “appropriate” because they are “newer”—that is, post-modern—within the chronological history or archaeology of European ideas). Epistemic disobedience takes us to a different place, to a different “beginning” (not in Greece, but in the responses to the “conquest and colonization” of America and the massive trade of enslaved Africans), to spatial sites of struggles and building rather than to a new temporality within the same space (from Greece, to Rome, to Paris, to London, to Washington DC). I will explore the opening up of these spaces—the spatial paradigmatic breaks of epistemic disobedience—in Waman Puma de Ayala and Ottabah Cugoano. The basic argument (almost a syllogism) that I will develop here is the following: if coloniality is constitutive of modernity since the salvationist rhetoric of modernity presupposes the oppressive and condemnatory logic of coloniality (from there come the damnés of Fanon), then this oppressive logic produces an energy of discontent, of distrust, of release within those who react against imperial violence. This energy is translated into decolonial projects that, as a last resort, are also constitutive of modernity. Modernity is a three-headed hydra, even though it only reveals one head: the rhetoric of salvation and progress. Coloniality, one of whose facets is poverty and the propagation of AIDS in Africa, does not appear in the rhetoric of modernity as its necessary counterpart, but rather as something that emanates from it. For example, the Millennium Plan of the United Nations headed by Kofi Anan, and the Earth Institute at Columbia University headed by Jeffrey Sachs, work in collaboration to end poverty (as the title of Sach’s book announces).5 But, while they question the unfortunate consequences of modernity, never for a moment is the ideology of modernity or the black pits that hide its rhetoric ever questioned: the consequences of the very nature of the capitalist economy—by which such ideology is supported—in its various facets since the mercantilism of the sixteenth century, free trade of the following centuries, the Industrial Revolution of the nineteenth century, and the technological revolution of the twentieth century. On the other hand, despite all the debate in the media about the war against terrorism, on one side, and all types of uprisings, of protests and social movements, it is never suggested that the logic of coloniality that hides beneath the rhetoric of modernity necessarily generates the irreducible energy of humiliated, vilified, forgotten, or marginalized human beings. Decoloniality is therefore the energy that does not allow the operation of the logic of coloniality nor believes the fairy tales of the rhetoric of modernity. Therefore, decoloniality has a varied range of manifestations—some undesirable, such as those that Washington today describes as “terrorists”—and decolonial thinking is, then, thinking that de-links and opens (de-linking and opening in the title come from here) to the possibilities hidden (colonized and discredited, such as the traditional, barbarian, primitive, mystic, etc.) by the modern rationality that is mounted and enclosed by categories of Greek, Latin, and the six modern imperial European languages.

## 3

#### Cuba currently provides a successful alternative to capitalism---however, inclusion into the global market would destroy that example, which leads to dehumanization

Malott ‘5 (Professor at Brooklyn College, City College of New York, and D’Youville College; “Cuban Education in Neo-liberal Times: Socialist Revolutionaries and State

Capitalism”; 2005; Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies)JFIII

Throughout this paper I have made the case that Cuba’s internal humanitarian ¶ achievements have garnered international admiration and support. However, perhaps ¶ equally important has been their unwavering dedication to other oppressed peoples ¶ throughout the world that has earned them not only the respect, but also the watchful ¶ eye of the international community, which, it can be argued, has contributed to their ¶ longevity. While Castro has consistently been portrayed as a despotic dictator in the ¶ United States, his public speech and his national and international policies have ¶ reflected those of a man driven by an armed revolutionary love genuinely searching ¶ for a more just, egalitarian future beyond the destructive tendencies of capitalism.¶ The example of Castro’s unwavering militant dedication to the People’s Revolution, ¶ and the Cuban populace’s relentless push forward in the areas of human social ¶ progress stand as a glaring example of the magnitude of what can be accomplished ¶ against the neo-liberal push to privatize public services with a continuously ¶ diminishing supply of resources in an increasingly hostile environment. In other ¶ words, Cuba should be a source of inspiration to those of us who understand the urgency of creating a life informed by values of cooperation and mutual aid, rather ¶ than a world structured around competition and manufactured scarcity. At the same ¶ time, however, Cuba makes clear that participating in the global market, even when ¶ done as a means of providing for the people, makes them vulnerable to the inherent ¶ crises built into the capitalist system of value production. What is more, such ¶ engagement has pushed back gains in anti-racism as Cubans are pitted against Cubans ¶ in a desperate scramble for dollars. It is obvious that the external investment of ¶ foreign capital motivated by private gain is steeped in divisiveness and crises. Even ¶ Cuba’s state-run businesses, informed by values of cooperation and equality, while ¶ producing many benefits when accompanied by a strong trading partner such as the ¶ former Soviet Union, depends on the external control of labor power, and is therefore ¶ somewhat dehumanizing. The diagnosis: Capitalism is not good for humanity ¶ regardless if it is state or privately run. We can therefore conclude that while the ¶ Cuban experiment has made progress toward humanization, it is still hindered by the ¶ dehumanizing nature of value-production.¶ Finally, and to reiterate, Cuba’s 40 plus years of international solidarity, reminds ¶ those of us paying attention that there is little room in today’s crisis-ridden global ¶ environment for inter-Left squabbling. Open and healthy debate of course should be ¶ encouraged for tactical and philosophical reasons, but in the spirit of solidarity. The ¶ future truly is undetermined: there is no guarantee, for example, that humanity will ¶ overcome the institutionalization of authoritarianism and the process of value ¶ production, whether state-sponsored, privately controlled, or more commonly, a ¶ mixed system of state and private domination. Marx spoke of strength within diversity ¶ providing people with a better opportunity to meet each other’s needs in a socialist ¶ context. Marx was referring to a diversity of skills. Peter McLaren and Ramin ¶ Farahmandpur (2005) and Paula Allman (2001) have extended his analysis to include ¶ a diversity of ethnic and cultural backgrounds. Similarly, I would add that a diversity ¶ of ideas, Marxist and anarchist to name just two, should not only be tolerated, but ¶ encouraged as evidence of an open and free movement against all forms of ¶ oppression. As we forge ahead into the unforeseeable future, whoever and wherever ¶ we are, acting as international solidarity workers, let us image and practice ¶ increasingly just, egalitarian, anti-racist, anti-sexist, anti-homophobic, anti-capitalist creative ways to regain control of our labor power in the spirit of our species being ¶ and for the betterment of all life on this planet.

#### Neoliberalism’s end point is extinction

Darder 10 (Professor Antonia Darder, Distinguished Professor of Education, University of Illinois, Urbana Champaign, “Preface” in *Critical Pedagogy, Ecoliteracy, & Planetary Crisis: The Ecopedagogy Movement* by Richard V. Kahn, 2010, pp. x-xiii) GENDER MODIFIED

It is fitting to begin my words about Richard Kahn’s Critical Pedagogy, Ecoliteracy, and Planetary Crisis: The Ecopedagogy Movement with a poem. The direct and succinct message of The Great Mother Wails cuts through our theorizing and opens us up to the very heart of the book’s message—to ignite a fire that speaks to the ecological crisis at hand; a crisis orchestrated by the inhumane greed and economic brutality of the wealthy. Nevertheless, as is clearly apparent, none of us is absolved from complicity with the devastating destruction of the earth. As members of the global community, we are all implicated in this destruction by the very manner in which we define ourselves, each other, and all living beings with whom we reside on the earth. Everywhere we look there are glaring signs of political systems and social structures that propel us toward unsustainability and extinction. In this historical moment, the planet faces some of the most horrendous forms of “[hu]man-made” devastation ever known to humankind. Cataclysmic “natural disasters” in the last decade have sung the environmental hymns of planetary imbalance and reckless environmental disregard. A striking feature of this ecological crisis, both locally and globally, is the overwhelming concentration of wealth held by the ruling elite and their agents of capital. This environmental malaise is characterized by the staggering loss of livelihood among working people everywhere; gross inequalities in educational opportunities; an absence of health care for millions; an unprecedented number of people living behind bars; and trillions spent on fabricated wars fundamentally tied to the control and domination of the planet’s resources. The Western ethos of mastery and supremacy over nature has accompanied, to our detriment, the unrelenting expansion of capitalism and its unparalleled domination over all aspects of human life. This hegemonic worldview has been unmercifully imparted through a host of public policies and practices that conveniently gloss over gross inequalities as commonsensical necessities for democracy to bloom. As a consequence, the liberal democratic rhetoric of “we are all created equal” hardly begins to touch the international pervasiveness of racism, patriarchy, technocracy, and economic piracy by the West, all which have fostered the erosion of civil rights and the unprecedented ecological exploitation of societies, creating conditions that now threaten our peril, if we do not reverse directions. Cataclysmic disasters, such as Hurricane Katrina, are unfortunate testimonies to the danger of ignoring the warnings of the natural world, especially when coupled with egregious governmental neglect of impoverished people. Equally disturbing, is the manner in which ecological crisis is vulgarly exploited by unscrupulous and ruthless capitalists who see no problem with turning a profit off the backs of ailing and mourning oppressed populations of every species—whether they be victims of weather disasters, catastrophic illnesses, industrial pollution, or inhumane practices of incarceration. Ultimately, these constitute ecological calamities that speak to the inhumanity and tyranny of material profiteering, at the expense of precious life. The arrogance and exploitation of neoliberal values of consumption dishonor the contemporary suffering of poor and marginalized populations around the globe. Neoliberalism denies or simply mocks (“Drill baby drill!”) the interrelationship and delicate balance that exists between all living beings, including the body earth. In its stead, values of individualism, competition, privatization, and the “free market” systematically debase the ancient ecological knowledge of indigenous populations, who have, implicitly or explicitly, rejected the fabricated ethos of “progress and democracy” propagated by the West. In its consuming frenzy to gobble up the natural resources of the planet for its own hyperbolic quest for material domination, the exploitative nature of capitalism and its burgeoning technocracy has dangerously deepened the structures of social exclusion, through the destruction of the very biodiversity that has been key to our global survival for millennia. Kahn insists that this devastation of all species and the planet must be fully recognized and soberly critiqued. But he does not stop there. Alongside, he rightly argues for political principles of engagement for the construction of a critical ecopedagogy and ecoliteracy that is founded on economic redistribution, cultural and linguistic democracy, indigenous sovereignty, universal human rights, and a fundamental respect for all life. As such, Kahn seeks to bring us all back to a formidable relationship with the earth, one that is unquestionably rooted in an integral order of knowledge, imbued with physical, emotional, intellectual, and spiritual wisdom. Within the context of such an ecologically grounded epistemology, Kahn uncompromisingly argues that our organic relationship with the earth is also intimately tied to our struggles for cultural self-determination, environmental sustainability, social and material justice, and global peace. Through a carefully framed analysis of past disasters and current ecological crisis, Kahn issues an urgent call for a critical ecopedagogy that makes central explicit articulations of the ways in which societies construct ideological, political, and cultural systems, based on social structures and practices that can serve to promote ecological sustainability and biodiversity or, conversely, lead us down a disastrous path of unsustainability and extinction. In making his case, Kahn provides a grounded examination of the manner in which consuming capitalism manifests its repressive force throughout the globe, disrupting the very ecological order of knowledge essential to the planet’s sustainability. He offers an understanding of critical ecopedagogy and ecoliteracy that inherently critiques the history of Western civilization and the anthropomorphic assumptions that sustain patriarchy and the subjugation of all subordinated living beings—assumptions that continue to inform traditional education discourses around the world. Kahn incisively demonstrates how a theory of multiple technoliteracies can be used to effectively critique the ecological corruption and destruction behind mainstream uses of technology and the media in the interest of the neoliberal marketplace. As such, his work points to the manner in which the sustainability rhetoric of mainstream environmentalism actually camouflages wretched neoliberal policies and practices that left unchecked hasten the annihilation of the globe’s ecosystem. True to its promise, the book cautions that any anti-hegemonic resistance movement that claims social justice, universal human rights, or global peace must contend forthrightly with the deteriorating ecological crisis at hand, as well as consider possible strategies and relationships that rupture the status quo and transform environmental conditions that threaten disaster. A failure to integrate ecological sustainability at the core of our political and pedagogical struggles for liberation, Kahn argues, is to blindly and misguidedly adhere to an anthropocentric worldview in which emancipatory dreams are deemed solely about human interests, without attention either to the health of the planet or to the well-being of all species with whom we walk the earth.

## 4

**Imaginaries of climatic apocalypticism are profoundly depoliticizing—appeals to a singular human fate objectify nature and ensure nothing changes.**

**Swyngedouw ‘13**

Erik, Professor of Geography at the University of Manchester in its School of Environment and Development, “Apocalypse Now! Fear and Doomsday Pleasures,” Capitalism Nature Socialism, 2013 Vol. 24, No. 1, 918

A flood of literature on the relationship between apocalyptic imaginaries, popular culture, and politics has excavated the uses and abuses of revelatory visions (Skrimshire 2010; Calder Williams 2011). Despite the important differences between the transcendental biblical use of the apocalypse and the thoroughly material and socio-physical ecological catastrophes-to-come, the latter, too, **depoliticize matters**. As Alain Badiou contends: [T]he rise of the ‘‘rights of Nature’’ **is a contemporary form of the opium** **for the people**. It is an only slightly camouflaged religion: the millenarian terror, concern for everything save the properly political destiny of peoples, **new instruments for control of everyday life, the obsession with hygiene, the fear of death and catastrophes . . . It is a gigantic operation in the depoliticization of subjects.** (Badiou 2008, 139) Environmental problems are indeed commonly staged as **universally threatening** **to** the survival of **humankind**, announcing the premature termination of civilization as we know it and sustained by what Mike Davis (1999) aptly called ‘‘**ecologies of fear**.’’ Much of the discursive matrix through which the presentation of the environmental condition we are in is quilted systematically by the continuous invocation of fear and danger, the specter of ecological annihilation, or at least seriously distressed socio-ecological conditions for many people in the near future. The nurturing of fear, in turn, is sustained in part by a particular set of **phantasmagorical imaginations** that serve to reinforce the seriousness of the situation (Katz 1995). The apocalyptic imaginary of a world without water or at least with endemic water shortages; **ravaged by hurricanes** whose intensity is amplified by climate change; pictures of scorched land as global warming shifts the geo-pluvial regime and the spatial variability of droughts and floods; icebergs that disintegrate; alarming **reductions in biod**iversity as species disappear or are threatened by extinction; **post-apocalyptic images of nuclear wastelands;** the threat of peak-oil; the devastations raked by wildfires, tsunamis, spreading diseases like SARS, Avian Flu, Ebola, or HIV\***all these imaginaries of a Nature out of synch**, **destabilized, threatening, and out of control** are paralleled by equally disturbing images of a society that continues piling up waste, pumping CO2 into the atmosphere, recombining DNA, deforesting the earth, etc . . . In sum, our ecological predicament is sutured by millennialism fears sustained by an apocalyptic rhetoric and representational tactics, and by a series of performative gestures signalling an **overwhelming**, **mind-boggling danger\***one that threatens to undermine the very coordinates of our everyday lives and routines and may shake up the foundations of all we took and take for granted. Of course, apocalyptic imaginaries have been around for a long time as an integral part of Western thought, first of Christianity and later emerging as the underbelly of fast-forwarding technological modernization and its associated doomsday thinkers. However, present day millennialism preaches an apocalypse without the promise of redemption. Saint John’s biblical apocalypse, for example, found its redemption in God’s infinite love, while relegating the outcasts to an afterlife of permanent suffering. The proliferation of modern apocalyptic imaginaries also held up the promise of redemption: the horsemen of the apocalypse, whether riding under the name of the proletarian, technology, or capitalism, could be tamed with appropriate political and social revolutions. **The environmental apocalypse**, **in contrast**, **takes different forms**. It is not immediate and total (but slow and painful), not revelatory (it does not announce the dawn of a new rose-tinted era); no redemption is promised (for the righteous ones), and there are no outcasts. Indeed, if the boat goes done, the first-class passengers will also drown. As Martin Jay argued, while traditional apocalyptic versions still held out the hope for redemption, for a ‘‘second coming,’’ for the promise of a ‘‘new dawn,’’ environmental apocalyptic imaginaries are ‘‘leaving behind any hope of rebirth or renewal . . . in favor of an **unquenchable fascination** **with being on the verge of an end that never comes’’** (Jay 1994, 33). The emergence of new forms of millennialism around the environmental nexus is indeed of a particular kind that promises neither redemption nor realization. As Klaus Scherpe insists, this is not simply apocalypse now, but **apocalypse forever**. It is a vision that does not suggest, prefigure, or expect the necessity of an event that will alter the course of history (Scherpe 1987). Derrida (referring to the nuclear threat in the 1980s) sums this up most succinctly: ‘‘here, precisely, is announced\*as promise or as threat\*an apocalypse without apocalypse, an apocalypse without vision, without truth, without revelation . . . without message and without destination, without sender and without decidable addressee . . . an apocalypse beyond good and evil’’ (Derrida 1982). The environmentally apocalyptic future, forever postponed, neither promises redemption nor does it possess a name, a positive designation. The attractions of such an apocalyptic imaginary are related to a series of characteristics. In contrast to standard left arguments about the apocalyptic dynamics of unbridled capitalism, I would argue that **sustaining and nurturing apocalyptic imageries are an integral and vital part of the new cultural politics of capitalism for which the management of fear is a central leitmotiv** (Badiou 2007) **and provides** part of **the cultural support for** a process of **post-politicization** (Swyngedouw 2010a). At the symbolic level, **apocalyptic imaginaries are extraordinarily powerful in disavowing or displacing social conflict and antagonisms**. Apocalyptic imaginations are decidedly populist and foreclose a proper political framing. Or in other words, the presentation of climate change as a global humanitarian cause produces a **thoroughly depoliticized imaginary**, one that does not revolve around choosing one trajectory rather than another, or identifies clear adversaries in a political process; it is one that is not articulated with specific political programs or socio-ecological projects or transformations. It insists that we have to make sure that radical technomanagerial and socio-cultural transformations, organized within the horizons of a capitalist order that is beyond dispute, are initiated that retrofit the climate (Swyngedouw 2007). In other words, we have to change radically, **but within the contours of the existing state of the situation**\*‘‘the partition of the sensible’’ in Rancie`re’s (1998) words, **so that nothing really has to change**.

**The impact is unending structural violence and apocalyptic environmental destruction along the periphery**

**Swyngedouw ‘13**

Erik, Professor of Geography at the University of Manchester in its School of Environment and Development, “Apocalypse Now! Fear and Doomsday Pleasures,” Capitalism Nature Socialism, 2013 Vol. 24, No. 1, 918

What we are witnessing is a strange reversal whereby the specter of economic and/or ecological catastrophe is mobilized primarily by the **elites** **from the global North**. Neither Prince Charles nor Al Gore can be accused of revolutionary zeal. For them, the ecological condition is\*correctly of course\*understood as potentially threatening to civilization as we know it. At the same time, their image of a dystopian future functions as a **fantasy** that sustains a practice of adjusting things today such that civilization as we know it (**neoliberal capitalism**) can continue for a bit longer, spurred on by the conviction that radical change can be achieved without changing radically the contours of capitalist eco-development. The imaginary of crisis and potential collapse produces an **ecology of fear**, danger, and uncertainty while reassuring ‘‘the people’’ (or, rather, the population) that the techno-scientific and socio-economic elites have the necessary tool-kit to readjust the machine **such that things can stay basically as they are.** What is of course radically disavowed in their pronouncements is the fact that many people in many places of the world **already live in the socio-ecological catastrophe**. **The ecological Armageddon is already a reality**. While the elites nurture an apocalyptic dystopia that can nonetheless be avoided (**for them),** the **majority of the world already lives ‘‘within the collapse of civilization’’** (The Invisible Committee 2009). **The Apocalypse is indeed a combined and uneven one, both in time and across space** (see Calder Williams 2011).

**Our alternative is to vote negative to unconditionally reject climate catastrophism.**

## Cuba Econ

#### Cuban economy growing now – less restrictions and cooperatives

Sabo ‘12 (Eric, “Castro Sees Acceptable Cuban Economic Growth of 3.7% Next Year”, Bloomberg, December 14 2012, <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-12-14/castro-sees-acceptable-cuban-economic-growth-of-3-7-next-year.html>)

Cuban President Raul Castro said that economic growth will be at an “acceptable” 3.7 percent next year as the communist government eases control over businesses and employment.

The Caribbean nation’s economy expanded a less than forecast 3.1 percent in 2012 even as tourist arrival jumped a record 4.9 percent, Castro told the National Assembly yesterday. The government had previously forecast growth of 3.4 percent for this year, he said.

The growth forecast for next year “is acceptable in a scenario of a continuing global economic crisis and persecution of Cuban bank transactions” due to the U.S. embargo, Castro said, according to a transcript of the speech posted on the government-run website Granma.

Since his brother Fidel started handing over power in 2006, Castro has taken measures to open the island’s economy, including loosening of property laws and controls prohibiting private enterprise such as taxi and mobile phone companies. Cooperatives with as many as five employees began managing their own operations this month, a policy meant to loosen restrictions on basic services and increase productivity.

Almost 400,000 Cubans are now self-employed, a number that should grow as the government allows more private enterprise, Castro said.

#### Sugarcane isn’t sustainable – no investment or commitment

Soligo & Jaffe ‘10**–** Rice Scholar at the James A. Baker III Institute for Public Policy, Rice University AND Wallace S. Wilson Fellow in Energy Studies at Rice University (Ronald AND Amy Myers, Cuba's Energy Future Strategic Approaches to Cooperation, p. 102-103)

Issues in Achieving Cuba’s Ethanol Potential As noted, estimates of Cuba’s ethanol potential will depend on assumptions about the amount of sugarcane that can be planted and harvested, as well as what sugarcane yields can be achieved. More ambitious assumptions will yield higher outputs. For example, Juan Sanchez assumes that Cuba could devote 2 million hectares to sugarcane with yields of 80 tons per hectare and 83.6 liters per ton (6,688 liters per hectare). He projects ethanol output at 13.4 billion liters, or 3.5 billion gallons. 47¶ Three and a half billion gallons seems unrealistic for the foreseeable future. There is some question as to whether Cuba could ever again attain the 1.5 million hectares of sugarcane harvested in 1970, let alone 2 million. According to Brian Pollitt, the 1970 harvest was achieved only by cutting cane that would normally be left to mature for another season in order to produce a higher sugar yield in the following year. 48 Obviously this is not a sustainable practice if optimal yields are to be achieved. ¶ Two billion gallons can be produced with a harvested area of 1.33 million hectares and a yield of seventy-five tons per hectare. That area of cultivation is not too far from the average harvest of 1.28 million hectares that Cuba was able to maintain during the 1970s and 1980s. Yet reaching 1.33 million hectares will require time and substantial investment in farm machinery and restoration of the land, which has been neglected and compacted by the use of heavy Soviet-built harvesting machinery. The land will also have to be tilled and newly planted with sugarcane. ¶ Achieving higher sugarcane yields will also require time and investments to acquire or develop higher-yielding sugarcane varieties. Cuban yields averaged only fifty-eight tons per hectare during the 1970s and 1980s, substantially below the seventy-five tons per hectare needed to produce 2 billion gallons of ethanol. Yet other countries, as noted, have achieved or exceeded that yield, and some private Cuban farmers are reported to have achieved even higher yields of 100 tons per acre. 49 Yields, of course, are a function of other factors besides cane variety. The condition of the land, access to water and fertilizer, and other inputs would all need to be considered. ¶ Finally, Cuba will have to undertake significant investments in distilleries, transport, storage, and distribution infrastructure if it wants to produce the levels of ethanol that the authors believe are achievable. Investment costs for the biorefineries alone will come to billions of dollars. For example, in 2006, corn-based ethanol plants in the United States cost roughly $1.88 per gallon for a capacity of 48 million gallons per year, and $1.50 per gallon for capac- ity of 120 million gallons per year (reflecting significant economies of scale). So even if all new plants in Cuba were built with the larger capacity, it would require $3 billion dollars (at 2006 prices) to build sufficient capacity to produce 2 billion gallons.

#### No Latin American terrorism-not in self-interest, groups weak

Richard Weitz 11, Senior Fellow and Director, Center for Political-Military Analysis, Hudson Institute. “Where are Latin America’s Terrorists?” 11-9-11http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/where-are-latin-america-s-terrorists-

The Colombian army’s killing of Alfonso Cano, head of the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), will not eliminate that country’s largest guerrilla group anytime soon. But it does partly illustrate why international terrorism has not established a major presence in Latin America. Local security forces, bolstered by generous American assistance, have made the region a difficult place for foreign terrorists to set up operational cells – and other conditions also help to make Latin America less vulnerable. One reason why the FARC has survived repeated blows to its leadership is the support that it receives from various groups, perhaps including government officials, in neighboring Ecuador and Venezuela. Fortunately, this backing appears to have declined in the last year or so, following improvement in Colombia’s relations with these countries. Another factor contributing to the FARC’s survival has been its transformation over the years from a revolutionary organization into a narco-terrorist group that uses violence to support its criminal operations. Many former terrorist and insurgent groups in the region have undergone similar transformations over the last two decades. These groups, some with transnational reach, mostly engage in narcotics trafficking, arms smuggling, and kidnapping. At worst, they sometimes employ terrorist tactics (commonly defined as violence that deliberately targets civilians). In Colombia, the FARC and the National Liberation Army (ELN) finance their operations through drug trafficking, kidnapping, and extortion. These groups might kill civilians, but their main targets are the police and security personnel who threaten their activities. Latin America is distinctive in the recurring and broad overlap of mass movements professing revolutionary goals with transnational criminal operations. The Internet and modern social media are allowing these mass criminal movements to expand their activities beyond kidnapping, extortion, and trafficking in drugs, arms, and people, to include fraud, piracy, information theft, hacking, and sabotage. Violent mass movements remain in some Latin American countries, but, like the FARC, they are typically heavily engaged in organized crime. Drug cartels and gang warfare may ruin the lives of thousands of innocent people, but they should not be seen as equivalent to the ideological revolutionaries who used to wreak havoc in the region, or to contemporary mass terrorists. Extra-regional terrorist movements such as al-Qaeda have minimal presence in South America, with little independent operational activity and few ties to local violent movements. At most, the two types of groups might share operational insights and revenue from transnational criminal operations. Hezbollah has not conducted an attack in Latin America in almost two decades. Indigenous organized criminal movements are responsible for the most serious sources of local violence. Latin American countries generally are not a conducive environment for major terrorist groups. They lack large Muslim communities that could provide a bridgehead for Islamist extremist movements based in Africa and the Middle East. The demise of military dictatorships and the spread of democratic regimes throughout Latin America (except for Cuba) means that even severe economic, class, ethnic, and other tensions now more often manifest themselves politically, in struggles for votes and influence. No Latin American government appears to remain an active state sponsor of foreign terrorist movements. At worst, certain public officials may tolerate some foreign terrorists’ activities and neglect to act vigorously against them. More often, governments misapply anti-terrorist laws against their non-violent opponents. For example, despite significant improvement in its human-rights policies, the Chilean government has at times applied harsh anti-terrorism laws against indigenous Mapuche protesters. Indeed, Latin American terrorism is sometimes exaggerated, because governments have incentives to cite local terrorist threats to secure foreign support, such as US capacity-building funding. Just as during the Cold War, when Latin American leaders were lavished with aid for fighting communist subversion, governments seek to fight “terrorist” threats at America’s expense. Ironically, the strength of transnational criminal organizations in Latin America may act as a barrier to external terrorist groups. Extra-regional terrorists certainly have incentives to penetrate the region. Entering the US, a high-value target for some violent extremist groups, from Latin America is not difficult for skilled operatives. Extra-regional terrorist groups could also raise funds and collaborate operationally with local militants. But Latin America’s powerful transnational criminal movements, such as the gangs in Mexico that control much of the drug trafficking into the US, do not want to jeopardize their profits by associating themselves with al-Qaeda and its affiliates. Supporting terrorism would merely divert time and other resources from profit-making activities, while focusing unsought US and other international attention on their criminal operations.

## Sugarcane Ethanol

#### Biotech solves food conflict

Ejeh 12

Ajogwu, Department of Soil and Environmental Management, Anyigba.

http://scholarsresearchlibrary.com/aasr-vol4-iss2/AASR-2012-4-2-906-913.pdf

The positive correspondence between agricultural bi otechnology and food security has for long been est ablished. Early in December 199, the 54 th UN general assembly session declared that the appl ication of agricultural biotechnology in developing countries provides viab le opportunities for improving productivity and inc reasing production capacity in the agricultural sector (Mug abe, 2000). And in connection to the green revolut ion, (Santaniello, 2005) pointed out that “agricultural biotechnology is the major technological innovation to be made Ohikere J. Z. et al Arch. Appl. Sci. Res., 2012, 4 (2):906-913 Scholars Research Library available to formers after the end of the green rev olution”. These positions at once identify and rec ommend the application of biotechnology in agriculture as an a pparatus for addressing food insecurity in developi ng countries. Asserting the linkage between agricultural biotechn ology and food security, it was pointed out that a gricultural biotechnology promises to play a crucial role in im proving agricultural productivity and reducing the environmental impact of agriculture leading to agricultural susta inability and food security in many regions of the world. Indeed, agricultural biotechnology has enlarged and increas e the abilities of science to overcome genetic and environmental constraints which impose serious limitations on the capacities of crops and animals to yield their opt imum outputs. Through the tools of agricultural biotechnology, pl ant breeders can select single genes that produce a desired trait and move them unto another plant easily as the gene tic barrier between these plants is completely over come. Thus, through agricultural biotechnology, the yields of c ertain plants can be increase and even their nutrie nts content and nutritional values improved in a much easier and fa ster way than via the conventional plant breeding m ethods. Applying the techniques of agricultural biotechnolo gy in combination with other scientific techniques the insert and innate productivity potentials of some of our crops can be harnessed and unleashed to aid the nation a s a whole to realize its dream of food security. Taking into co gnizance the three pillars of food security in Nige ria in the following ways:

**No extinction**

Easterbrook 3(Gregg, senior fellow at the New Republic, “We're All Gonna Die!”, <http://www.wired.com/wired/archive/11.07/doomsday.html?pg=1&topic=&topic_set>=)

If we're talking about doomsday - the end of human civilization - many scenarios simply don't measure up. A single nuclear bomb ignited by terrorists, for example, would be awful beyond words, but life would go on. People and machines might converge in ways that you and I would find ghastly, but from the standpoint of the future, they would probably represent an adaptation. Environmental collapse might make parts of the globe unpleasant, but considering that the biosphere has survived ice ages, it wouldn't be the final curtain. Depression, which has become 10 times more prevalent in Western nations in the postwar era, might grow so widespread that vast numbers of people would refuse to get out of bed, a possibility that Petranek suggested in a doomsday talk at the Technology Entertainment Design conference in 2002. But Marcel Proust, as miserable as he was, wrote *Remembrance of Things Past* while lying in bed.

#### Won’t collapse the environment

The Washington Post, August 29, 1997, “Diversity Is Not Enough to Ensure Hardy Ecosystems,” p. A03, l/n

Ecologists have long maintained that diversity is one of nature’s greatest strengths, but new research suggests that diversity alone does not guarantee strong ecosystems. In findings that could intensify the national debate over endangered species and habitat conservation, three new studies suggest that a greater abundance of plant and animal varieties does not always translate to better ecological health. At least equally important, the research found, are the types of species and how they function together. “Having a long list of Latin names isn’t always better than a shorter list of Latin names,” said Stanford University biologist Peter Vitousek, co-author of one of the studies published in the journal Science. Separate experiments in California, Minnesota and Sweden found that diversity often had little bearing on the performance of ecosystems -- at least as measured by the growth and health of native plants. In fact, the communities with the greatest biological richness were often the poorest when it came to productivity and the cycling of nutrients. One study compared plant life on 50 remote islands in northern Sweden that are prone to frequent wildfires from lightning strikes. Scientist David Wardle of Landcare Research in Lincoln, New Zealand, and colleagues at the Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, found that islands dominated by a few species of plants recovered more quickly than nearby islands with greater biological diversity. Similar findings were reported by University of Minnesota researchers who studied savannah grasses, and by Stanford’s Vitousek and colleague David Hooper, who concluded that functional characteristics of plant species were more important than the number of varieties in determining how ecosystems performed. “In aiming to protect natural ecosystems, we cannot just manage for species variety alone,” the Stanford researchers wrote. British plant ecologist J.P. Grime, in a commentary summarizing the research, said there is not yet “convincing evidence that species diversity and ecosystem function are consistently and causally related.” “It could be argued,” he added, “that the tide is turning against the notion of high biodiversity as a controller of ecosystem function and insurance against ecological collapse.”

#### Species loss is exaggerated – not all are key

**Possingham 07**, Hugh. Professor of mathematics in the spatial ecol­ogy group at the University of Queensland “[Triage: Not all endangered species worth saving says scientist: cost-efficiency decisions needed](http://gmarkets.wordpress.com/2007/10/17/triage-not-all-endangered-species-worth-saving-says-scientist-cost-efficiency-decisions-needed/).” October 17, 2007. <http://gmarkets.wordpress.com/2007/10/17/triage-not-all-endangered-species-worth-saving-says-scientist-cost-efficiency-decisions-needed/>

**<More training in mathematics needed:** Professor Possingham’s proposal had raised eyebrows at the inaugural University of Queensland Federation Fellows Public Lecture in Brisbane last month. He had told the audience his proposal represented “an unpal­atable proof of triage; that is the highest risk species are not necessarily the species we work on. (It is) an economically rational allocation of funds to maximize final outcome given fixed resources.” Possingham had said the conservation industry did not have the training in applied maths and economics to make good decisions. Universities should offer mas­ters in quantitative wildlife man­agement, he had said. “It’s hard to convince people in first year that maths is relevant but by third year they realize that all of science is quantitative.” **Saving condor cost $US20 million:** Possingham, professor of mathematics in the spatial ecol­ogy group at the University of Queensland, said: “The Californian condor has been recovered from the brink of extinction, but it cost $US1O mil­lion to $US20 million. That $20 million could have been used to secure large tracts of rainforest to save hundreds of species. We hand out our money to the species that are most likely to go extinct and we ignore the cost.” He said that took away the money that could be spent on others. “We spend a lot of money saving the basket cases but while you’re doing that all the things that aren’t basket cases become basket cases.” **Cost-efficiency decision:** Possingham, whose background is in applied mathe­matics and biochemistry, said it was a cost-efficiency decision. Lose another species of beetle or grasshopper and the cost would be low. But the cassowary, the giant flightless bird of the far north Queensland rainforests, was worth saving. “If they go extinct, the forests of far north Queensland will change forever because the cas­sowaries disperse the seeds of a whole range of trees and they might diminish,” he said. “And for every tree, there’s probably 20 species of insect. It would cause an extinction cascade of 100 to 1000 other species.”

#### No impact – consensus

Taylor 12 (James, Forbes energy and environment writer, 3/14/2012, "Shock Poll: Meteorologists Are Global Warming Skeptics", www.forbes.com/sites/jamestaylor/2012/03/14/shock-poll-meteorologists-are-global-warming-skeptics/)

A recent survey of American Meteorological Society members shows meteorologists are skeptical that humans are causing a global warming crisis. The survey confirms what many scientists have been reporting for years; the politically focused bureaucratic leadership of many science organizations is severely out of touch with the scientists themselves regarding global warming issues. According to American Meteorological Society (AMS) data, 89% of AMS meteorologists believe global warming is happening, but only a minority (30%) is very worried about global warming. This sharp contrast between the large majority of meteorologists who believe global warming is happening and the modest minority who are nevertheless very worried about it is consistent with other scientist surveys. This contrast exposes global warming alarmists who assert that 97% of the world’s scientists agree humans are causing a global warming crisis simply because these scientists believe global warming is occurring. However, as this and other scientist surveys show, believing that some warming is occurring is not the same as believing humans are causing a worrisome crisis. Other questions solidified the meteorologists’ skepticism about humans creating a global warming crisis. For example, among those meteorologists who believe global warming is happening, only a modest majority (59%) believe humans are the primary cause. More importantly, only 38% of respondents who believe global warming is occurring say it will be very harmful during the next 100 years. With substantially fewer than half of meteorologists very worried about global warming or expecting substantial harm during the next 100 years, one has to wonder why environmental activist groups are sowing the seeds of global warming panic. Does anyone really expect our economy to be powered 100 years from now by the same energy sources we use today? Why immediately, severely, and permanently punish our economy with costly global warming restrictions when technological advances and the free market will likely address any such global warming concerns much more efficiently, economically and effectively? In another line of survey questions, 53% of respondents believe there is conflict among AMS members regarding the topic of global warming. Only 33% believe there is no conflict. Another 15% were not sure. These results provide strong refutation to the assertion that “the debate is over.” Interestingly, only 26% of respondents said the conflict among AMS members is unproductive. Overall, the survey of AMS scientists paints a very different picture than the official AMS Information Statement on Climate Change. Drafted by the AMS bureaucracy, the Information Statement leaves readers with the impression that AMS meteorologists have few doubts about humans creating a global warming crisis. The Information Statement indicates quite strongly that humans are the primary driver of global temperatures and the consequences are and will continue to be quite severe. Compare the bureaucracy’s Information Statement with the survey results of the AMS scientists themselves. Scientists who have attended the Heartland Institute’s annual International Conference on Climate Change report the same disconnect throughout their various science organizations; only a minority of scientists believes humans are causing a global warming crisis, yet the non-scientist bureaucracies publish position statements that contradict what the scientists themselves believe. Few, if any, of these organizations actually poll their members before publishing a position statement. Within this context of few actual scientist surveys, the AMS survey results are very powerful.

#### CO2 isn’t key

Watts, 25-year climate reporter, works with weather technology, weather stations, and weather data processing systems in the private sector, 7/25/’12

(Anthony, <http://wattsupwiththat.com/2012/07/25/lindzen-at-sandia-national-labs-climate-models-are-flawed/>)

ALBUQUERQUE, N.M. — Massachusetts Institute of Technology professor Richard Lindzen, a global warming skeptic, told about 70 Sandia researchers in June that too much is being made of climate change by researchers seeking government funding. He said their data and their methods did not support their claims.

“Despite concerns over the last decades with the greenhouse process, they oversimplify the effect,” he said. “Simply cranking up CO2 [carbon dioxide] (as the culprit) is not the answer” to what causes climate change.

Lindzen, the ninth speaker in Sandia’s Climate Change and National Security Speaker Series, is Alfred P. Sloan professor of meteorology in MIT’s department of earth, atmospheric and planetary sciences. He has published more than 200 scientific papers and is the lead author of Chapter 7 (“Physical Climate Processes and Feedbacks”) of the International Panel on Climate Change’s (IPCC) Third Assessment Report. He is a member of the National Academy of Sciences and a fellow of the American Geophysical Union and the American Meteorological Society.

For 30 years, climate scientists have been “locked into a simple-minded identification of climate with greenhouse-gas level. … That climate should be the function of a single parameter (like CO2) has always seemed implausible. Yet an obsessive focus on such an obvious oversimplification has likely set back progress by decades,” Lindzen said.

For major climates of the past, other factors were more important than carbon dioxide. Orbital variations have been shown to quantitatively account for the cycles of glaciations of the past 700,000 years, he said, and the elimination of the arctic inversion, when the polar caps were ice-free, “is likely to have been more important than CO2 for the warm episode during the Eocene 50 million years ago.”

There is little evidence that changes in climate are producing extreme weather events, he said. “Even the IPCC says there is little if any evidence of this. In fact, there are important physical reasons for doubting such anticipations.”

Lindzen’s views run counter to those of almost all major professional societies. For example, the American Physical Society statement of Nov. 18, 2007, read, “The evidence is incontrovertible: Global warming is occurring.” But he doesn’t feel they are necessarily right. “Why did the American Physical Society take a position?” he asked his audience. “Why did they find it compelling? They never answered.”

Speaking methodically with flashes of humor — “I always feel that when the conversation turns to weather, people are bored.” — he said a basic problem with current computer climate models that show disastrous increases in temperature is that relatively small increases in atmospheric gases lead to large changes in temperatures in the models.

But, he said, “predictions based on high (climate) sensitivity ran well ahead of observations.”

Real-world observations do not support IPCC models, he said: “We’ve already seen almost the equivalent of a doubling of CO2 (in radiative forcing) and that has produced very little warming.”

He disparaged proving the worth of models by applying their criteria to the prediction of past climatic events, saying, “The models are no more valuable than answering a test when you have the questions in advance.”

Modelers, he said, merely have used aerosols as a kind of fudge factor to make their models come out right. (Aerosols are tiny particles that reflect sunlight. They are put in the air by industrial or volcanic processes and are considered a possible cause of temperature change at Earth’s surface.)

Then there is the practical question of what can be done about temperature increases even if they are occurring, he said. “China, India, Korea are not going to go along with IPCC recommendations, so … the only countries punished will be those who go along with the recommendations.”

He discounted mainstream opinion that climate change could hurt national security, saying that “historically there is little evidence of natural disasters leading to war, but economic conditions have proven much more serious. Almost all proposed mitigation policies lead to reduced energy availability and higher energy costs. All studies of human benefit and national security perspectives show that increased energy is important.”

He showed a graph that demonstrated that more energy consumption leads to higher literacy rate, lower infant mortality and a lower number of children per woman.

Given that proposed policies are unlikely to significantly influence climate and that lower energy availability could be considered a significant threat to national security, to continue with a mitigation policy that reduces available energy “would, at the least, appear to be irresponsible,” he argued.

Responding to audience questions about rising temperatures, he said a 0.8 of a degree C change in temperature in 150 years is a small change. Questioned about five-, seven-, and 17-year averages that seem to show that Earth’s surface temperature is rising, he said temperatures are always fluctuating by tenths of a degree.

# 2nc

## Colonialism

### Overview

#### Racism is a d-rule

**Memmi 2K** (Albert, Professor Emeritus of Sociology @ U of Paris, Naiteire, Racism, Translated by Steve Martinot, p. 163-165)

The struggle against racism will be long, difficult, without intermission, without remission, probably never achieved. Yet, for this very reason, it is a struggle to be undertaken **without** surcease and without **concessions**. One cannot be indulgent toward racism; one **must not** even **let the monster in the house, especially** **not in a mask**. To give it merely a foothold means to augment the bestial part in us and in other people, which is to diminish what is human. T**o accept the racist universe to the slightest degree is to endorse fear, injustice, and violence**. It is to accept the persistence of the dark history in which we still largely live. it is to agree that the outsider will always be a possible victim (and which man is not himself an outsider relative to someone else?. Racism illustrates, in sum, the inevitable negativity of the condition of the dominated that is, it illuminates in a certain sense the entire human condition. The anti-racist struggle, difficult though it is, and always in question, is nevertheless one of the prologues to the ultimate passage from animosity to humanity. In that sense, we cannot fail to rise to the racist challenge. However, it remains true that one’s moral conduit only emerges from a choice: one has to want it. **It is a choice** among other choices, and always debatable in its foundations and its consequences. Let us say, broadly speaking, that the choice to conduct oneself morally is the condition for the establishment of a human order, for which racism is the very negation. This is almost a redundancy. **One cannot found a moral order, let alone a legislative order, on racism, because racism signifies the exclusion of the other**, and his or her subjection to violence and domination. From an ethical point of view, if one can deploy a little religious language, racism is ‘the truly capital sin. It is not an accident that almost all of humanity’s spiritual traditions counsels respect for the weak, for orphans, widows, or strangers. It is not just a question of theoretical morality and disinterested commandments. Such unanimity in the safeguarding of the other suggests the real utility of such sentiments. All things considered, we have an interest in banishing injustice, because injustice engenders violence and death. Of course, this is debatable. There are those who think that if one is strong enough, the assault on and oppression of others is permissible. Bur no one is ever sure of remaining the strongest. One day, perhaps, the roles will be reversed. All unjust society contains within itself the seeds of its own death. It is probably smarter to treat others with respect so that they treat you with respect. “Recall.” says the Bible, “that you were once a stranger in Egypt,” which means both that you ought to respect the stranger because you were a stranger yourself and that you risk becoming one again someday. It is an ethical and a practical appeal—indeed, it is a contract, however implicit it might be. In short, the refusal of racism is the condition for all theoretical and practical morality because, in the end, **the ethical choice commands the political choice**, **a just society must be** a society **accepted by all**. If this contractual principle is not accepted, then only conflict, violence, and destruction will be our lot. If it is accepted, we can hope someday **to live in peace**. True, it is a wager, but the stakes are irresistible.

#### It’s not simply about political economics, rather, this ideology is rooted in a racialized contempt towards difference that marginalizes those who don’t fit neatly into our black-white dichotomy of race relations

Martinez 1994 (Elizabeth, Chicana activist, author, and educator, March, “Seeing More Than Black & White: Latinos, racism, and the cultural divides” http://www.indigenouspeople.net/blackwht.htm)

A certain relish seems irresistible to this Latina as the mass media has been compelled to sit up, look south of the border, and take notice. Probably the Chiapas uprising and Mexico's recent political turmoil have won us no more than a brief day in the sun. Or even less: liberal Ted Koppel still hadn't noticed the historic assassination of presidential candidate Colosio three days afterward. But it's been sweet, anyway. When Kissinger said years ago "nothing important ever happens in the south," he articulated a contemptuous indifference toward Latin America, its people and their culture which has long dominated U.S. institutions and attitudes. Mexico may be great for a vacation and some people like burritos but the usual image of Latin America combines incompetence with absurdity in loud colors. My parents, both Spanish teachers, endured decades of being told kids were better off learning French. U.S. political culture is not only Anglo-dominated but also embraces an exceptionally stubborn national self-centeredness, with no global vision other than relations of domination. The U.S. refuses to see itself as one nation sitting on a continent with 20 others all speaking languages other than English and having the right not to be dominated. Such arrogant indifference extends to Latinos within the U.S. The mass media complain, "people can't relate to Hispanics" - or Asians, they say. Such arrogant indifference has played an important role in invisibilizing La Raza (except where we become a serious nuisance or a handy scapegoat). It is one reason the U.S. harbors an exclusively white-on-Black concept of racism. It is one barrier to new thinking about racism which is crucial today. There are others. Good-bye White Majority In a society as thoroughly and violently racialized as the United States, white-Black relations have defined racism for centuries. Today the composition and culture of the U.S. are changing rapidly. We need to consider seriously whether we can afford to maintain an exclusively white/Black model of racism when the population will be 32 percent Latino, Asian/Pacific American and Native American - in short, neither Black nor white - by the year 2050. We are challenged to recognize that multi-colored racism is mushrooming, and then strategize how to resist it. We are challenged to move beyond a dualism comprised of two white supremacist inventions: Blackness and Whiteness. At stake in those challenges is building a united anti-racist force strong enough to resist contemporary racist strategies of divide-and- conquer. Strong enough, in the long run, to help defeat racism itself. Doesn't an exclusively Black/white model of racism discourage the perception of common interests among people of color and thus impede a solidarity that can challenge white supremacy? Doesn't it encourage the isolation of African Americans from potential allies? Doesn't it advise all people of color to spend too much energy understanding our lives in relation to Whiteness, and thus freeze us in a defensive, often self- destructive mode?

#### Specifically, the combination of racial stigmatization and economic nationalist ideology guarantees unimaginably heinous violence

Radcliffe, 2007 (Sarah A., Senior Lecturer in Latin American Geography at the University of Cambridge, “Forum: Latin American Indigenous Geographies of Fear: Living in the Shadow of Racism, Lack of Development, and Antiterror Measures” Annals of the Association of American Geographers, Vol. 97, No. 2, Jun., 2007, Project Muse)

Currently, neoliberalism is the hegemonic development model in Latin America such that the majority of regional development priorities and projects have been shaped by the theory, interpretation, and implementation of neoliberalism. As such, the region offers an ideal location in which to evaluate this development model in terms of its ability to address indigenous concerns. Over the past thirty years, neoliberalism and its adjunct of democracy promotion have been applied, albeit unevenly and with varying degrees of enthusiasm, resulting in privatization of assets and resources, opening up of trade barriers, legislative reforms to facilitate labor flexibility, and the selective rolling backward and forward of the state in social reproduction. Far from being monolithic, neoliberalism is characterized by variation, hybridity with existing policies, and multiple and contradictory aspects regarding neoliberalizing spaces, subjects, and states (Perreault and Martin 2005). As an agenda for development hope, neoliberalism is premised on the notion of a self-adjusting market in which free market capitalism can "construct some sort of space within which it can function" (Harvey 2000, 176-77) and where the role of the state is ostensibly reduced. Ethnic difference can be interpreted as a block on the free working of the market. In the current neoliberal and geopolitical context, according to one businessman, ethnic mobilization "could jeopardize the exploitation of natural resources-gas, oil, gold ... in territories with a significant indigenous population" (Gonzalez Manrique 2005, 1). For Latin American Indian populations, neoliberalism is directly linked to the nonfunctioning of market economies, and the restructuring of economic rights vis- a-vis nation-states in ways that undercut indigenous security and livelihoods. This is in large part due to the restless spatialization of capital as it negotiates with "the geography of place" (Harvey 2000, 179). The geographies of market capitalism are frequently destructive of local and national forms of economy, just as they "creatively" expand the opportunities for minority wealth creation. Although neoliberal capital compromises with its very spatialization, these apparent flexibilities serve to deepen uneven development as they permit greater exploitation of particular juxtapositions of landscape, people, and resources (Massey 2005). Latin American neoliberalisms work against a politics of redistribution by exacerbating inequality and pushing indigenous people into poverty. Privatization of land markets, combined with the emphasis on individual responsibility, has compounded indigenous loss of voice (e.g., Sanabria 1999). Neoliberalism's support for entrepreneurialism pushes Indians into market-oriented production and restrictive forms of political participation (Radcliffe and Laurie 2006a, 2006b; Andolina, Laurie, and Radcliffe, forthcoming). Large numbers of Indians remain impoverished under neoliberalism, trapped by segregated labor markets, limited product outlets, insecure land tenure, and weak social welfare. The economic story of neoliberalism's failure represents only part of the picture, however; neoliberalism has also entailed the restructuring of the cultural terms of (indigenous) citizenship and the sociopolitical pact through which rights are extended and realized. The neoliberal dismantling of corporatist state systems, which granted Indians some recognition and representation in decisions over rights, has contributed to widespread ethnic protest. Neoliberal restructuring breaks previous forms of rule (1930-1970s) that granted Indians access to resources and political representation (Yashar 1999). This Indian-state pact was broken, reworked, and re- formed during the debt crisis, democratic transitions, and neoliberalism in a contested and tense process (Assies, van der Haar, and Hoekema 2001), such that although civil and political rights are now formally established on paper, social and economic rights are more insecure in practice, and the political and cultural bases for state-indigenous negotiations have been trans- formed. Formal democracy, with regular elections and civilian representatives, now exists, yet slow economic growth, inequalities, and ineffective judiciaries and social services provision combine to undermine citizens' confidence in elective democracies (UNDP 2004). On the one hand administrative decentralization and formal channels of citizen participation deepen democracy, even as macroeconomic decision making remains with technocrat elites, and social welfare comes through unaccountable NGOs (Radcliffe 2001). Policy shifts to multiculturalism entail specific politico-cultural consequences for Indians and shape their political and social rights. Under neoliberal multiculturalism, the new "indigenous slot" offered to ethnic citizens has tended to give limited (and conditional) resources to Indians and to police their expression of identity (Hale 2002; Paley 2002). Multiculturalism represents both "opportunity and peril" for Indians (Hale 2002, 487), the peril resting in its tendency to listen only to certain voices. On these grounds, neoliberal development prompts indigenous groups to mobilize to demand recognition (as racially discriminated groups whose ethnic recognition under corporatism was removed) and redistribution (a voice in macroeconomic and national decision making). Ecuador illustrates the groundedness and contingent nature of interconnections between political economy, political culture, ethnic identity, and institutionalized social difference in neoliberal development. Ecuadorian neoliberalism over twenty years has openly favored economic elites and systematically harmed low-income sectors (Divalos 2004).12 In this context it is not surprising that Ecuador's indigenous campaigns hold governments accountable for overeager endorsement of neoliberalism (Collins 2001; Zamosc 2004) and stand at the forefront of peaceful protest alongside poor urban and rural dwellers, women, and informal workers. For example, they protest the neoliberal Ecuador-U.S. Free Trade Treaty negotiations with "days of struggle" and demands for transparent talks. Indian agendas highlight the need for capitalist development, but question the context of closed decision-making, U.S. geopolitics, and neoliberal models of poverty alleviation. According to CONAIE leader Leonidas Iza, We don't have food to feed our children. Our markets are flooded with cheap imports. Imported milk is dumped on Ecuador for half what it costs to produce, but TNCs sell it back to us at $1.80 a liter. We have no way to live, and the FTAA will only make it worse. When we complain, the US government calls us terrorists. We are not threatening anything but we are hungry and tired and things have to change. -(Quoted in CONAIE 2006) Protest against neoliberalism makes Indians vulnerable to state and extra-state violence, echoing earlier histories of anti-Indian violence. In March 2006, the Ecuadorian president accused Indian movements of destabilizing the country with four days of roadblocks and protests; the government declared a state of emergency in five highland, largely Indian, provinces in an effort to prevent indigenous strategy meetings (BBC News 2006a). Public meetings were banned and a curfew was imposed, troops reinforced security along major roads into the capital (Comercio 2006; Andrade 2006). Despite these actions, CONAIE continued to engage a public debate around the institutional and political terms of free-trade decision making. Why, it asked, did the government make negotiations confidential? Why appoint an export agro-industry representative as Minister of Economy (CONAIE 2006)? In short, Ecuador exemplifies the recent "politicization of ethnic cleavages" (Yashar 1999, 87) by which worsening indigenous disadvantage together with reorganization of decision- making structures generates Indian protest. Neoliberal economic and political restructurings are experienced as threats to Andean ethnic security, with Indians "fear[ing free trade] will damage their livelihoods and their way of life" (Andrade 2006). Yet it is not merely a question of different priorities-an indigenous alternative to a neoliberal agenda. Rather "attempts to establish a neoliberal order can act as factors of political destabilization" (Zamosc 2004, 132). In other words, the seeds of political instability, now of such concern to Washington, lie precisely with the political agendas and consequences embedded in neoliberal macroeconomic development.

#### Unless we challenge the ideology underpinning current engagement towards Latin America, global slaughter becomes inevitable

Robinson 2008 (William I. Robinson, professor of sociology at the University of California, Santa Barbara, “Latin America and Global Capitalism: A Critical Globalization Perspective” pg. xii-xiii)

The truth, as Hegel said, is in the whole. That said, if there is any one caveat to highlight here, it is that in a slim volume such as this simplification is unavoidable. I can only shine a spotlight on a select few of the trees that make up the forest and must inevitably omit entirely a look at other trees, no matter how much they may be integral to the forest. In the end, any intellectual endeavor is open-ended: a work in progress. My approach—to look at Latin America as a whole—inevitably understates complexity and divergence and overstates the extent to which general statements can be made. There is no single, homogenous Latin America. Nonetheless, the exercise remains valid—indeed, useful and vital—insofar as there are underlying structural shifts that have produced clear region-wide patterns of change. There is a general pattern across all of Latin America of transition to global capitalism, even if each country and region has experienced this transition on the basis of its own particular constellation of social forces, historical circumstances, and contingent variables. I am concerned in the present study with identifying this underlying unity among varied patterns of change, with extrapolating from divergent experiences to uncover these general patterns and categories of events—such as the spread of nontraditional exports, the rise of transnational capitalists from among the region's dominant groups, the debt crisis and the preponderance of global financial markets, and the upsurge of new resistance movements across the region. These general patterns point to underlying causal processes of capitalist globalization. Returning to the dual themes of crisis and critical globalization studies, there can be little doubt that we are living in troubling times in the "global village." The system of global capitalism that now engulfs the entire planet is in crisis. There is consensus among scientists that we are on the precipice of ecological holocaust, including the mass extinction of species; the impending collapse of agriculture in major producing areas; the meltdown of polar ice caps; the phenomenon of global warming; and the contamination of the oceans, food stock, water supply, and air. Social inequalities have spiraled out of control, and the gap between the global rich and the global poor has never been as acute as it is in the early twenty-first century. While absolute levels of poverty and misery expand around the world under a new global-social apartheid, the richest 20 percent of humanity received in 2000 more than 85 percent of the world's wealth while the remaining 80 percent of humanity had to make do with less than 15 percent of the wealth, according to the United Nation's oft-cited annual Human Development Report (UNDP, 2000). Driven by the imperatives of over accumulation and transnational social control, global elites have increasingly turned to authoritarianism, militarization, and war to sustain the system. Many political economists concur that a global economic collapse is possible, even probable. In times such as these intellectuals are called upon to engage in a critical analytical and theoretical understanding of global society: to contribute to an understanding of history and social change that may elucidate the inner workings of the prevailing order and the causal processes at work in that order that generate crisis. They are also called upon to expose the vested interests bound up with the global social order, the discourses through which those interests are articulated, and the distinct alternatives to the extant order that counterhegemonic agents put forward. Intellectual production is always a collective process. Let us not lose sight of the social and historical character of intellectual labor. All those scholars who engage in such labor or make knowledge claims are organic intellectuals in the sense that studying the world is itself a social act, committed by agents with a definite relationship to the social order. Intellectual labor is social labor; its practitioners are social actors; and the products of its labor are not neutral or disinterested. In recent years I have proposed a rationale and minimal guidelines for critical globalization studies and have called on intellectuals to "exercise a preferential option for the majority in global society" (Robinson, 2006c). Globalization is not a neutral process. It involves winners and losers and new relations of power and domination. We need organic intellectuals capable of theorizing the changes that have taken place in the system of capitalism, in this epoch of globalization, and of providing to popular majorities these theoretical insights as inputs for their real-world struggles to develop alternative social relationships and an alternative social logic—the logic of majorities—to that of the market and of transnational capital. In other words, critical globalization studies has to be capable of inspiring emancipatory action, of bringing together multiple publics in developing programs that integrate theory and practice.

### framework

#### Their framework precludes us from challenging dominant ideologies about Latin America. On this topic especially, it is important to insist on the inclusion of critical theory in unique forums like debate in order to achieve any form of real progress. Our radical politics offers the only hope of guiding concrete social change

Valdes, 2001 (Francisco, Professor of Law at the University of Miami, Co-Director of the Center for Hispanic and Caribbean Legal Studies, B.A. from UC Berkeley, La Raza Law Journal, 12 La Raza L.J. 137, “Insisting on Critical Theory in Legal Education: Making Do While Making Waves”, lexis)

Given the sociolegal landscape of these times, this entrenched status quo is not likely to change substantially anytime soon, at least not without great and sustained struggle. This struggle will require students to insist on critical theory in legal education, and to do so over and over again so that incremental progress is achieved, and then sticks. It will require that law school applicants ask recruiters about the inclusion and integration of critical theory in the curriculum, and to make it plain that final enrollment decisions can be affected, for the better or worse, by the school's response to this question. This struggle also will require individual faculty members and administrators to support student requests and demands, and also to intervene proactively and strategically within the institution whenever possible, to expand opportunities for critical theory in various aspects of formal legal education. Clearly, this struggle is ongoing. In the meantime, faculty and administrators can and must, at a minimum, increase the use of seminar offerings and settings, as well as similarly discretionary opportunities for curricular action, to expand access to critical theory for today's students in these virtually unilateral and relatively expeditious ways. And students should, at a minimum, enroll in these courses and talk them up to new students, supporting these marginal efforts in every possible way, both as students and as alumni. Which, of course, takes us back to the present status quo: the ghetto - the place from which we make waves while making do. Of course, this ghetto of boutique seminars, projects, and centers that exists today is a wonderful and lively place. You should take advantage of these offerings and celebrate this progress, including right here, with the Center for Social Justice and the many activities that it offers to you. It is this ghetto, precisely, that allows us to make do while making waves - and while insisting on a real integration of critical theory in legal education. To make headway, however, it seems to me that we also must create a demand - a "market' demand, if you will - for this kind of basic curricular reform as a substantive way to diversify American legal education and as a way to enhance its value to those of us who remain committed to the example and the legacy of Judge Olmos. If we instead are dismissive or fearful of theory, or indifferent to it in this context of institutional hostility, then we simply are acquiescing to an oppressive status quo that deprives us of a tool that we very much need to help foster and guide social change.

#### Debate has become totally detached from the reality of our politics—roleplaying turns us into government drones who can’t face the dysfunctionality of current governance—only new styles of debate away from fiat can help us face the reality of our flawed mindsets

Lindsey 12 (Dr Jason, PhD from Columbia University and is currently Associate Professor and Chair of Political Science at St. Cloud State University, Baudrillard’s Simulated Politics and Debord’s Agents of Detournement, journal of baud studies vol 9 nmbr 3)

I. Introduction¶ For the political scientist, Baudrillard's work on simulation and the hyperreal is prescient. Politics in contemporary times seems very hollow when compared to the past. In democratic political systems debates on policy have given way to increasingly baroque ideological arguments. The "issues" that resonate the most with voters are generally symbolic or cultural disputes disconnected from economic management or social welfare. Scholarly evidence for this trend continues to accumulate. A good example is the work Lau and Heldman (2009) which builds on earlier research by Lau in (Sears, Lau, Tyler, and Allen (1980). From this perspective politics, at least in the most developed countries, increasingly resembles Baudrillard's interaction of simulacra.¶ Before his death, Baudrillard frequently pointed out the ironies of contemporary politics. Consider his statement about the French vote on the EU’s Constitutional treaty in 2005: “The vote is fixed. If the ‘no’ side wins the day this time, they will make us vote again (as in Denmark and Ireland) until the ‘yes’ wins. We may as well vote yes right now” (Baudrillard, 2006). Here there is the sense that this is not what politics and a referendum are, but this is what they have come to be. In most of our political systems we see similar hints that something is not the way it was. What are the tangible differences between left and right wing administrations? Would a left or right government in France handle the EU differently? In the United States, Presidents as vastly different as Obama and Bush dealt with the 2008 economic crisis and its aftermath with a continuity of policies. So when we vote, what are we doing? What are the actual options we are choosing between?¶ Baudrillard’s perspective fits well with a growing commentary on the emptiness at the heart of contemporary politics. Zizek in his recent (2008) writing on violence points to the curious demands of young rioters in Paris’ banlieus in October 2005. That is, they did not seem to have any demands beyond the spasm of violence in which they engaged. A similar incoherence can be observed at anti globalization protests. People are angry and want to do something about it. However, they seem unable to coherently explain what it is that has them so angry. The spasms of violence that break out on the periphery of any large protest nowadays also points to a frustration with current politics. Most recently, we have seen the Occupy Wall Street protests successfully capture the attention of a very large audience. However, these protests failed to articulate a coherent political program. In his visit to the group camped out in New York, Zizek pointed out this shortcoming when he was invited to speak. As he put it, “We know what we do not want. But what do we want?” (Zizek, 2011).¶ If there are no substantive policy differences between parties anymore, then, as Baudrillard would expect, we have to invent some. Witness the entire pop culture industry in the United States devoted to the mythology of Conservatives and Liberals. This industry now embraces books, television, radio, and the Internet, as well as satirical greeting cards in either flavor. Here again is the sense that these examples are not real politics. Instead, we have cultural products that seem to be the very definition of Baudrillard’s simulacra. But how do we know this?¶ If all politics is just being played out within the hyperreal, that is, politics are just combinations of signs and simulacra, then why do we have a sense that this is not “real” politics? Why do referendums seem so empty to us? Why are we able to organize protests, but then have the sense that we failed to define a “real” concrete program? Furthermore are signs and simulacra powerful enough to inspire individuals to the point of political violence? Baudrillard would most likely argue that violence on the periphery of politics is not inspired by the interaction of simulacra. Instead, this violence represents a frustration and impatience with politics. For Baudrillard, the possibility of a contemporary, active politics is very slim. Thus, we should expect to see indifference or frustration. However, if that is the case, then how do we explain the motivation of some individuals for engaging in this empty politics to the point of extremism?¶ To explain this tension, we should examine evidence of a politics capable of referencing something outside of other simulacra. A good pressure point for such an analysis is contemporary use of the modern political tactic of detournement as described by Debord and the situationists. Despite evidence for Baudrillard’s analysis of politics as simulation, the modern political tactic of detournement is still effective. If this is the case, then how can this be explained within Baudrillard’s larger analysis of our contemporary situation?¶ II. Simulations and Detournement¶ Recently, a colleague expressed some frustration to me when trying to talk to his students about Che Guevera. Although the students recognized his image, they had no clear idea who Che was. As Baudrillard and others would expect, they knew the image of Che from our consumer culture, but could not articulate who he was. Yet, they still knew his image was associated with subversive activities and radical politics.¶ This sort of incident illustrates an important point about images; they are double edged. Since the image can be disconnected from its initial context, we have the possibility of DeBord and the Situationists' detournement. We can recycle and re cut the image (like the "culture jamming" of the Ad Busters) to create new messages [culture-jamming] that are communicable through the cultural terrain (see www.adbusters.org). On the other hand, given Baudrillard’s description of our contemporary situation, how plausible is detournement since images are indeed detached? More concretely, how far removed can a given image be before it has lost both its "official" meaning and its reprogrammed "subversive" one? Does this problem indicate that we must consider the timing of detournement activities? Must we create the subversive use of the image while there is still a consciousness of the image's original intent?¶ Furthermore, if there is an element of timing necessary for detournement, then we must consider the following sort of analysis. Why are some images more deeply ingrained with their initial intent? In turn, such deeper images may retain a possible subversive or detournement meaning for a longer period as well. If some images can be used for a longer period, then does this challenge Baudrillard's assertions that there is no meaning left beyond simulation? If there is no meaning behind the image, then why are some still useable in both "official" and "subversive" modes for a much longer period than others?¶ Does the possibility of detournement mean that there is some truth to our sense of contemporary politics being a simulation of "real politics”? The ability of detournement to expose the real meaning behind advertising and other public statements suggests that we still possess an ability to understand the authentic when we see it. How else can one explain detournement's continuing effectiveness?¶ Baudrillard indicates in his work Simulations that this is the wrong question to ask. According to Baudrillard: "We are witnessing the end of perspective and panoptic space (which remains a moral hypothesis bound up with every classical analysis of the 'objective' essence of power), and hence the very abolition of the spectacular” (Baudrillard, 1983:54). Thus, Baudrillard thought that we had already entered (in the 1980's) a period later than the society of the spectacle that Debord describes in the 1960's. The idea of any remaining ground or foundation from which one could engage in Debord's neo Marxist analysis has already disappeared according to Baudrillard.¶ From this perspective, there is no relationship or channel of manipulation to unmask. The relationship between media and us (the audience) has collapsed to the point that Baudrillard sees no space between the two. In, Simulations, Baudrillard speaks explicitly about television (Ibid.:55-58). Already in 1983 he is concerned that reality television meant that there was no longer a subject with perspective. So, to Baudrillard, Debord's analysis is already obsolete because we are no longer an audience to a spectacle but instead we are a part of simulation. Thus for Baudrillard, the real has been replaced by the hyperreal.¶ However, if Baudrillard is correct, then shouldn't detournement become ineffective? If the distance needed for a relationship like Debord's spectacle has collapsed, then how could the dialectic of recuperation and detournement still be possible? For Baudrillard the answer would appear to be that Debord's concept is impossible. Anything that appears to us now as detournement is most likely a simulation of that process. Recuperation and detournement are collapsed categories just like every other possible anchor in the hyperreal. Indeed, Baudrillard seems borne out to some extent when we consider the efforts of companies and products to establish "street cred". These efforts range from advertising that engages in self-parody to the planting of grass roots reviews on websites. Thus, the idea of detournement, or perhaps we should say authentic, non-simulated detournement seems obsolete.¶ Debord himself indicates that detournement relies on some sort of ground or context. Hence, his second law of detournement, "The distortions introduced in the detourned elements must be as simplified as possible, since the main impact of detournement is directly related to the conscious or semiconscious recollection of the original contexts of the elements" (Debord and Wolman [1956] 2006). If Baudrillard is correct in his description of the hyperreal, then it is hard to see how this original context can survive.¶ Yet, despite Baudrillard's criticism, there is evidence of Debord's dialectic functioning in contemporary culture. Writing in the late 1950's, Debord and Wolman argued that a growth in detournement would become visible in the arts through, "an increasingly extensive transformation of phrases or plastic works that happen to be in fashion" (Ibid.:3). This observation triggers several associations with contemporary culture such as the pervasive sampling that makes up current music, books that stitch together different cultural worlds, (such as Pride and Prejudice and Zombies) or television sitcoms such as The Office, which styles itself like a reality program. Furthermore, some images and pieces of culture retain enough meaning that they can easily be turned into a "subversive" mode. How is this possible unless there remains enough relationship and connection to areas outside of simulation?¶ Perhaps Baudrillard could argue that these acts of resistance are simply wheels within wheels. The evidence we see of Debord's dialectic is simply the dramatic narrative of the simulation we know. With this interpretation, the hyperreal can retain the dramatic elements and themes of an earlier time, even though this is now unhinged from meaning. However, this solipsistic position ignores much evidence from contemporary culture.¶ For example, we can see the dynamic of Debord's detournement and recuperation at work in several areas of contemporary, popular culture. Consider these recent manifestations of cultural recuperation: Motorcycles and motorcycle gang style- now co-opted into brand named superstores; punk rock and punk rock music- co-opted in the 1990's through grunge and alternative labels; or Goth subculture- co-opted both in popular television and movies and mainstream cosmetics that now feature Goth style colors in lipstick etc. Thus Debord's dynamic of detournement and recuperation seems to still be going strong.¶ Two intertwining poles of agency explain this dynamic’s motive force. The first pole (or it could be the second) of this dynamo are strategic, market calculations (recuperation revives failing street cred and hence sales). The second pole (though we might prefer that it be the first), are artistic imperatives (detournement carves out a space for creativity and, hence, originality). Yet, where is such agency to be found in Baudrillard's view?¶ In Baudrillard's broader work the simulacra he describes appear to feed off of each other. Yet this view seems sorely lacking in human agency. In a classic, broad reflection on perception and memory Bergson states, "The function of the body is not to store up recollections, but simply to choose, in order to bring back to consciousness, by the real efficacy thus conferred on it, the useful memory, that which may complete and illuminate the present situation with a view to ultimate action" (Bergson, 1991:179). Indeed, if the goal of an actor within Debord's dialectic is action, then she chooses some images and symbols with purpose. This dimension of strategy and tactics is missing from Baudrillard's analysis because it is, again to him, the wrong perspective. In contrast, detournement is at its core for Debord, a tool or tactic of class struggle and for defeating the remains of modernism in the arts. Such a program or cause is obsolete to Baudrillard given his view of our contemporary situation.¶ Another way to pose this difference between the two thinkers is to compare Debord's idea of the "spectacle" to Baudrillard's idea of "the system of objects". The chapter on advertising in Baudrillard's The System of Objects, brings out an important distinction between Baudrillard and Debord (Baudrillard, [1968] 1996:164-196). The discussion develops into an exploration of the mass psychology of advertising. Baudrillard argues that the rational claims made in advertising are not really believed by any of us. Instead, they provide a rationalization for purchases that we desire due to non-rational motivations. Baudrillard sees advertising as a surface phenomenon of the system of objects that we live within. The key difference between Baudrillard's description of this vast economic, political, and ideological system of consumption from Debord turns upon agency.¶ Debord still sees the spectacle as a force that can be countered with tactics such as detournement. In contrast, Baudrillard sees the system of objects as a more pervasive whole into which we are psychologically integrated. The idea of individual agency leading to some sort of resistance begins to look in Baudrillard's conception like the rebelliousness of a child, rather than the acts of Debord's class conflict.¶ So, where has this discussion taken us in thinking about politics and the simulation of politics? Debord and Wolman argue under the second law of detournement that it indeed requires a context but that this is, "only a particular case of a general law that governs not only detournement but also any other form of action in the world. The idea of pure absolute expression is dead" (Debord and Wolman [1956] 2006). Thus, for Debord this context can be as mythical, metaphysical, or ideological as its audience is capable of comprehending.¶ Signs and simulacra in such a context suggest the stage of “sorcery” within Baudrillard's precession of simulacra. Could this be a good way of thinking about contemporary politics as a closed system of obscurantist meanings? From this perspective, detournement could still be alive in pockets of the hyperreal where individuals still participate within a bounded envelope of ideology. Within this context signs can profoundly refer to other signs for the initiated.¶ On the other hand, how believable is the idea that contemporary politics is an obscurantist system for the initiated, since politics involves mass behavior? Can such a view explain the agency and motivation we still encounter among political entrepreneurs that emerge from the grassroots? How can we explain the efforts at detournement we still see in society from below, as well as successful examples of recuperation?¶ III. Baudrillard, Debord, and Nostalgia¶ A possible path of reconciliation between these two positions is to consider Baudrillard's discussion of nostalgia. Baudrillard discusses in several of his later writings the prevalence for nostalgia in contemporary culture. Furthermore, our recent visions of the future seem to be ones where individuals are looking back upon us. The most obvious versions of this nostalgia for Baudrillard are books and films where, in a post apocalyptic setting; the survivors walk around the debris of our contemporary world.¶ In this sense there is a context in Baudrillard when he examines contemporary ideas of the future. The odd nostalgia he describes comes from us, human agents, trying to imagine the outcome of our contemporary actions. From this perspective, our unease is not due to the style or practice of contemporary politics, but to an underlying intuition about the failure of politics. Contemporary humanity faces the possibility of catastrophic risk. The shadow of ecological disaster is especially present in the minds of most of us.¶ Nostalgia then is something we feel for what politics was. Perhaps detournement continues to work because many of us long for modern (as opposed to contemporary) politics with its clarity of class conflict and ideologies that revolved around the role of the free market. Thus, we still respond to detournement actions that reference this earlier context. Furthermore, many of us prefer to still practice and participate in politics bounded by this context. ¶ Yet, we suspect that this is simulation, not because it is "unreal" but because politics in this sense does not address the most urgent issues that should be political. Instead, with our politics locked into this modern context, the urgent issues of climate change, pollution, technological risk, and mass scale terrorism become topics for culture. Thus, we see the nostalgia for the "society that was", our current one, in literature and film with post apocalyptic themes.¶ Nostalgia is also a defense or a coping mechanism. What agency do any of us possess within our contemporary context? Because we sense the futility of politics, as we know it within this contemporary setting, we retreat to behaving as if the old context, with its familiar categories and practices, still exists. Because we behave this way, it does continue to exist but at a cost. We soldier on within a modern politics that is increasingly detached from the constraints (ecological, economic, and biological) of our existence. This closed system of modern politics goes on in a ritualistic fashion, despite our growing frustration, and awareness, of its inability to address our common problems.¶ Recent commentary that criticizes the whole idea of detournement and Baudrillard’s analysis reflects this desire for politics as it was. In their book, Nation of Rebels, Heath and Potter argue that Baudrillard and Debord have created a closed ideology (Heath and Potter, 2004). From this critical perspective, they argue that there is no system performing recuperation. Instead, by collapsing the categories of the political and the cultural, many on the left have fallen into a bottomless trap. They continue to try and create a counterculture that simply sells more lifestyle product, while failing to attend to “real” politics. Real politics being the incremental policy changes that create results as in the past.¶ Is this a devastating critique? Or is this nostalgia for the politics that was? The examples Heath and Potter give of positive change, the American Civil Rights Movement, the construction of the welfare state, seem like a museum to us now. Is the context for such political activity still with us? Do we live in an era capable of producing such outcomes?¶ Instead, politics in this sort of analysis begins to resemble religion in that we appeal to it and diligently perform our duties waiting for an intervention that does not come. Have we not performed our roles earnestly enough? Are we neglecting the rites of our fathers? Do we need to switch to another denomination? Should we blame the clergy? And of course some of us begin to have our doubts that any of it matters.¶ From this perspective, the post apocalyptic nostalgia so prevalent in contemporary culture voices our lurking fears. In these movies and books, our lurking suspicion that contemporary politics fails to address the "real problem" is realized. This is also a reconciliation of Baudrillard and Debord. Detournement still works because we can access this past context. Indeed, we continue to blindly insist that this past social context is still our contemporary home. When our contemporary attempts at politics flounder, because they must confront a very different world today, we try to evaluate their efficacy with this rubric from the past. Why are our governments unable to address the looming ecological crisis? Why don’t our political parties provide us with a range of public policies to choose from?¶ What do these observations mean for thinking about politics? If Baudrillard and Debord are both accurate in their descriptions, then we seem to be in a moment of political stagnation. The tactics of Debord's detournement remain relevant because we continue to look backward to what politics were. These tactics are successful on one larger point, they temporarily expose our contemporary politics as a simulation of the modern form of politics that was. In this sense, practicing Debord's detournement is a useful activity, but only a first step leading to our contemporary time's pervasive nostalgia. The next step, taking Baudrillard's diagnosis seriously, and developing new forms of politics for our contemporary situation, is a greater challenge (see also Lindsey 2007).

### Alt

#### Only our approach paves the way for effective practical application and policy implementation

Johnson, 1985 (John J. Johnson, professor emeritus of Latin American history at Stanford, “One Hundred Years of Historical Writing on Modern Latin America by United States¶ Historians”, The Hispanic American Historical Review, Vol. 65, No. 4 (Nov., 1985), pp. 745-765, JSTOR)

Recent publications in diplomatic history do not bode well. There has been a strong tendency to ground arguments more in ideological conviction than in empirical data. Researchers have chosen to deal with the practical rather than the theoretical aspect of policy formation and implementation. There remains surprisingly little agreement on identifying the basic issues, to say nothing of how they should be studied. Official documents have been downgraded to the point that they figure only marginally in most studies, those of Bryce Wood being major exceptions. Relying upon quantitative methodologies and dependency themes, many authors may have overemphasized economic stakes as the principal factor in explaining foreign policy behavior. The ranks of those who would sustain the politico-security argument have been significantly reduced.
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## Cuba econ

#### Lifting restrictions won’t cause enough investment

Specht ‘13 **–** Legal Advisor, Pearlmaker Holsteins, Inc., B.A., LSU (Jonathan, “Raising Cane: Cuban Sugarcane Ethanol’s Economic and Environmental Effects on the United States”, UC Davis, 4-24-13, http://environs.law.ucdavis.edu/issues/36/2/specht.pdf)

III. THE POTENTIAL CUBAN ETHANOL INDUSTRY¶ To speak of a “Cuban sugarcane-based ethanol industry” is, at this point, largely a matter of speculation. Thanks in large part to the anti-ethanol views of Fidel Castro (who has said that ethanol should be discouraged because it diverts crops from food to fuel), Cuba currently has almost no ethanol industry. In the words of Ronald Soligo and Amy Myers Jaffe of the Brookings Institution, “Despite the fact that Cuba is dependent on oil imports and is aware of the demonstrated success of Brazil in using ethanol to achieve energy self-sufficiency, it has not embarked on a policy to develop a larger ethanol industry from sugarcane.” There is, however, no reason why such an industry cannot be developed. As Soligo and Jaffe wrote, “In addition, Cuba has large land areas that once produced sugar but now lie idle. These could be revived to provide a basis for a world-class ethanol industry. We estimate that if Cuba achieves the yield levels attained in Nicaragua and Brazil and the area planted with sugarcane approaches levels seen in the 1970s and 1980s, Cuba could produce up to 2 billion gallons of sugar-based ethanol per year.” ¶ The ideal domestic policy scenario for the creation of a robust Cuban sugarcane ethanol industry would be a situation in which the U.S. trade embargo on Cuba is ended, U.S. tariff barriers have been removed (in the case of sugar) or not revived (in the case of ethanol), and the Renewable Fuel Standard requiring that a certain percentage of U.S. fuel come from ethanol remain in place. Of course, changes in United States policy alone, even those that ensure a steady source of demand for Cuban sugarcane-based ethanol, would not be enough to create an ethanol industry from scratch. The country will need to decide that fostering the industry is to be a key goal of the post-Castro era, and will need to shape its domestic policies to encourage the growth of such an industry. ¶ Given that the Cuban sugar industry lived and died by its ties with specific foreign powers for most of the Twentieth Century, Cuba will likely be quite wary of investing too much in the creation of a sugarcane ethanol industry that it perceives as being largely a creature of U.S. energy and agricultural policy. Therefore, the creation of a significant sugarcane ethanol industry in Cuba will require a large increase in domestic demand for ethanol. One way that Cuba could encourage domestic demand for ethanol would be to follow the Brazilian model of encouraging the purchase of Flex Fuel vehicles, which can run on any blend of fuel between 100% gasoline and 100% ethanol. Because Cuba has so many old automobiles, expecting new vehicles to provide a source of demand for ethanol may be an extremely unrealistic prospect. On the other hand, the fact that there is so much pent-up demand for new automobiles in Cuba could mean that, with sufficient and well-directed government incentives, Flex Fuel vehicles could be adopted in Cuba at faster rates than in other countries.

#### a) US production is SO competitive that experts are urging Obama to cap imports from Brazil

WSJ ‘13 (Wall Street Journal; “U.S. Corn-Ethanol Producers: Curb Imports From Brazil”; January 30, 2013; <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887324610504578273842341906004.html>”)

WASHINGTON—The U.S. corn-ethanol industry is urging the Obama administration to cut down on imports of a different type of ethanol from Brazil, in a bid to reduce competition and improve its bottom line.¶ The push involves an unusual request for the industry: asking the Environmental Protection Agency to reduce part of the U.S. renewable-fuel mandate, which is normally backed by the industry as a way to underpin demand.¶ The new strategy comes as U.S. ethanol-refinery shutdowns are on the rise. Of the 211 ethanol refineries in the country, 34 were idle as of Monday, according to the Renewable Fuels Association. That represents about 14% of the roughly 14.7 billion gallons of capacity, said the trade group, whose members include Decatur, Ill.-based Archer Daniels Midland Co. ADM +1.05% and Abengoa ABG.MC -1.14% Bioenergy Corp., a unit of Spain's Abengoa SA.¶ In addition to competition from imports, U.S. producers are selling into a smaller market as Americans drive more fuel-efficient cars and ethanol makers' efforts to increase the amount of their product blended into gasoline haven't caught on.¶ A 2007 law sets mandates for annual U.S. use of alternative fuels. The number is supposed to keep rising, with the EPA deciding the exact targets each year.¶ But Congress limited the amount of corn starch-based fuels that can count toward the annual quota, to leave room for "advanced" biofuels. The EPA has determined that ethanol from Brazilian sugarcane qualifies as advanced whereas ethanol from Midwestern corn doesn't.¶ While U.S. ethanol makers have criticized those categories, they haven't previously suggested reducing any of the mandates. Now, however, in discussions with the White House Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs earlier this month, industry representatives have made clear that they believe the U.S. mandate encourages imports of ethanol made from Brazilian sugarcane at the expense of U.S. producers, according to people familiar with the meetings.¶ "I am concerned that at a time when the U.S. industry is having to shut down plants because of a lack of marketplace opportunities, the EPA has provided an incentive to import more Brazilian ethanol," said Bob Dinneen, president of the Renewable Fuels Association, in an interview.¶ An EPA spokeswoman said "the standards are undergoing interagency review" and declined to comment further. That review process began in July, when the EPA sent a draft of the standards to the White House. Nearly a month into 2013, the agency has yet to announce what the mandates for this year will be.¶ The White House Office of Management and Budget, which includes the regulatory affairs office, didn't respond to a request for comment.¶ The Brazilian fuel is in demand in part because domestically produced advanced fuels—from corn stalks or wood chips, for instance—haven't become available in large quantities, as lawmakers had hoped.¶ In 2012, about 92% of the advanced fuel that counted toward the quota was imported, according to EPA data. The Renewable Fuels Association, citing its own analysis of U.S. trade data, said the bulk of the imported fuel was ethanol made from Brazilian sugarcane.¶ If the EPA were to reduce the amount of "advanced" fuel required in the U.S., it would effectively limit the market for the Brazilian imports.¶ Leticia Phillips, the North American representative for Unica, a Brazilian sugarcane industry association, said reducing the quota "would be a step backwards for the entire program, because it would create uncertainty and run counter to the intention of cutting climate-changing emissions." She was referring to an EPA finding that the sugarcane fuel creates fewer greenhouse-gas emissions than traditional fossil fuels as well as corn ethanol.¶ "Ethanol imported under the advanced category has no bearing on the vast majority of the ethanol sold in the United States," Ms. Phillips said. "Once you start making changes to appease specific interests, you may end up compromising what so far has been a solid program."¶ U.S. producers of fuels that qualify as advanced, such as diesel motor fuel made from soybeans and cooking oil, also fret about reducing the advanced-fuel quota.¶ "We believe the EPA has established reasonable, sustainable production targets and that it would be a real mistake to retreat from those targets now," said Anne Steckel, vice president of federal affairs for the National Biodiesel Board, which represents alternative diesel fuel producers. Ms. Steckel said those producers would boost their diesel output in 2013 "to fill an increasing amount of this market."

## Sugarcane ethanol

#### Warming won’t cause extinction

Barrett, professor of natural resource economics – Columbia University, ‘7

(Scott, Why Cooperate? The Incentive to Supply Global Public Goods, introduction)

First, climate change does not threaten the survival of the human species.5 If unchecked, it will cause other species to become extinction (though biodiversity is being depleted now due to other reasons). It will alter critical ecosystems (though this is also happening now, and for reasons unrelated to climate change). It will reduce land area as the seas rise, and in the process displace human populations. “Catastrophic” climate change is possible, but not certain. Moreover, and unlike an asteroid collision, large changes (such as sea level rise of, say, ten meters) will likely take centuries to unfold, giving societies time to adjust. “Abrupt” climate change is also possible, and will occur more rapidly, perhaps over a decade or two. However, abrupt climate change (such as a weakening in the North Atlantic circulation), though potentially very serious, is unlikely to be ruinous. Human-induced climate change is an experiment of planetary proportions, and we cannot be sur of its consequences. Even in a worse case scenario, however, global climate change is not the equivalent of the Earth being hit by mega-asteroid. Indeed, if it were as damaging as this, and if we were sure that it would be this harmful, then our incentive to address this threat would be overwhelming. The challenge would still be more difficult than asteroid defense, but we would have done much more about it by now.

Environmental apocalypticism causes eco-authoritarianism and mass violence against those deemed environmental threats – also causes political apathy which turns case

Buell 3 Frederick—cultural critic on the environmental crisis and a Professor of English at Queens College and the author of five books, *From Apocalypse To Way of Life,* pages 185-186

Looked at critically, then, crisis discourse thus suffers from a number of liabilities. First, it seems to have become a political liability almost as much as an asset. It calls up a fierce and effective opposition with its predictions; worse, its more specific predictions are all too vulnerable to refutation by events. It also exposes environmentalists to being called grim doomsters and antilife Puritan extremists. Further, concern with crisis has all too often tempted people to try to find a “total solution” to the problems involved— a phrase that, as an astute analyst of the limitations of crisis discourse, John Barry, puts it, is all too reminiscent of the Third Reich’s infamous “final solution.”55 A total crisis of society—environmental crisis at its gravest—threatens to translate despair into inhumanist authoritarianism; more often, however, it helps keep merely dysfunctional authority in place. It thus leads, Barry suggests, to the belief that only elite- and expert-led solutions are possible.56 At the same timeit depoliticizes people, inducing them to accept their impotence as individuals; this is something that has made many people today feel, ironically and/or passively, that since it makes no difference at all what any individual does on his or her own, one might as well go along with it. Yet another pitfall for the full and sustained elaboration of environmental crisis is, though least discussed, perhaps the most deeply ironic. A problem with deep cultural and psychological as well as social effects, it is embodied in a startlingly simple proposition: the worse one feels environmental crisis is, the more one is tempted to turn one’s back on the environment. This means, preeminently, turning one’s back on “nature”—on traditions of nature feeling, traditions of knowledge about nature (ones that range from organic farming techniques to the different departments of ecological science), and traditions of nature-based activism. If nature is thoroughly wrecked these days, people need to delink from nature and live in postnature—a conclusion that, as the next chapter shows, many in U.S. society drew at the end of the millenium. Explorations of how deeply “nature” has been wounded and how intensely vulnerable to and dependent on human actions it is can thus lead, ironically, to further indifference to nature-based environmental issues, not greater concern with them. But what quickly becomes evident to any reflective consideration of the difficulties of crisis discourse is that all of these liabilities are in fact bound tightly up with one specific notion of environmental crisis—with 1960s- and 1970s-style environmental apocalypticism. Excessive concern about them does not recognize that crisis discourse as a whole has significantly changed since the 1970s. They remain inducements to look away from serious reflection on environmental crisis only if one does not explore how environmental crisis has turned of late from apocalypse to dwelling place. The apocalyptic mode had a number of prominent features: it was preoccupied with running out and running into walls; with scarcity and with the imminent rupture of limits; with actions that promised and temporally predicted imminent total meltdown; and with (often, though not always) the need for immediate “total solution.” **Thus doomsterism was its reigning mode;** eco-authoritarianism was a grave temptation; and as crisis was elaborated to show more and more severe deformations of nature, temptation increased to refute it, or give up, or even cut off ties to clearly terminal “nature.”

Empirics go neg - ecosystems adapt

Maier 09

Don Maier, Independent Environmental Scholar, May 2009, “What’s So Good about Biodiversity? A Survey of Bad Answers,” Paper presented to the 6th Annual Joint International Society for Environmental Philosophy/ISEE Conference <http://www.environmentalphilosophy.org/ISEEIAEPpapers/2009/Maier.pdf>

One could rework Noss' statement once again to restrict the biodiversity it mentions to that which has accompanied the presence of H. sapiens on the planet. Its value then derives from all the biological factors that have sustained life that humanity has known. Human presence is extremely recent – something less than 200,000 years, so this is a considerable restriction. Yet even during man's brief tenure, not just the composition of biodiversity (which species exist), but also species diversity in its proper sense, without regard to composition, have dramatically changed – and largely because of changes induced by humans. As conservation biologist Martin Jenkins remarks, There is growing consensus that from around 40,000 to 50,000 years ago onward, humans have been directly or indirectly responsible for the extinction in many parts of the world of all or most of the larger terrestrial animal species.146 The component set of species has undergone remarkable transformation due to human influences. The component set of ecosystems has also been transformed as a result. This is the point of the concept of anthropogenic biomes (mentioned in Section 4.3 on "The moral force of biodiversity"), none of which existed 60,000 years ago. The biomes from that time are now extinct, like many of the species that occupied them, and largely on account of their extinction. So apparently, whatever biological conditions have sustained life over the last 200,000 years have also sustained so many changes in life that the planet now is hard to recognize as a later biotic and environmental version of its former self. One might insist that the concern for biodiversity should be restricted even further – to the sustaining of life (just) as we know it right now in the early 21st century. But with this additional restriction, we have finally reached a confluence with the just-so model of biodiversity value and its attendant problems – discussed in Section 4.1.4 on "The just-so model".

Biodiversity loss is inevitable and necessary

Bhattacharya 3/5/13

Shaoni Bhattacharya, consultant for New Scientist, New Scientist, March 5, 2013, "Is extinction really such a bad thing?", http://www.newscientist.com/blogs/culturelab/2013/03/extinction.html

IT'S not something that you would expect London's Natural History Museum to extol, but its new exhibition says extinction may not be so bad after all. "Extinction, like death, is a natural part of life," declares a sage epigraph at the start of this thoughtful exhibition. "Extinction isn't necessarily the end of the world, it could be just the beginning..." The exhibition aims to make visitors question their ideas on extinction. Is it any worse when caused by humans than by meteorites or volcanic eruptions? Should conservation be our watchword, or should some organisms go extinct? The five mass extinctions in Earth's history wiped out swathes of life, but out of the devastation new species rose - shaped and honed by evolution - to inherit the Earth. More than 99 per cent of species that ever lived are now dead, and the exhibition hammers home the point that extinction drives evolution, which results in life in all its wondrous forms.

#### Prefer our evidence – theirs is unverifiable nonsense

Taylor 2K (Jerry, director of [natural resource studies](http://www.cato.org/research/natur-st.html) at the Cato Institute, The Environmental Movement: Running Out of Gas “, http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=4716)

Third, Americans are growing numb to the constant cries of wolf. Back in the 1960s, environmentalists told us the population explosion would cause civilizational collapse by 1990. It never happened, and even 3rd-World people are living longer, better-fed lives than ever before. In the 1970s, environmentalists told us that we would run out of oil and most other valuable resources by the turn of the century, plunging us into a new Dark Age. It never happened, and resources are cheaper today (that is to say, more abundant) than ever before. Later in the 1970s, the environmentalists told us that a new Ice Age was upon us unless we took drastic action to reduce pollution (which, we were told, clouded the skies, blocking the sun). Now we're told that it's warming, not cooling, that's the threat and that the four horsemen of the apocalypse are about to descend upon us. Yet during all this warming, crop yields are at record levels, the economy is humming along quite nicely and human welfare has never been better. If everyone's an environmentalist, then no one's an environmentalist. And that's fine with me. The environmental lobby, while it has its good points, is all too filled with pseudo science, quasi-paganism, self-righteousness and anticapitalist fervor for me to spill tears over its troubles. Its childish morality plays and economic know-nothingism too often get in the way of serious discussion about real environmental issues. Perhaps Earth Day's flop last week means that we've matured enough to have that discussion.

#### Their evidence is just an exaggeration and tech solves

Bailey 2K (Ronald, award-winning science correspondent for *Reason* magazine, testified before Congress, author of numerous books, member of the Society of Environmental Journalists and the American Society for Bioethics and Humanities, “[Earth Day, Then and Now](http://reason.com/archives/2000/05/01/earth-day-then-and-now) The planet's future has never looked better. Here's why”, <http://reason.com/archives/2000/05/01/earth-day-then-and-now/4>)

Earth Day 1970 provoked a torrent of apocalyptic predictions. "We have about five more years at the outside to do something," ecologist Kenneth Watt declared to a Swarthmore College audience on April 19, 1970. Harvard biologist George Wald estimated that "civilization will end within 15 or 30 years unless immediate action is taken against problems facing mankind." "We are in an environmental crisis which threatens the survival of this nation, and of the world as a suitable place of human habitation," wrote Washington University biologist Barry Commoner in the Earth Day issue of the scholarly journal *Environment*. The day after Earth Day, even the staid *New York Times* editorial page warned, "Man must stop pollution and conserve his resources, not merely to enhance existence but to save the race from intolerable deterioration and possible extinction." Very Apocalypse Now. Three decades later, of course, the world hasn't come to an end; if anything, the planet's ecological future has never looked so promising. With half a billion people suiting up around the globe for Earth Day 2000, now is a good time to look back on the predictions made at the first Earth Day and see how they've held up and what we can learn from them. The short answer: The prophets of doom were not simply wrong, but **spectacularly** **wrong**. More important, many contemporary environmental alarmists are similarly mistaken when they continue to insist that the Earth's future remains an eco-tragedy that has already entered its final act. Such doomsters not only fail to appreciate the huge environmental gains made over the past 30 years, they ignore the simple fact that increased wealth, population, and technological innovation don't degrade and destroy the environment. Rather, such developments preserve and enrich the environment. If it is impossible to predict fully the future, it is nonetheless possible to learn from the past. And the best lesson we can learn from revisiting the discourse surrounding the very first Earth Day is that passionate concern, however sincere, is no substitute for rational analysis.

#### Adapation answers invisible threshold

Doremus 2K (Holly, Professor of Law at UC Davis Washington & Lee Law Review, Winter 57 Wash & Lee L. Rev. 11, lexis)

Reluctant to concede such losses, tellers of the ecological horror story highlight how close a catastrophe might be, and how little we know about what actions might trigger one. But the apocalyptic vision is less credible today than it seemed in the 1970s. Although it is clear that the earth is experiencing a mass wave of extinctions, the complete elimination of life on earth seems unlikely. Life is remarkably robust. Nor is human extinction probable any time soon. Homo sapiens is adaptable to nearly any environment. Even if the world of the future includes far fewer species, it likely will hold people. One response to this credibility problem tones the story down a bit, arguing not that humans will go extinct but that ecological disruption will bring economies, and consequently civilizations, to their knees. But this too may be overstating the case. Most ecosystem functions are performed by multiple species. This functional redundancy means that a high proportion of species can be lost without precipitating a collapse