#### Even though lawmakers have backed off an Iran sanctions bill now – there still remains the potential that Congress could increase additional sanctions

Luke **Johnson 2/12**, Over 100 House Members Say Hold Off On Iran Sanctions Vote, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2014/02/12/house-iran-sanctions-vote\_n\_4775072.html

WASHINGTON -- A bipartisan group of 104 House members urged Congress in a letter sent Wednesday to President Barack Obama not to vote on an Iran sanctions bill while an interim agreement between the Iran and the West is in place.¶ "We understand that there is no assurance of success and that, if talks break down or Iran reneges on pledges it made in the interim agreement, Congress may be compelled to act as it has in the past by enacting additional sanctions legislation," wrote the members. "At present, however, we believe that Congress must give diplomacy a chance. A bill or resolution that risks fracturing our international coalition or, worse yet, undermining our credibility in future negotiations and jeopardizing hard-won progress toward a verifiable final agreement, must be avoided."¶ The effort represents a momentum shift in the House against sanctions. A bill backing sanctions passed in the chamber by a 400-20 vote in July.¶ Reps. Lloyd Doggett (D-Texas) and David Price (D-N.C.) gathered support for the letter, which as of Feb. 3 had more than 70 signatories. They also picked up four Republican signatories -- Reps. John Duncan Jr. (Tenn.), Richard Hanna (N.Y.), Walter Jones (N.C.) and Thomas Massie (Ky.). The only member of the Democratic leadership to sign onto the letter was Assistant Democratic Leader Rep. Jim Clyburn (D-S.C.); House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.), House Democratic Whip Rep. Steny Hoyer (D-Md.) and House Democratic Caucus Chairman Rep. Xavier Becerra (D-Calif.) did not sign.¶ The letter comes as the effort by Sens. Mark Kirk (R-Ill.) and Robert Menendez (D-N.J.) to pass an Iran sanctions bill has lost steam in the Senate. That bill would hit Iran with more sanctions unless it agreed to restrictions on uranium enrichment that go beyond the current six-month interim agreement negotiated with Western powers. Iran's foreign minister has warned that additional sanctions would kill the interim deal.¶ Even the America-Israel Public Affairs Committee, a prime driver behind the sanctions push, has backed off the idea of holding a vote.¶ Talks between the West and Iran on a permanent agreement for its nuclear program are slated to begin in mid-February.

#### The GOP will exploit the plan to flip Democratic votes on Iran—causes sanctions

Josh **Rogin**, Daily Beast, **2/5**/14, GOP Will Force Reid to Save Obama’s Iran Policy—Over and Over Again, www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2014/02/05/gop-will-force-reid-to-save-obama-s-iran-policy-over-and-over-again.html

Dozens of Republican senators joined Wednesday to demand that Harry Reid allow a floor vote on a new Iran sanctions bill. If he doesn’t, they are planning to make his life miserable.¶ The Republican Senate caucus is planning to use every parliamentary trick in the book to push Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid to allow a floor vote on a new Iran sanctions bill that the Obama administration strenuously opposes. The Obama White House has succeeded in keeping most Democrats in line against supporting quick passage of the “Nuclear Weapon Free Iran Act,” which currently has 59 co-sponsors, including 13 Democrats. Reid has faithfully shelved the bill, pending the outcome of negotiations between Iran and the world’s major powers—the so-called “P5+1.” But tomorrow, Republicans plan to respond by using an array of floor tactics—including bringing up the bill and forcing Reid to publicly oppose it—as a means of putting public pressure on Reid and Democrats who may be on the fence. “Now we have come to a crossroads. Will the Senate allow Iran to keep its illicit nuclear infrastructure in place, rebuild its teetering economy and ultimately develop nuclear weapons at some point in the future?” 42 GOP senators wrote in a letter sent to Reid late Wednesday and obtained by The Daily Beast. “The answer to this question will be determined by whether you allow a vote on S. 1881, the bipartisan Nuclear Weapon Free Iran Act, which is cosponsored by more than half of the Senate.” The GOP letter calls on Reid to allow a vote on the bill during the current Senate work period—in other words, before the chamber’s next recess. Senate GOP aides said that until they get a vote, GOP senators are planning to use a number of procedural tools at their disposal to keep this issue front and center for Democrats. Since the legislation is already on the Senate’s legislative calendar, any senator can bring up the bill for a vote at any time and force Democrats to publicly object. Senators can also try attaching the bill as an amendment to future bills under consideration. Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell has been a harsh critic of Reid’s shelving of the bill, so he could demand a vote on it as a condition of moving any other legislation. If those amendments are blocked by Reid, Senators can then go to the floor and make speech after speech calling out Reid for ignoring a bill supported by 59 senators—and calling on fence-sitting Democrats to declare their position on the bill. “This letter is a final warning to Harry Reid that if Democrats want to block this bipartisan legislation, they will own the results of this foreign policy disaster,” one senior GOP senate aide said. The Republican senators believe, based on recent polls, that the majority of Americans support moving forward with the Iran sanctions bill now. They also believe that if Reid did allow a vote, the bill would garner more than the 59 votes of its co-sponsors and that Democrats vulnerable in 2014 races would support it, pushing the vote total past a veto-proof two-thirds supermajority.

#### New sanctions cause negotiation collapse and Middle East War

Rachel **Kleinfeld**, Carnegie Endowment For International Peace, **1/31**/14, Sanctions Could Disrupt Negotiations With Iran, carnegieendowment.org/2014/02/03/sanctions-could-disrupt-negotiations-with-iran/h02v

Facing skyrocketing inflation, a collapsing currency and a sudden loss of imported goods, Iranians voted last year to kick out Mahmoud Ahmadinejad and elected a government they thought might jump-start their economy.¶ The new government of President Hassan Rouhani is not "moderate" - but it is practical. It would like a nuclear weapon, but it wants economic relief more. Rouhani knows his only bargaining chip to end sanctions is to stop the nuclear weapons program.¶ But the Rouhani government is on a short leash. Iran's supreme leader, Ali Khamenei, holds the ultimate power - and he is skeptical that a deal can be struck. Hardliners in Iran who benefit from sanctions are against it, as are many in the U.S. Congress. Khamenei needs to walk a careful line: If he looks like he's capitulating too much, then he'll face domestic backlash. He knows he has only a few months to deliver.¶ That is why the congressional threat of more sanctions - even if they take effect only if the deal fails - is so dire. Hardliners and Khamenei will take such legislation as proof that the United States wants regime change, not an end to Iran's nuclear program. Rouhani himself has said that if sanctions legislation passes, negotiations are off.¶ So why have more than 50 senators signed up as co-sponsors of new sanctions? Some do want regime change. So would we all - Iran is a noxious, terrorist-supporting, human-rights-destroying government. But regime change wouldn't end the security threat. Even the "Green Movement" that marched for democracy a few years ago wanted to obtain a nuclear weapon.¶ Others think that sanctions got Iran to the negotiating table, so more sanctions will push them even harder. This is a miscalculation. Negotiations have begun. Iran has allowed nuclear inspectors to seal up their nuclear plants. More sanctions will simply seem like bad faith on our part. They also could provide the excuse other countries are looking for to break with the sanctions regime. Bans on oil imports are causing real economic hardship to allies such as Japan who depended on Iran for much of their energy, and export bans are hurting European companies desperate to restart growth. If the United States looks like the bad guy, these governments are likely to give in to domestic pressure and reduce their sanctions against Iran.¶ Finally, the American Israel Public Affairs Committee is lobbying Congress hard with the message that a vote against sanctions is a vote against Israel. To me, as a Jew and a Zionist, this is not only hogwash: It is allowing an unelected American nongovernmental organization to wrap itself in the Israeli flag while suggesting actions that threaten Israel.¶ If we cannot end Iran's nuclear program with diplomacy, we will end it through war. Two years ago, the national security organization I founded worked with Pentagon planners on a simulation game to look at what would happen after the United States bombed Iran. In all the possible scenarios, Iran was likely to do one thing: attack Israel to open up a two-front war and further drag America into conflict in the Middle East. A vote for sanctions at this point is a vote for war - and for Iranian missile attacks on Israel.

the Jewish state. "I can't remember the last time the differences [between the U.S. and Israel] were this stark," said one former Democratic White House official with ties to the Jewish community. "There's now a little more freedom [for progressive Democrats] to say what they want to say, without fear of getting their tuchus kicked by the organized Jewish community." A Gallup survey conducted this year showed 55 percent of Democrats sympathizing with the Israelis over the Palestinians, compared with 78 percent of Republicans and 63 percent of independents who do so. A landmark Pew poll of American Jews, released in October, showed that 35 percent of Jewish Democrats said they had little or no attachment to Israel, more than double the 15 percent of Jewish Republicans who answered similarly. At the 2012 Democratic National Convention, many delegates booed a platform proposal supporting the move of the U.S. Embassy in Israel from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. In 2011, Democrats lost Anthony Weiner's heavily Jewish, solidly Democratic Brooklyn House seat because enough Jewish voters wanted to rebuke the president's perceived hostility toward Israel. Pro-Israel advocacy groups rely on the mantra that support for Israel carries overwhelming bipartisan support, a maxim that has held true for decades in Congress. But most also reluctantly acknowledge the growing influence of a faction within the Democratic Party that is more critical of the two countries' close relationship. Within the Jewish community, that faction is represented by J Street, which positions itself as the home for "pro-Israel, pro-peace Americans" and supports the Iran negotiations. "Organizations that claim to represent the American Jewish community are undermining [Obama's] approach by pushing for new and harsher penalties against Iran," the group wrote in an action alert to its members. Some supporters of Israel view J Street with concern. "There's a small cadre of people that comes from the progressive side of the party that are in the business of blaming Israel first. There's a chorus of these guys," said a former Clinton administration foreign policy official. "But that doesn't make them the dominant folks in the policy space of the party, or the Hill." Pro-Israel activists worry that one of the ironies of Obama's situation is that as his poll numbers sink, his interest in striking a deal with Iran will grow because he'll be looking for any bit of positive news that can draw attention away from the health care law's problems. Thus far, Obama's diminished political fortunes aren't deterring Democrats from protecting the administration's prerogatives. Congressional sources expect the Senate Banking Committee, chaired by South Dakota Democrat Tim Johnson, to hold off on any sanctions legislation until there's a resolution to the Iranian negotiations. But if Obama's standing continues to drop, and if Israel doesn't like the deal, don't be surprised to see Democrats become less hesitant about going their own way.

**China’s taking advantage of weak US relations to encroach on the region.**

**Munene 6/17** – (2012, Macharia, professor of history and international relations, USIU, “Superpowers redefine their policies,” Business Daily Africa, http://www.businessdailyafrica.com/Opinion-and-Analysis/America-and-China-redefine-their-policies--/-/539548/1885816/-/qf5u13z/-/index.html)

For a long time, Latin America was considered a preserve of the United States but China is making successful inroads. It is seemingly repaying the United States with its own coin since Americans frequently encroach on what China would thinks is Beijing’s backyard in Asia. It has developed good ties with Brazil which leads in Latin America in self assertiveness. Mexico would like to appear to be independent of the United States in terms of making decisions on who to relate to and thus received Xi very well before the Chinese president went to meet Obama in California. Besides Mexico, Xi was a guest in Costa Rica as well as Trinidad and Tobago. In itself, this development might be a tacit understanding between the two leading powers that they will infiltrate each other’s sphere of influence even as they try to forge what Xi would like to think of as a new relationship of trust between the two countries. Xi’s global onslaught worries some countries which are forced to come out of geopolitical hibernation and essentially respond to the agenda set by China.

**Mexico key to expanding Chinese regional influence**

**Ellis 13** – (6/6, R. Evan, , PhD, professor of national security studies, modeling, gaming, and simulation with the Center for Hemispheric Defense Studies, with a research focus on Latin America’s relationships with external actors, including China, Russia, and Iran, “China's New Backyard,” Foreign Policy, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2013/06/06/china\_s\_new\_backyard\_latin\_america?page=0,0)

Ironically, **it's the Latin American country closest to the United States where Xi might be able to make up the most ground.** Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto's engagement with the Chinese president, both at the April summit in Boao, China, and this week in Mexico City, allow him to differentiate himself from his pro-U.S. predecessor, Felipe Calderón. Similarly, Mexico's role in forming the Pacific Alliance, a new subregional organization built around a group of four pro-market, pro-trade countries (Chile, Colombia, Mexico, and Peru) **allows Mexico to reassert a leadership role in the Americas, relatively independent of the United States.**

**Chinese investment and security assistance in Latin America is key to a stable oil supply chain – trades off with US influence and no-strings nature makes it uniquely valuable**

**Xiaoxia 5/6** – (2013, Wen, Economic Observer, Worldcrunch, “IN AMERICA'S BACKYARD: CHINA'S RISING INFLUENCE IN LATIN AMERICA,” http://www.worldcrunch.com/china-2.0/in-america-039-s-backyard-china-039-s-rising-influence-in-latin-america/foreign-policy-trade-economy-investments-energy/c9s11647/)

Initially, China’s activities in Latin America were limited to the diplomatic level. By providing funds and assisting in infrastructure constructions, China managed to interrupt diplomatic ties between poor Latin countries and Taiwan. Since then, with China's economic boom, the supply of energy and resources has gradually become a problem that plagues China -- and its exchanges with Latin America thus are endowed with real substantive purpose. Among the numerous needs of China, **the demand for oil has always been the most powerful driving force**. In the past 30 years, China has consumed one-third of the world's new oil production and become the world's second-largest oil importer. More than half of China's oil demand depends on imports, which increases the instability of its energy security. Diversification is inevitable. In this context, Latin America and its huge reserves and production capacity naturally became a destination for China. China must better protect its energy supply, and can't just play the simple role of consumer. It must also help solidify the important links of the petroleum industry supply chain. Indeed, the China National Petroleum Corporation frequently appears in Latin American countries, and China’s investment and trade in the Latin American countries are also focused on its energy sector. In the opinion of many European and American scholars, China's current practice isn’t much different from that of Western colonizers of the last century. These scholars believe that China doesn’t care about local human rights or the state of democracy when dealing with countries. **All China is interested in is establishing long-term, stable economic relations.** This realistic path is exactly opposite to that of America's newfound idealism. Thus China has become a close collaborator of certain Latin American countries, such as Venezuela, that are in sharp conflict with the United States. The global financial crisis of 2008 was a chance for China to become an increasingly important player in Latin American. As Europe and the United States were caught in a financial quagmire, China, with nearly $3 trillion of foreign exchange reserves as backing, embarked on "funds-for-assets" transactions with Latin American countries. So what does China want exactly in entering Latin American? Is it to obtain a stable supply of energy and resources, and thus inadvertently acquire political influence? Or the other way round? Presumably most U.S. foreign policy-makers are well aware of the answer. **China's involvement in the Latin American continent doesn’t constitute a threat to the United States, but brings benefits.** It is precisely because China has reached "loans-for-oil" swap agreements with Venezuela, Brazil, Ecuador and other countries that it brings much-needed funds to these oil-producing countries in South America. Not only have these funds been used in the field of oil production, **but they have also safeguarded the energy supply of the United States**, as well as stabilized these countries' livelihood -- and to a certain extent reduced the impact of illegal immigration and the drug trade on the U.S. For South America, China and the United States, this is not a zero-sum game, but a multiple choice of mutual benefits and synergies. Even if China has become the Latin American economy’s new upstart, it is still not in a position to challenge the strong and diverse influence that the United States has accumulated over two centuries in the region.

**Oil shocks cause extinction
Roberts 04** (Paul, Regular Contributor to Harpers and NYT Magazine, “The End of Oil: On The Edge of a Perilous New World”, p. 93-94)

The obsessive focus on oil is hardly surprising, given the stakes. In the fast-moving world of oil politics, oil is not simply a source of world power, but a medium for that power as well, a substance whose huge importance enmeshes companies, communities, and entire nations in a taut global web that is sensitive to the smallest of vibrations. A single oil "event" — a pipeline explosion in Iraq, political unrest in Venezuela, a bellicose exchange between the Russian and Saudi oil ministers — sends shockwaves through the world energy order, pushes prices up or down, and sets off tectonic shifts in global wealth and power. Each day that the Saudi-Russian spat kept oil supplies high and prices low, the big oil exporters were losing hundreds of millions of dollars and, perhaps, moving closer to financial and political disaster — while the big consuming nations enjoyed what amounted to a massive tax break. Yet in the volatile world of oil, the tide could quickly turn. A few months later, as anxieties over a second Iraq war drove prices up to forty dollars, the oil tide abruptly changed directions, transferring tens of billions of dollars from the economies of the United States, Japan, and Europe to the national banks in Riyadh, Caracas, Kuwait City, and Baghdad, and threatening to strangle whatever was left of the global economic recovery. So embedded has oil become in today's political and economic spheres that the big industrial governments now watch the oil markets as closely as they once watched the spread of communism — and with good reason: six of the last seven global recessions have been preceded by spikes in the price of oil, and fear is growing among economists and policymakers that, in today's growth-dependent, energy-intensive global economy, oil price volatility itself may eventually pose more risk to prosperity and stability and simple survival than terrorism or even war.

#### 1) The affirmative’s reliance on the government to solve problems is at the root of forgetting individual complicity in violence. The individual becomes powerless to do anything about wars and violence.

**Kappeler 95** – Susanne, associate professor at Al-Akhawayn University, The Will to Violence: The Politics of Personal Behaviour, p. 10-11

'We are the war' does not mean that the responsibility for a war is shared collectively and diffusely by an entire society - which would be equivalent to exonerating warlords and politicians and profiteers or, as Ulrich Beck says, upholding the notion of collective irresponsibility', where people are no longer held responsible for their actions, and where the conception of universal responsibility becomes the equivalent of a universal acquittal.6 On the contrary, the object is precisely to analyse the specific and differential responsibility of everyone in their diverse situations. Decisions to unleash a war are indeed taken at particular levels of power by those in a position to make them and to command such collective action. We need to hold them clearly responsible for their decisions and actions without lessening theirs by any collective 'assumption' of responsibility. Yet **our habit of focusing on the stage where the major dramas of power take place tends to obscure** our sight in relation to our own sphere of competence, **our own power and our own responsibility — leading to** the -well-known illusion of our apparent **'powerlessness'** and its accompanying phenomenon, our so-called political disillusionment. Single **citizens** — even more so those of other nations - **have come to feel secure in their obvious non-responsibility for** such **large-scale political events** as, say, the wars in Croatia and Bosnia-Hercegovina or Somalia - **since the decisions for such events are always made elsewhere**. Yet **our insight** that indeed we are not responsible for the decisions of a Serbian general or a Croatian president **tends to mislead us into thinking that** therefore **we have no responsibility** at all, not even **for forming our own judgement**, and thus into underrating the responsibility we do have within our own sphere of action. In particular, **it seems to absolve us from having to try to see any relation between our own actions and those events,** or to recognize the connections between those political decisions and our own personal decisions. It not only shows that we participate in what Beck calls 'organized irresponsibility', upholding the apparent lack of connection between bureaucratically, institutionally, nationally and also individually organized separate competences. **It** also **proves the** phenomenal and **unquestioned alliance of our personal thinking with the thinking of the major powermongers**. For we tend to think that we cannot 'do' anything, say, about a war, because we deem ourselves to be in the wrong situation; because we are not where the major decisions are made. Which is why **many** of those not yet entirely disillusioned with politics **tend to engage in a form of mental deputy politics, in the style of 'What would I do if I were the** general, the prime minister, the **president**, the foreign minister or the minister of defence?' **Since we seem to regard their mega spheres of action as the only worthwhile and truly effective ones**, and since our political analyses tend to dwell there first of all, **any question of what I would do if I were indeed myself tends to peter out in the comparative insignificance of having what is perceived as 'virtually no possibilities'**: what I could do seems pretty and futile. For my own action I obviously desire the range of action of a general, a prime minister, or a General Secretary of the UN — finding expression in ever more prevalent formulations like 'I want to stop this war', 'I want military intervention', 'I want to stop this backlash', or 'I want a moral revolution.'7'**We are this war'**, however, **even if we do not command the troops or participate in so-called peace talks**, namely as Drakulic says, **in** our 'non-comprehension': **our willed refusal to feel responsible for our own thinking** and for working out our own understanding, preferring innocently to drift along the ideological current of prefabricated arguments or less than innocently taking advantage of the advantages these offer. And we 'are' the war in our 'unconscious cruelty towards you', our tolerance of the 'fact that you have a yellow form for refugees and I don't' - our readiness, in other words, to build identities, one for ourselves and one for refugees, one of our own and one for the 'others'. **We share in the responsibility for this war** and its violence in the way we let them grow inside us, that is, **in the way we shape 'our feelings, our relationships, our values' according to the structures and the values of war and violence**.

#### The affirmative’s rhetoric supports an order of security which provides unrestrained freedom to be violent to the United States, while blaming violence upon China.

**Nayar,** School of Law, University of Warwick, **1999** (Jayan, 9 Transnat’l L. & Contemp. Probs. 599, Fall)

**The period since 1945** may be regarded as a long peace only in the restricted sense that there has been no war between major powers. In other respects, and for much of the world, it **has been a period of frequent wars.** . . . By one estimate, between 1945 and 1989 there were 138 wars, resulting in some 23 million deaths. . . . All **138 wars were fought in the Third World, and many were fuelled by weapons provided by the two major powers** [the United States and the Soviet Union] **or their allies**. <=32> n31

The twentieth-century is a period of history which, in the words of anthropologist Marvin Harris, has seen "a war to end all wars followed by a war to make the world safe for [\*614] democracy, followed by a world full of military dictatorships." **We were then promised a New World-order as the reward for agreeing to the Gulf War, as the end of the Cold War gave way to a seemingly endless series of intra-state wars** which the international community is unwilling or unable to bring to order. <=33> n32

 Once again, from the perspective of the ordered, **the order of security has proved to be the ideological weapon for the systematic infliction of violence. It is not so much the order of security that is of interest here, but rather, the ordering which takes place in its guise**.

 And with the passing of history, so has the legitimizing claim for the necessity of violent ordering for "security" purposes--fascism, colonialism, communism, capitalism (depending on the ideological orientation of the claimant), terrorism (particularly of the Islamic bent). **There is always an enemy, sometimes internal, sometimes external, threatening the well-being of the people. The languages of nationalism and sovereignty, of peace and collective security, constructed to suit whichever threat happens to be in fashion, are passionately employed**; the anarchy that is a Hobbesian state of nature is always the prophesied consequence of the lack of order that is impending. **And the price that the "ordered" has to pay for all this "security" in the post-colonial, new world-order?: the freedom of those who order to be violent!**

#### By projecting the image of violence upon the Chinese, we become locked into the viewpoint of the hero. This clouds our judgment, ultimately resulting in a massive escalation of violence and counter-violence that can never result in peace.

**Levy** **2004** – Paul, political activist, The Current World Crisis, 2004: Nightmare or Waking Dream?, google

When viewed as a dreaming process, and seen symbolically, it is clear that there is total polarization going on deep inside the dreamer, as the opposites are totally split, disassociated and trying to destroy one another. **A reflection of this intense inner polarization that is happening** deep inside the collective consciousness of humanity **is the "shadow projection**" going on in this waking dream of ours. Psychologically speaking, **projecting the shadow is a perverse way of dealing with our own darkness by projecting it onto someone else and imagining that the other is the embodiment of the darkness that ultimately belongs to ourselves.** Each side of the polarity is overly identified with the light, or God, splitting off and seeing the other as the embodiment of evil, even of Satan himself. Be it Bush seeing Sadaam Hussein that way, the terrorists seeing the Americans that way, the Palestinians seeing the Israelis that way, as well as visa versa. It should be noted that **this is exactly the same psychological phenomenon that happened in Hitler's Europe towards the Jews** during the second World War. Psychologically, **this is a very dangerous situation, as a person (or a nation) can become fanatically identified with their point of view, unable to self-reflect, and become possessed by the hero, or saviour archetype.** This figure is religious in nature, as it derives from the transpersonal, archetypal dimension of the collective unconscious. The person (or nation) inflated with the hero or saviour archetype wants to save the world from evil. But **by projecting the shadow onto an "other," and wanting to destroy them, we literally become possessed by the very same darkness we are trying to destroy, just perpetuating the never-ending cycle of violence.** This dynamic is a reflection of and analogous to how, when we are split-off and disassociated, the trauma that is at the root of this process endlessly re-creates itself. Seeing symbolically, **we are at war with a mirrored reflection of our own shadow, which is a battle that can never be won**. Etymologically, the word mirror actually means "shadow holder." **If this process of shadow projection continues to go unrecognized and continues to get acted out unconsciously, we can undoubtedly expect** not only more dreaming processes like this in the future, but we can expect **the message to hit us over the head even more forcefully**.

#### This projection proves that we have an individual complicity in the problem. The perpetual scapegoating tactics mobilize populations to commit atrocities.

#### Jeramiah Abrams and Connie Zweig, Jungian psychologists, ’91 (Meeting The Shadow, p. xx)

The collective shadow-human evil-is staring back at us virtually everywhere: It shouts from newsstand headlines; it wanders our streets, sleeping in doorways, homeless; it squats in X-rated neon-lit shops on the peripheries of our cities; it embezzles our monies from the local savings and loan; it corrupts power-hungry politicians and perverts our systems of justice; it drives invading armies through dense jungles and across desert sands; it sells arms to mad leaders and gives the profits to reactionary insurgents; it pours pollution through hidden pipes into our rivers and oceans, and poisons our food with invisible pesticides.

These observations are not some new fundamentalism, thumping on a biblical version of reality. Our era has made forced witnesses of us all. The whole world is watching. **There is no way to avoid the frightening specter of satanic shadows acted out by conniving politicians, white-collar criminals, and fanatic terrorists**. Our inner desire to be whole-now made manifest in the machinery of global communication-forces us to face the conflicting hypocrisy that is everywhere today.

**While most individuals and groups live out the socially acceptable side of life, others seem to live out primarily the socially disowned parts. When they become the object of negative group projections, the collective shadow takes the form of scapegoating, racism, or enemy-making**. To antiCommunist Americans, the USSR is the evil empire. To Moslems, America is the great Satan. To Nazis, the Jews are vermin Bolsheviks. To ascetic Christian monks, witches are in league with the devil. To South African advocates of apartheid or American members of the Ku Klux Klan, blacks are subhuman, undeserving of the rights and privileges of whites.

**The hypnotic power and contagious nature of these strong emotions are evident in the universal pervasiveness of racial persecution, religious wars, and scapegoating tactics around the world**. In these ways, **human beings attempt to dehumanize others in an effort to ensure that they are wearing the white hats-and that killing the enemy does not mean killing human beings like themselves**.

#### The Alternative. We have a text: Begin a confrontation of the shadow through rejection of the affirmative’s projection of violence.

#### 1) By confronting the shadow we can begin channel shadow energy to constructive uses. Failure to acknowledge the shadow self gives it a chance to exert its power, culminating in the bloodiest wars of history.

Edward C. **Whitmont**, **’91** (Meeting the Shadow, p. 17-19)

**When we refuse to face the shadow** or try to fight it with willpower alone, saying, "Get thee beind me, Satan," **we merely relegate this energy to the unconscious, and from there it exerts its power in a negative, compulsive, projected form**. Then our projections will transform our surrounding world into a setting which shows us our own faces, though we do not recognize them as our own. **We become increasingly isolated; instead of a real relation to the surrounding world there is only an illusory one**, for we relate not to the world as it is but to the "evil, wicked world" which our shadow projection shows us. The result is an inflated, autoerotic state of being, cut off from reality, which usually takes the well-known form of "If only so and so were such ` and such," or "When this will have happened," or "If I were properly under;" stood" or "appreciated."

Such an impasse is seen by us, because of our projections, as the ill will of the environment, and thus a vicious circle is established, continuing ad infinitum, ad nauseam. **These projections eventually so shape our own attitudes** toward others **that** at last **we literally bring about that which we project**. **We imagine ourselves** so long p**ursued by ill will that ill will is eventually produced** by others **in response to** our vitriolic **defensiveness**. Our fellow men[sic] see this as unprovoked hostility; this arouses their defensiveness and their shadow projections upon us, to which we in turn react with our defensiveness, thereby causing more ill will.

In order to protect its own control and sovereignty **the ego instinctively puts up** a great **resistance** **to** the **confrontation** with the shadow; when it catches a glimpse of the shadow **the ego most often reacts with an attempt to eliminate it**. Our will is mobilized and we decide, "I just won't be that way any more!" Then comes the final shattering shock, when we discover that, in part at least, **this is impossible** no matter how we try. **For the shadow represents energically charged autonomous patterns of feeling and behavior. Their energy cannot simply be stopped by an act of will. What is needed is rechanneling or transformation.** However, **this** task **requires** both an **awareness and** an **acceptance of the shadow as something which cannot simply be gotten rid of**.

Somehow, almost everyone has the feeling that a quality once acknowledged will of necessity have to be acted out, for the one state which we find more painful than facing the shadow is that of resisting our own feeling urges, of bearing the pressure of a drive, suffering the frustration or pain of not satisfying an urge. Hence in order to avoid having to resist our own feeling urges when we recognize them, we prefer not to see them at all, to convince ourselves that they are not there. **Repression appears less painful** than discipline. **But** unfortunately **it is also more dangerous, for it makes us act without consciousness of our motives**, hence irresponsibly. Even though we are not responsible for the way we are and feel, we have to take responsibility for the way we act. Therefore we have to learn to discipline ourselves. And discipline rests on the ability to act in a manner that is contrary to our feelings when necessary. This is an eminently human prerogative as well as a necessity.

Repression, on the other hand, simply looks the other way. When persisted in, repression always leads to psychopathology, but it is also indispensable to the first ego formation. This means that we all carry the germs of psychopathology within us. In this sense potential psychopathology is an integral part of our human structure.

**The shadow has to have its place of legitimate expression somehow, sometime, somewhere. By confronting it we have a choice of when, how and where we may allow expression** to its tendencies **in a constructive context**. And when it is not possible to restrain the expression of its negative side we may cushion its effect by a conscious effort to add a mitigating element or at least an apology. Where we cannot or must not refrain from hurting we may at least try to do it kindly and be ready to bear the consequences. When we virtuously look the other way we have no such possibility; then the shadow, left to its own devices, is likely to run away with us in a destructive or dangerous manner. Then it just "happens" to us, and usually when it is most awkward; since we do not know what is happening we can do nothing to mitigate its effect and we blame it all on the other fellow.

There are also of course social and collective implications of the shadow problem. They are staggering, for here lie the roots of social, racial, and national bias and discrimination. Every minority and every dissenting group carries the shadow projection of the majority, be it Negro, white, Gentile, Jew, Italian, Irish, Chinese or French. Moreover, **since the shadow is the archetype of the enemy, its projection is likely to involve us in the bloodiest of wars precisely in times of the greatest complacency about peace and our own righteousness. The enemy and the conflict with the enemy** are archetypal factors, projections of our own inner split, and cannot be legislated or wished away. They **can be dealt with-if at all-only in terms of shadow confrontation and in the healing of our individual split**. The most dangerous times, both collectively and individually, are those in which we assume that we have eliminated it.

#### Confronting the shadow requires time to be alone – examining the shadow can by overridden by outside concerns.

Jeramiah **Abrams** **and** Connie **Zweig**, **’91** (Meeting the Shadow, p. xviii-xix)

At moments like these, when we are possessed by strong feelings of sha anger, or we find that our behavior is off the mark in some way, the shad erupting unexpectedly. **Usually it recedes just as quickly**, because **meeting the shadow can be a frightening and shocking experience to our self-image**.

For this reason we may quickly shift into denial, hardly noticin murderous fantasy, suicidal thought, or embarrassing envy that could re bit of our own darkness. The late psychiatrist R. D. Laing poeticall scribes the mind's denial reflex:

The range of what we think and do is limited by what wefail to notice. And because we fail to notice

that we fail to notice there is little we can do to change until we notice how failing to notice shapes our thoughts and deeds.

**Although we cannot gaze at it directly, the shadow does appear in daily life**. For example, we meet it in humor-such as dirty jokes or slapstick anticswhich express our hidden, inferior, or feared emotions. When we observe closely that which strikes us as funny-such as someone slipping on a banana peel or referring to a taboo body part-we discover that the shadow is active. John Sanford points out that people who lack a sense of humor probably have a very repressed shadow. It's usually the shadow self who laughs at jokes.

English psychoanalyst Molly Tuby suggests six other ways in .which, even unknowingly, we meet the shadow every day:

In our exaggerated feelings about others ("I just can't believe he would do that!" "I don't know how she could wear that outfit!")

In negative feedback from others who serve as our mirrors ("This is the third time you arrived late without calling me.")

If the denial holds, as Laing says, then we may not even notice th; fail to notice. For example, it's common to meet the shadow at midlife, 1 one's deeper needs and values tend to change direction, perhaps even make a 180-degree turn. This calls for breaking old habits and cultivating dor talents. If we don't stop to heed the call and continue to move in the same direction, we will remain unaware of what midlife has to teach.

Depression, too, can be a paralyzing confrontation with the dark s: contemporary equivalent of the mystic's dark night of the soul. **The demand for a descent into the underworld can be overridden by outer cerns**, such as the need to work long hours, distractions by other people: antidepressant drugs, which damp our feelings of despair. In this case, A to grasp the purpose of our melancholy.

**Meeting the shadow calls for slowing the pace of life, listening to body's cues, and allowing ourselves time to be alone in order to digest cryptic messages from the hidden world.**

In those interactions in whch we continually have the same troubling effect on several different people ("Sam and I both feel that you have not been straightforward with us.")

In our impulsive and inadvertent acts ("Oops, I didn't mean to say that.")

In situations in which we are humiliated ("I'm so ashamed about how lie treats me.")

#### U.S. “Hegemony” is a delusion of grandeur, it only exacerbates geopolitical problems

Fettweis ’11 (Christopher J. Fettweis, The Superpower as Superhero Hubris in U.S. Foreign Policy, Tulane University, Paper prepared for presentation at the 2011 meeting of the American Political Science Association)

Though the United States is not the first state to have suffered from the effects of hubris, it¶ suffers the most. No other country believes that it is the “indispensible nation,” established by God to¶ bring freedom, democracy and open trading systems to the rest of the world. The rhetoric of the¶ exceptionalism narrative sells with the public, and is a sine qua non for high leadership posts. If hubris¶ only led to an inflated sense of self-worth, it would not be pathological; unfortunately, it has more¶ pernicious effects. Leaders under its spell tend to overestimate their capabilities, and those of their¶ country. They engage in counterproductive interventions as well as quixotic adventures in nationbuilding¶ and public diplomacy; they also are rendered averse to apology and tend to believe that their¶ power is vital to world peace and security. This paper is a discussion of the beliefs spawned by hubris¶ and narcissism in U.S. foreign policy. Where does this pathology come from? What are its effects?¶ As civil war slowly filled the vacuum left by Saddam Hussein’s regime, the Bush Administration¶ and other supporters of the war were left horrified and somewhat flabbergasted. The conquest had been¶ swift, as expected, but the aftermath was not going as planned. By the time that the 2007 “surge” of¶ troops and change in U.S. strategy helped to reduce the sectarian violence to perhaps more tolerable¶ levels, untold tens – perhaps hundreds – of thousands were dead, including more than four thousand¶ Americans, and millions more had fled. The Iraqi economy was a complete wreck, and de facto ethnic¶ cleansing had divided the country. The United States had managed to do the impossible: It had actually¶ made life in Iraq worse than it was under Saddam.¶ It was not supposed to have gone this way. In the lead-up to the war, the administration had¶ assured a wary public that the war would be quick, easy, cheap and glorious. Former Pentagon official¶ Kenneth Adelman famously predicted that “liberating Iraq would be a cakewalk,” which was the¶ dominant message promoted by the war’s proponents, even if some bristled a bit at the use of that word.1¶ The Hussein regime was a house of cards, the American people were told, that would collapse with the¶ slightest nudge (or the “first whiff of gunpowder,” according to Richard Perle).2 American troops would¶ be greeted as liberators, not conquerors; the streets of Baghdad and Basra, according to the Vice¶ President, were “sure to erupt with joy.”3 And while “ethnic differences” existed in Iraq, Deputy¶ Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz was convinced that they were exaggerated.4 A healthy Iraqi¶ democracy was waiting to replace Saddam’s tyranny, needing only a little push to help bring it about.¶ Furthermore, Iraqi oil would pay for it all. Post-conflict planning done by the State Department prior to¶ the war was pushed aside, since there was going to be no need for its insights.5 “Today,” wrote WilliamKristol and Lawrence Kaplan before the war, “we may attack Iraq with minimal risk.”6 The fact that¶ many – if not most – military professionals did not share this optimism was apparently of no¶ consequence.7¶ Iraq was not the first time that U.S. leaders were misled by cakewalk expectations, and it¶ probably will not be the last. Over and over again, the United States has overestimated its capabilities and¶ as a result made decisions that, in retrospect, appear bafflingly ill-advised. From the Bay of Pigs through¶ Vietnam to Iraq, Washington has repeatedly exhibited the kind of overconfidence that the Greeks would¶ immediately recognize as hubris, or an inflated self-esteem that leads inevitably to folly.¶ In fact, no country displays the symptoms of hubris as clearly as does the United States. Only in¶ the United States could a secretary of state not be mocked for claiming that “if we have to use force, it is¶ because we are America; we are the indespensible nation. We stand tall and we see further than other¶ countries into the future.”8 Only a U.S. leader could proclaim that it was “our responsibility to history” to¶ “rid the world of evil,” as did George W. Bush, and have his people rally behind him as if such a thing¶ were actually possible.9 Only the United States feels that its ideals are not only appropriate everywhere¶ but actual gifts from God, deserving of aggressive promotion in all corners of the world. The United¶ States is more theological with its foreign policy than any other state, and committed theologues cannot¶ help but display the haughtiness and intellectual arrogance that we normally associate as hallmarks of¶ hubris.Derek Reveron has written that through the disaster in Iraq, the United States has “learned that¶ being a superpower does not make it a superhero that can accomplish anything it desires.”10¶ Unfortunately, while it is certainly true that there are limits to what it can accomplish, there is little reason¶ to believe that U.S. leaders recognize them. A certain degree of self-analysis is needed to help the United¶ States realize that it is not a superhero, and that the national interest occasionally demands that its leaders¶ say “no, we can’t.” A dash of modesty now and again would probably help as well.

#### Turn—actively competing internationally destroys alliances and causes extinction

Paul Craig Roberts, Senior Research Fellow @ the Hoover Institution, Stanford University, William E. Simon Chair in Political Economy, Center for Strategic and International Studies, August 9, 2007 (“US Hegemony Spawns Russian-Chinese Military Alliance,” http://www.lewrockwell.com/roberts/roberts218.html, Wake)

This week the Russian and Chinese militaries are conducting a joint military exercise involving large numbers of troops and combat vehicles. The former Soviet Republics of Tajikistan, Kyrgkyzstan, and Kazakstan are participating. Other countries appear ready to join the military alliance. This new potent military alliance is a real world response to neoconservative delusions about US hegemony. Neocons believe that the US is supreme in the world and can dictate its course. The neoconservative idiots have actually written papers, read by Russians and Chinese, about why the US must use its military superiority to assert hegemony over Russia and China. Cynics believe that the neocons are just shills, like Bush and Cheney, for the military-security complex and are paid to restart the cold war for the sake of the profits of the armaments industry. But the fact is that the neocons actually believe their delusions about American hegemony. Russia and China have now witnessed enough of the Bush administration's unprovoked aggression in the world to take neocon intentions seriously. As the US has proven that it cannot occupy the Iraqi city of Baghdad despite 5 years of efforts, it most certainly cannot occupy Russia or China. That means the conflict toward which the neocons are driving will be a nuclear conflict. In an attempt to gain the advantage in a nuclear conflict, the neocons are positioning US anti-ballistic missiles on Soviet borders in Poland and the Czech Republic. This is an idiotic provocation as the Russians can eliminate anti-ballistic missiles with cruise missiles. Neocons are people who desire war, but know nothing about it. Thus, the US failures in Iraq and Afghanistan. Reagan and Gorbachev ended the cold war. However, US administrations after Reagan's have broken the agreements and understandings. The US gratuitously brought NATO and anti-ballistic missiles to Russia's borders. The Bush regime has initiated a propaganda war against the Russian government of V. Putin. These are gratuitous acts of aggression. Both the Russian and Chinese governments are trying to devote resources to their economic development, not to their militaries. Yet, both are being forced by America's aggressive posture to revamp their militaries. Americans need to understand what the neocon Bush regime cannot: a nuclear exchange between the US, Russia, and China would establish the hegemony of the cockroach. n a mere 6.5 years the Bush regime has destroyed the world's good will toward the US. Today, America's influence in the world is limited to its payments of tens of millions of dollars to bribed heads of foreign governments, such as Egypt's and Pakistan's. The Bush regime even thinks that as it has bought and paid for Musharraf, he will stand aside and permit Bush to make air strikes inside Pakistan. Is Bush blind to the danger that he will cause an Islamic revolution within Pakistan that will depose the US puppet and present the Middle East with an Islamic state armed with nuclear weapons? Considering the instabilities and dangers that abound, the aggressive posture of the Bush regime goes far beyond recklessness. The Bush regime is the most irresponsibly aggressive regime the world has seen since Hitler's.

#### Manufacturing moving from China to Mexico now

Appliance Manufacturing 7/3/2013 News and information for international appliance industry “Report: Mexico Cheaper than China for Manufacturing Appliances” http://www.appliancemagazine.com/news.php?article=1684614

Manufacturing in Mexico will increasingly offer cost advantages over manufacturing in China and other major economies, according to new research by The Boston Consulting Group (BCG), which foresees manufacturing adding $20 billion to $60 billion in output to Mexico's economy annually within the next five years.¶ The group said that, with the North America Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), U.S. manufacturers of components for finished goods assembled in Mexico also stand to benefit.¶ The group said Mexico's improving competitive edge is driven by relatively low labor costs and shorter supply chains, which results from Mexico's closer proximity to U.S. markets.¶ Mexico also has an important advantage in its 44 free-trade agreements, which allow many of its exports to go into major economies with few or no duties. Mexico has more free-trade agreements than any other nation.¶ The group pointed to tipping point that was reached in 2012. It was then that the average manufacturing cost in Mexico, adjusted for productivity, became less than the costs in China. BCG projects that, by 2015, average total manufacturing costs in Mexico could be about 6% less than in China and 20%-30% lower than in Japan, Germany, Italy, and Belgium.¶ "Mexico is in a strong position to be a significant winner from shifts in the global economy," said Harold L. Sirkin, a BCG senior partner. "That is good news not only for Mexico, which relies on exports for around one-third of its GDP. It's also good for America, since products made in Mexico contain four times as many U.S.-made parts, on average, as those made in China."¶

#### Recent reforms to Mexico’s labor laws solves the plan in its entirety

De la Vega et al. 2012

(Oscar De la Vega is Office Managing Shareholder in Littler Mendelson's Mexico City office and has been an active spokesperson on behalf of several business committees, advocating for a labor law reform for many years. Monica Schiaffino is a Shareholder, and Liliana Hernández is an Associate, in the Mexico City office. Eduardo Arrocha is Of Counsel in the Mexico City office and has over 40 years of employment and labor law experience in Mexico, having been the general counsel for a major international company for many years. “Mexico Enacts Important Reforms to the Federal Labor Law.” November 30, 2012. Littler.com. http://www.littler.com/publication-press/publication/mexico-enacts-important-reforms-federal-labor-law.)

¶ Mexico's Federal Official Gazette today published a Decree that reforms and repeals various provisions of its Federal Labor Law (FLL). The reform will become effective on December 1, 2012, with some exceptions which are discussed below. The FLL had not been subjected to any substantial modifications since 1970. Accordingly, the reform has extensive implications for employers with operations in Mexico. ¶ Below we provide a summary of the FLL reforms and their potential impact. ¶ Employment Relationship¶ The reform adds seasonal employment agreements and initial training agreements as new types of employment contracts, in addition to those already permitted under the statute (i.e., employment contracts for specific work and for a definite or indefinite period). ¶ The initial training employment agreements must establish a time period of three months, as a general rule, and six months, for executive positions. Additionally, a probationary period of 30 days, generally, and 180 days, for executive positions, will apply to employment agreements for an indefinite term or to those exceeding 180 days. ¶ Notably, the reform adds the requirement that, in order to avoid employer liability, the opinion of the Joint Commission for Productivity and Training must be taken into consideration before terminating an "initial training employment agreement" or an employment agreement subject to a probationary period. Requiring the opinion of the Joint Commission for Productivity and Training will likely result in a bureaucratic and potentially conflictive process. ¶ Outsourcing¶ The reform heightens the regulations on outsourcing (subcontracting) with severe implications to many employers. Under the new law, "outsourcing" is defined as follows: ¶ The subcontracting regime occurs when work is performed or services are rendered through workers hired by and working under a contractor's control, for the benefit of a customer, whether a legal or natural person, and the customer sets the tasks for the contractor and supervises the contractor in rendering the services or performing the contracted work: ¶ This type of work must comply with the following conditions: ¶ It cannot cover the totality of the activities, whether equal or similar in totality, undertaken at the center of the workplace.¶ It is justified due to its specialized character.¶ It cannot include tasks equal or similar to the ones carried out by the customer's workers. If these conditions are not met, the customer will be deemed to be the employer for purposes and effects under the Law, including as it applies to obligations related to social security. ¶ The reform initiative also establishes new requirements, including that the contract must be in writing and that the customer (or beneficiary of the services) must ensure that the contractor complies with its obligations under the labor law. It further provides that the subcontracting regime will not allow the transfer of workers from a customer to a contractor, for purposes of undermining any right under the labor law. ¶

#### New labor laws increase workers’ rights

Starner 1-3

(Thomas Starner, freelance writer and editor. “New Labor Law in Mexico: Positive changes -- and potential pitfalls for U.S. multinationals -- are part of a new labor law in Mexico, which was 42 years in the making but, experts say, was much needed.” Thursday, January 3, 2013. http://www.hreonline.com/HRE/view/story.jhtml?id=534354722).

They have been 42 years in the making, but American employers that either have facilities in Mexico or outsource work there should benefit from recent changes in the country's antiquated labor laws. Not everything in the new law may help, however, according to employment lawyers with extensive international experience. On the positive side, changes passed by the Mexican Congress (and that went into effect on Dec. 1) will help lower the cost of hiring and firing workers in areas such as back wages and the ability to hire and fire employees with much less red tape. Oscar De la Vega, managing shareholder in the Mexico City office of Littler Mendelson, says from a strictly financial standpoint, the law imposes a new one-year limit on any back wages employers must pay a worker who eventually wins a lawsuit over a wrongful dismissal. Under the old law, which existed since 1970, lawsuits dragged on for years and employers were liable for full back pay if they eventually lost – no matter how long the case went on. Other key changes affecting American companies with employees or outsourced workers in Mexico revolve around temporary training contracts and probationary periods, outsourcing regulations, and discrimination and harassment, among others. "On balance the new law is a good thing, although there are some issues that are not very clear and could generate some potential liability," he says.