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#### **The plan is a vehicle for neoliberal exploitation – US economic engagement becomes a tool for military intervention and US security interests while strengthening its economic grip over Latin America**

Jacobs 4 (Jamie Elizabeth, Assistant Prof of Polisci at West Virginia U, "Neoliberalism and Neopanamericanism: The View from Latin America," Latin American Politics & Society 46.4 (2004) 149-152, MUSE)

The advance of neoliberalism suffers no shortage of critics, both from its supporters who seek a greater balance in the interests of North and South, and from its opponents who see it as lacking any real choice for developing states. The spread of neoliberalism is viewed by its strongest critics as part of the continuing **expression of Western power** through the mechanisms of globalization, often directly linked to the **hegemonic power** of the United States. Gary Prevost and Carlos Oliva Campos have assembled a collection of articles that pushes this debate in a somewhat new direction. This compilation addresses the question from a different perspective, focusing not on the neoliberal process as globalization but on neoliberalism as the new guise of panamericanism, which emphasizes a distinctly political overtone in the discussion. The edited volume argues that neoliberalism reanimates a system of relations in the hemisphere that **reinforces the most negative aspects of** the last century's U.S.-dominated panamericanism. The assembled authors offer a critical view that places neoliberalism squarely in the realm of **U.S. hegemonic exploitation of interamerican relations**. This volume, furthermore, articulates a detailed vision of the potential failures of this approach in terms of culture, politics, security, and economics for both North and South. Oliva and Prevost present a view from Latin America that differs from that of other works that emphasize globalization as a general or global process. This volume focuses on the implementation of free market capitalism in the Americas as a continuation of the U.S. history of hegemonic control of the hemisphere. While Oliva and Prevost and the other authors featured in this volume point to the changes that have altered global relations since the end of the Cold War—among them an altered balance of power, shifting U.S. strategy, and evolving interamerican relations—they all view the U.S. foreign policy of neoliberalism and economic integration essentially as **old wine in new bottles**. As such, old enemies (communism) are replaced by new (drugs and terrorism), but the fear of Northern domination of and **intervention** in Latin America remains. Specifically, Oliva and Prevost identify the process through which "economics had taken center stage in interamerican affairs." They [End Page 149] suggest that the Washington Consensus—diminishing the state's role in the economy, privatizing to reduce public deficits, and shifting more fully to external markets—was instead a recipe for weakened governments susceptible to hemispheric domination by the United States (xi). The book is divided into two main sections that emphasize hemispheric and regional issues, respectively. The first section links more effectively to the overall theme of the volume in its chapters on interamerican relations, culture, governance, trade, and security. In the first of these chapters, Oliva traces the evolution of U.S. influence in Latin America and concludes that, like the **Monroe Doctrine and Manifest Destiny** in the past, the prospect of hemispheric **economic integration** will be marked by a **dominant view privileging U.S. security**, conceptualized in transnational, hemispheric terms, that is both asymmetrical and not truly integrated among all members. In this context, Oliva identifies the free trade area of the Americas (FTAA) as "an economic project suited to a hemispheric context that is politically favorable to the United States" (20). The chapters in this section are strongest when they focus on the political aspects of neoliberalism and the possible unintended negative consequences that could arise from the neoliberal program. Carlos Alzugaray Treto draws on the history of political philosophy, traced to Polanyi, identifying ways that social inequality has the potential to **undermine the stable governance** that is so crucial a part of the neoliberal plan. He goes on to point out how this potential for **instability** could also generate a new period of **U.S. interventionism in Latin America**. Treto also analyzes how the "liberal peace" could be undermined by the "right of humanitarian intervention" in the Americas if the NATO intervention in Yugoslavia served as a model for U.S. involvement in the hemisphere. Hector Luis Saint-Pierre raises the issue of "democratic neoauthoritarianism," responsible for "restricting citizenship to the exercise of voting, limiting its voice to electoral polls of public opinion, restraining human rights to consumer's rights, [and] shutting down spaces to the citizens' participation" (116). While these critiques are leveled from a structuralist viewpoint, they often highlight concerns expressed from other theoretical perspectives and subfields (such as the literature on citizenship and participation in the context of economic integration). These chapters also emphasize the way inattention to economic, social, and political crisis could damage attempts at integration and the overall success of the neoliberal paradigm in the Americas. In general, the section on hemispheric issues offers a suspicious view of the U.S. role in promoting integration, arguing that in reality, integration offers a deepening of **historical asymmetries of power**, the potential to create **new justifications** for **hegemonic intervention**, and the further weakening of state sovereignty in the South. [End Page 150]

#### The impact is extinction

**Brown, 05** (Charles, Professor of Economics and Research Scientist at the University of Michigan, 05/13/2005, <http://archives.econ.utah.edu/archives/pen-l/2005w15/msg00062.htm>)

The capitalist class owns the factories, the banks, and transportation-the means of production and distribution. Workers sell their ability to work in order to acquire the necessities of life. Capitalists buy the workers' labor, but only pay them back a portion of the wealth they create. Because the capitalists own the means of production, they are able to keep the surplus wealth created by workers above and beyond the cost of paying worker's wages and other costs of production. This surplus is called "profit" and consists of unpaid labor that the capitalists appropriate and use to achieve ever-greater profits. These profits are turned into capital which capitalists use to further exploit the producers of all wealth-the working class. Capitalists are compelled by competition to seek to maximize profits. The capitalist class as a whole can do that only by extracting a greater surplus from the unpaid labor of workers by increasing exploitation. Under capitalism, economic development happens only if it is profitable to the individual capitalists, not for any social need or good. The profit drive is inherent in capitalism, and underlies or **exacerbates all major social ills of our times**. With the rapid advance of technology and productivity, new forms of capitalist ownership have developed to maximize profit. The working people of our country confront serious, chronic problems because of capitalism. These chronic problems become part of the objective conditions that confront each new generation of working people. **The threat of nuclear war, which can destroy all humanity, grows** with the spread of nuclear weapons, space-based weaponry, and a military doctrine that justifies their use in preemptive wars and wars without end. Ever since the end of World War II, the U.S. has been constantly involved in aggressive military actions big and small. These wars have cost millions of lives and casualties, huge material losses, as well as trillions of U.S. taxpayer dollars. Threats to the environment continue to **spiral**, threatening all life on our planet. Millions of workers are unemployed or insecure in their jobs, even during economic upswings and periods of "recovery" from recessions. Most workers experience long years of **stagnant real wages,** while health and education costs **soar**. Many workers are forced to work second and third jobs to make ends meet. Most workers now average four different occupations during their lifetime, being involuntarily moved from job to job and career to career. Often, retirement-age workers are forced to continue working just to provide health care for themselves. With capitalist globalization, jobs move as capitalists export factories and even entire industries to other countries. Millions of people continuously live below the poverty level; many suffer homelessness and hunger. Public and private programs to alleviate poverty and hunger do not reach everyone, and are inadequate even for those they do reach. Racism remains the most potent weapon to divide working people. Institutionalized racism provides billions in extra profits for the capitalists every year due to the unequal pay racially oppressed workers receive for work of comparable value. All workers receive lower wages when racism succeeds in dividing and disorganizing them. In every aspect of economic and social life, African Americans, Latinos, Native Americans, Asian a nd Pacific Islanders, Arabs and Middle Eastern peoples, and other nationally and racially oppressed people experience conditions inferior to that of whites. **Racist violence** and the poison of racist ideas **victimize** all people of color no matter which economic class they belong to. The attempts to suppress and undercount the vote of the African American and other racially oppressed people are part of racism in the electoral process. Racism permeates the police, judicial and prison systems, perpetuating unequal sentencing, racial profiling, discriminatory enforcement, and police brutality. The democratic, civil and human rights of all working people are continually under attack. These attacks range from increasingly difficult procedures for union recognition and attempts to prevent full union participation in elections, to the absence of the right to strike for many public workers. They range from undercounting minority communities in the census to making it difficult for working people to run for office because of the domination of corporate campaign funding and the high cost of advertising. These attacks also include growing censorship and domination of the media by the ultra-right; growing restrictions and surveillance of activist social movements and the Left; open denial of basic rights to immigrants; and, violations of the Geneva Conventions up to and including torture for prisoners. These abuses all serve to maintain the grip of the capitalists on government power. They use this power to ensure the economic and political dominance of their class. Women still face a considerable differential in wages for work of equal or comparable value. They also confront barriers to promotion, physical and sexual abuse, continuing unequal workload in home and family life, and **male supremacist ideology** perpetuating unequal and often unsafe conditions. The constant attacks on social welfare programs severely impact single women, single mothers, nationally and racially oppressed women, and all working class women. The reproductive rights of all women are continually under attack ideologically and politically. Violence against women in the home and in society at large remains a shameful fact of life in the U.S.

#### Rejection of the aff is key to a historical materialist criticism – voting negative endorses an anti-capitalist methodology that denaturalizes the functions of capital

San Juan 6 (Epifanio, Jr., Fulbright Lecturer in American Studies at the Catholic University of Leuven, Belgium, “Crisis and Contradiction in Globalization Discourse” http://www.redcritique.org/WinterSpring2006/crisisandcontradictioninglobalizationdiscourse.htm) APB

In order to probe and analyze the multilayered contradictions of any phenomenon, we need to apply the principle of historical totalizing: connecting spheres of culture, ideology, and politics to the overarching structure of production and reproduction. This is axiomatic for any historical-materialist critique. Consequently, the question of cultural identity cannot be mechanically divorced from the historically determinate mode of production and attendant social relations of any given socioeconomic formation. What is the point of eulogizing hybrid, cyborg-esque, nomadic global citizens—even fluid, ambivalent "subject positions" if you like—when the majority of these postmodernized creatures are dying of hunger, curable epidemics, diseases and psychosomatic illnesses brought about precisely by the predatory encroachment of globalizing transnational corporations, mostly based in the U.S. and Western Europe? But it is not just academic postmodernists suffering from the virus of pragmatist metaphysics who apologize for profit-making globalization. Even a latterly repentant World Bank expert, Joseph Stiglitz, could submit in his well-known Globalization and Its Discontents, the following ideological plea: "Foreign aid, another aspect of the globalized world, for all its faults still has brought benefits to millions, often in ways that have almost gone unnoticed: guerillas in the Philippines were provided jobs by a World Bank financed-project as they laid down their arms" (Stiglitz 420). Any one slightly familiar with the Cold War policies of Washington vis-à-vis a neocolony like the Philippines knows that World Bank funds were then used by the U.S. Pentagon to suppress the Communist Party-led peasant rebellion in the 1950s against the iniquitous semi-feudal system and corrupt comprador regime (Doty; Constantino). It is globalization utilized to maintain direct coercive U.S. domination of the Philippines at a crucial conjuncture when the Korean War was mutating into the Vietnam War, all designed to contain "World Communism" (China, Soviet Union). Up to now, despite nationalist gains in the last decade, the Philippine government plays host every year to thousands of U.S. "Special Forces" purportedly training Filipino troops in the war against "terrorism"—that is, against anti-imperialist forces like the Communist Party-led New People's Army and progressive elements of the Moro Islamic National Liberation Front and the Moro National Liberation Front (International Peace Mission). One needs to repeat again that the present world system, as Hugo Radice argues, remains "both global and national", a contingent and contradictory process (4). Globalization dialectically negates and affirms national entities—pseudo-nations as well as those peoples struggling for various forms of national sovereignty. While a universal "free market" promoted by TNC triumphalism is deemed to be homogenizing and centralizing in effect, abolishing independent states/nationalities, and creating a global public sphere through juxtaposition, syncretic amalgamation, and so on, one perceives a counter-current of fragmentation, increasing asymmetry, unbridgeable inequalities, and particularistic challenges to neoliberal integration—including fundamentalist political Islam, eco-terrorism, drugs, migration, and other movements of "barbarians at the gates" (Schaeffer). Is it a question of mere human rights in representation and life-style, or actual dignity and justice in the everyday lives of whole populations with singular life-forms? Articulating these historical contradictions without theorizing the concept of crisis in capital accumulation will only lead to the short-circuiting transculturalism of Ashcroft and other ideologies waging battle for supremacy/hegemony over "popular common sense" imposing meaning/order/significance on the whole globalization process (Rupert). Indeed, academic inquirers of globalization are protagonists in this unfolding drama of universalization under duress. One may pose the following questions as a heuristic pedagogical maneuver: Can globalized capital truly universalize the world and bring freedom and prosperity to everyone, as its celebrants claim? Globalization as the transnationalized domination of capital exposes its historical limit in the deepening class inequality in a polarized, segregated and policed world. While surplus-value extraction in the international labor market remains basic to the logic of accumulation, the ideology of neoliberal transnationalism has evolved into the discourse of war on terrorism ("extremism") rationalized as "the clash of civilizations". Contradictions and its temporary resolutions constitute the imperialist project of eliding the crisis of unilateral globalism. A historical-materialist critique should seek to highlight the political economy of this recolonizing strategy operating in the fierce competition of the ruling classes of the U.S., Japan, and Europe to impose hegemonic control in an increasingly boundary-destroying space and continue the neocolonial oppression of the rest of the world. What is needed is a radical critique of the ideology of technological determinism and its associated apologetics of the "civilizing mission", the evangelism of "pre-emptive" intervention in the name of Realpolitik "democracy" against resistance by workers, peasants, women, indigenous communities (in Latin America, Africa, the Philippines and elsewhere [see Houghton and Bell; San Juan, "U.S. Imperial Terror"]), and all the excluded and marginalized peoples of the planet.
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#### Immigration reform will pass but Obama’s capital is still key

PBS 1/7/14 (Associated Press reporter Jim Kuhnhenn wrote this report. AP Director of Polling Jennifer Agiesta and AP News Survey Specialist Dennis Junius also contributed to this report, “Obama begins a renewed political push for immigration reform in 2014”, http://www.pbs.org/newshour/rundown/2014/01/president-obama-congress-push-for-immigration-reform-one-final-time.html, MK)

WASHINGTON (AP) – His agenda tattered by last year's confrontations and missteps, President Barack Obama begins 2014 clinging to the hope of winning a lasting legislative achievement: an overhaul of immigration laws.¶ It will require a deft and careful use of his powers, combining a public campaign in the face of protests over his administration's record number of deportations with quiet, behind-the-scenes outreach to Congress, something seen by lawmakers and immigration advocates as a major White House weakness.¶ In recent weeks, both Obama and House Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, have sent signals that raised expectations among overhaul supporters that 2014 could still yield the first comprehensive change in immigration laws in nearly three decades. If successful, it would fulfill an Obama promise many Latinos say is overdue.¶ The Senate last year passed a bipartisan bill that was comprehensive in scope that addressed border security, provided enforcement measures and offered a path to citizenship for 11 million immigrants in the United States illegally. House leaders, pressed by tea party conservatives, demanded a more limited and piecemeal approach.¶ Indicating a possible opening, Obama has stopped insisting the House pass the Senate version. And two days after calling Boehner to wish him happy birthday in November, Obama made it clear he could accept the House's bill-by-bill approach, with one caveat: In the end, "we're going to have to do it all."¶ Boehner, for his part, in December hired Rebecca Tallent, a former top aide to Sen. John McCain and most recently the director of a bipartisan think tank's immigration task force. Even opponents of a broad immigration overhaul saw Tallent's selection as a sign legislation had suddenly become more likely. Boehner also fed speculation he would ignore tea party pressure, bluntly brushing back their criticism of December's modest budget agreement.

#### Cuba policy is unpopular.

LeoGrande, 12

William M. LeoGrande School of Public Affairs American University, Professor of Government and a specialist in Latin American politics and U.S. foreign policy toward Latin America, Professor LeoGrande has been a frequent adviser to government and private sector agencies, 12/18/12, http://www.american.edu/clals/upload/LeoGrande-Fresh-Start.pdf

The Second Obama Administration Where in the executive branch will control over Cuba policy lie? Political considerations played a major role in Obama's Cuba policy during the first term, albeit not as preeminent a consideration as they were during the Clinton years. In 2009, Obama's new foreign policy team got off to a bad start when they promised Senator Menendez that they would consult him before changing Cuba policy. That was the price he extracted for providing Senate Democrats with the 60 votes needed to break a Republican filibuster on a must-pass omnibus appropriations bill to keep the government operating. For the next four years, administration officials worked more closely with Menendez, who opposed the sort of major redirection of policy Obama had promised, than they did with senators like John Kerry (D-Mass.), chair of the Foreign Relations Committee, whose views were more in line with the president's stated policy goals. At the Department of State, Assistant Secretary Arturo Valenzuela favored initiatives to improve relations with Cuba, but he was stymied by indifference or resistance elsewhere in the bureaucracy. Secretary Hillary Clinton, having staked out a tough position Cuba during the Democratic primary campaign, was not inclined to be the driver for a new policy. At the NSC, Senior Director for the Western Hemisphere Dan Restrepo, who advised Obama on Latin America policy during the 2008 campaign, did his best to avoid the Cuba issue because it was so fraught with political danger. When the president finally approved the resumption of people-to-people travel to Cuba, which Valenzuela had been pushing, the White House political team delayed the announcement for several months at the behest of Debbie Wasserman Schultz. Any easing of the travel regulations, she warned, would hurt Democrats' prospects in the upcoming mid-term elections.43 The White House shelved the new regulations until January 2011, and then announced them late Friday before a holiday weekend. Then, just a year later, the administration surrendered to Senator Rubio's demand that it limit the licensing of travel providers in exchange for him dropping his hold on the appointment of Valenzuela's replacement.44 With Obama in his final term and Vice-President Joe Biden unlikely to seek the Democratic nomination in 2016 (unlike the situation Clinton and Gore faced in their second term), politics will presumably play a less central role in deciding Cuba policy over the next four years. There will still be the temptation, however, to sacrifice Cuba policy to mollify congressional conservatives, both Democrat and Republican, who are willing to hold other Obama initiatives hostage to extract concessions on Cuba. And since Obama has given in to such hostage-taking previously, the hostage-takers have a strong incentive to try the same tactic again. The only way to break this cycle would be for the president to stand up to them and refuse to give in, as he did when they attempted to rollback his 2009 relaxation of restrictions on CubanAmerican travel and remittances. Much will depend on who makes up Obama's new foreign policy team, especially at the Department of State. John Kerry has been a strong advocate of a more open policy toward Cuba, and worked behind the scenes with the State Department and USAID to clean up the "democracy promotion" program targeting Cuba, as a way to win the release of Alan Gross. A new secretary is likely to bring new assistant secretaries, providing an opportunity to revitalize the Bureau of Western Hemisphere Affairs, which has been thoroughly cowed by congressional hardliners. But even with new players in place, does Cuba rise to the level of importance that would justify a major new initiative and the bruising battle with conservatives on the Hill? Major policy changes that require a significant expenditure of political capital rarely happen unless the urgency of the problem forces policymakers to take action.

#### Venezuela’s unpopular – GOP and Cuba lobby see it as appeasement

Mazzei, 12 Patricia, and Erika Bolstad, Miami Herald, 7/11/12, <http://www.miamiherald.com/2012/07/11/v-fullstory/2891728/republicans-attack-obama-for-chavez.html>

Mitt Romney, GOP howl over President Barack Obama’s remark about Hugo Chávez Republicans criticize President Obama for saying Venezuelan President Hugo Chávez has not threatened U.S. national security. The region’s experts, however, side with Obama. Republicans, led by Mitt Romney and Florida Sen. Marco Rubio, pounced on President Barack Obama on Wednesday after he told a Miami TV anchor that Venezuelan President Hugo Chávez does not pose a “serious” national security threat to the United States. Republicans wasted no time in firing up a key South Florida constituency coveted by both Romney and Obama: Cuban-American voters who hate Chávez for his close ties to the Castro regime in Cuba. “President Obama hasn’t been paying attention if he thinks that Hugo Chávez, with buddies like the regimes in Cuba, Iran, and Syria, drug cartels, arms traffickers, and extremist groups, is not a threat to the United States,” said Rep. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen of Miami, chairwoman of the House Foreign Affairs committee and co-chair of Romney’s National Hispanic Steering Committee. “I am deeply disappointed that this administration continues to bury its head in the sand about threats to U.S. security, our interests, and our allies.” Rubio said Obama “has been living under a rock” when it comes to Chávez, and said the president “continues to display an alarmingly naïve understanding of the challenges and opportunities we face in the western hemisphere.” Other Cuban-American lawmakers issued statements in the same critical vein, and Senate candidate Connie Mack, a Republican congressman from Fort Myers, tied his opponent Sen. Bill Nelson, D-Fla., to the president’s remarks. Experts in the region, though, called Obama’s comments reasonable. Chávez is “certifiable,” with a tremendous ego fueled by the power that comes from sitting on vast oil reserves — but he’s not as dangerous as the leaders of other less friendly regimes, said Riordan Roett, the director of Latin American Studies Program at the School of Advanced International Studies at The Johns Hopkins University. The Republican criticism is “just pure electoral politics,” Roett said. “He poses no security threat to the United States or anyone else,” Roett said. “Hugo Chávez is not going to attack us, he’s not going to occupy our embassy, he’s not going to bomb U.S. planes arriving in Caracas at Maiquetía Airport. He is a loudmouth who enjoys listening to himself, and has built up on the basis of oil revenue, a very, very populist, dependent regime that can’t deliver on basic services, on goods and commodities to his own people.” Here’s what Obama told Oscar Haza, a Spanish-language broadcast journalist and anchor in an interview with Obama that aired Tuesday night on A Mano Limpia (which roughly translates to “The Gloves Are Off”), Haza’s nightly show on WJAN-Channel 41: “We’re always concerned about Iran engaging in destabilizing activity around the globe,” Obama said. “But overall my sense is that what Mr. Chávez has done over the last several years has not had a serious national security impact on us. We have to be vigilant. My main concern when it comes to Venezuela is having the Venezuelan people have a voice in their affairs, and that you end up ultimately having fair and free elections, which we don’t always see.” Romney called Obama’s comment “stunning and shocking” and said in statement it’s a sign of “a pattern of weakness” in the president’s foreign policy. “It is disturbing to see him downplaying the threat posed to U.S. interests by a regime that openly wishes us ill,” Romney said. “Hugo Chávez has provided safe haven to drug kingpins, encouraged regional terrorist organizations that threaten our allies like Colombia, has strengthened military ties with Iran and helped it evade sanctions, and has allowed a Hezbollah presence within his country’s borders.” White House press secretary Jay Carney declined to answer questions about the president’s remarks. The president’s campaign spokesman, Ben LaBolt, said Romney is only “playing into the hands of Chávez” and his “outdated rhetoric” by giving him any attention. “Because of President Obama’s leadership, our position in the Americas is much stronger today than before he took office,” LaBolt said. “At the same time, Hugo Chávez has become increasingly marginalized and his influence has waned. It’s baffling that Mitt Romney is so scared of a leader like Chávez whose power is fading, while Romney continues to remain silent about how to confront al-Qaeda or how to bring our troops home from Afghanistan.” Michael Shifter, president of the Washington D.C.-based think tank Inter-American Dialogue, cautioned that it’s up to the president to judge in an election year whether it’s politically smart to talk about Chávez in a way that draws such heated Republican response in South Florida — especially considering how valuable the swing state’s votes are to Obama’s prospects.

#### PC key to holistic passage – multiple warrants

Martin 7/13 [Gary, Congressional journalist, “Democrats Stepping up Immigration Bill Debate,” Times Union, 2013, <http://www.timesunion.com/news/article/Democrats-stepping-up-immigration-bill-debate-4664043.php>] \*\*\*PC key to: -Recapture momentum -Gain public support -Spur industry backing -Increase public knowledge -Empirics\*\*\*

Obama told the Congressional Hispanic Caucus that he planned to increase his public role in the debate. Supporters of comprehensive immigration reform welcome the boost. A bipartisan bill that includes a path to citizenship sailed through the Senate last month. But immigration reform hit strong headwinds in the House, where GOP lawmakers support a slow-paced process, with a patchwork of separate bills to strengthen border security and increase visas for agricultural and high-tech workers coming before any consideration of citizenship. "A vast majority of our members do believe we have to wrestle with this problem," said House Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio. "They also believe that we need to do this step-by-step, common-sense approach." Despite the quick action in the Senate, Republicans said there is little chance that legislation other than border-security bills would be taken up by the House before its month-long recess in August. "We are going back to our districts and talk to our constituents," said Rep. John Fleming, R-La. The Obama administration and Democrats are preparing to use the upcoming weeks to recapture some of the lost momentum. Instead of campaign tactics targeting Republicans who oppose comprehensive immigration, Obama told Congressional Hispanic Caucus members that he wants to use the bully pulpit to build public support. He is planning to address the need for reform to specific industries, and to explain how immigration reform can boost economic growth. Obama feels there is a disconnect, said Rep. Pete Gallego, D-Alpine. "People don't know why immigration reform is relevant," Gallego said. The president will place a spotlight on the problems "so people will understand the stakes." Obama has reached out to Republican leaders in the House and Senate and held private talks on immigration reform. "To get this done requires some level of Republican cooperation," said Rep. Joaquin Castro, D-San Antonio. "He expressed to us that he has reached out to leaders in the House and intends on doing that some more." Obama has used the power of the presidency to highlight the need for immigration reform before. Earlier this year he used a campaign-style event in Nevada, a presidential swing state, to lay out his vision of an immigration reform bill and eventual citizenship for undocumented immigrants here illegally. Obama also spoke on the issue in his State of the Union address, urging Congress to act this year on a bill that includes both citizenship and border-security provisions. "He has used the tools in his toolbox to help bring us to the point where we have a bipartisan bill that cleared the Senate and progress in the House," said White House spokesman Jay Carney. Carney said the White House would make future decisions about "what the president does, who he talks to, and how he addresses the issue in accordance with what we think will help move this ball down the field." Many Democrats say the way to build support for the bill is to campaign for its passage in regions with agricultural, hospitality, high-tech and construction industries that would benefit from immigration reform.

#### **C**IR is key to reducing structural violence against immigrants

Banuelas 10

(Arturo Banuelas, October 2010 U.S. Catholic, “The lies are killing us: The need for immigration reform”, <http://www.uscatholic.org/culture/social-justice/2010/10/lies-are-killing-us-need-immigration-reform>, 10/26/13, VG)

Immigrants like Marisol show us that immigration reform is more than simply a matter of human rights for undocumented immigrants. It is a matter of survival for the poorest. No child of God should ever have to leave her family at 5 years of age to be able to eat and survive in our world. Like the majority of people who cross the border, these are not terrorists or drug smugglers but our brothers and sisters.

The growing anti-immigrant sentiment in our country since 9/11 did not happen because people suddenly wanted to become cruel and heartless. It began because people started believing a lie about who we Latinos are, both documented and undocumented.

This is why immigration is a defining issue that is about us—all of us Latinos—and about how we will shape the future of our church and our country. There is a saying in Spanish, "La mentira nos trae la muerte." Lies bring death.

The lie is that immigrants, and by association all of us Latinos, are disposable as human beings and not worthy of human dignity and respect. And this lie is killing us.

An immigrant recently told me, "I've been sacrificing myself for my family, but in this country I am worth nothing." Latinos and immigrants encounter racism, resentment, and extreme hostilities against them, and they masquerade as patriotism and now also as national security.

By now we are familiar with the countless problems immigrants endure as a result of this lie: an increase in border deaths to more than 400 a year; raids, arrests, and deportations separating families; a backlog in family reunification and visa requests; militarization of the border; sexual exploitation of women immigrants traveling north; abuses in detention centers.

Arizona has recently made national headlines for passing harsh anti-immigrant laws, but today more than 20 states have introduced even harsher laws than Arizona. The solutions these laws propose perpetuate lies, persecute innocent people, expose all of us Latinos to racial profiling, and cause death and suffering to the poor. Those who say that they are not against immigrants yet support such oppressive laws are practicing backdoor racism at its worst.

Sure, every nation has a right to protect its borders against impending threats, but immigrants working to feed their children are not a threat to anyone. Their presence is not a threat, it is a human right; and we support their right to a better life.

Many today scapegoat the poor for self-serving political gain, for economic greed, and security fears. Their lies blind people from seeing Christ in others and keep them from hearing the gospel call to hospitality of the stranger among us. These lies are being used to justify injustice and foster racism that causes pervasive exploitation of immigrants, who are demonized as illegal, as alien, as suspicious human beings.

Since the majority of the more than 90 nationalities that daily cross our borders are from the Americas, it is our Latinidad itself that is being attacked. We know that the root causes of immigration include extreme poverty, unemployment, political and military corruption, and government instability in the countries of origin. However, we Latinos and Latinas throughout the Americas also know that the United States shares in the responsibility for these conditions that drive immigrants north across our borders.

It is not a secret that once the estimated 12 to 20 million currently undocumented immigrants become citizens, our country will be different. This process has already begun, but wait until we get to vote, buy homes, graduate from universities, and become elected officials.

Es mentira, it is a lie that immigrants will not learn English. In our parish we have some 100 people learning English to become citizens, and similar programs exist all over.

Es mentira that all immigrants are here illegally. The truth is that the majority are here on some type of visa.

Es mentira that stronger enforcement along the U.S.-Mexico border will stop immigrants from crossing the border. It is jobs that bring immigrants to the United States.

Es mentira that immigrants are draining our health care and educational systems. The fact is that immigrants contribute about $90 billion in taxes, much more than the $5 billion they use in services.

Despite these lies I feel optimistic because this is our time, this is Latino time. We are coming of age, and we want to help fashion a new nation: one that is more just, equal, and free for all citizens, especially the poorest.
But we will need to do this the Latino way, grounded in a new vision we inherited from our indigenous ancestors, who said, "Tu eres mi otro yo," you are my other self. This is a profound spiritual vision of life, an economic program for justice, a cultural solution for peace, and an authentic reform for human dignity.

Tu eres mi otro yo is the Latino way. We are all linked as one. We stand together, or we fall together. We are each other, and we need to help each other. Our ancestors teach us: If I despise you, I despise myself. And if I promote the good in you, I promote the goodness in me and everyone else.

Our fathers, mothers, and abuelos have always taught what Christ teaches us: that we were made good and for good. When we see life from this decidedly Latino worldview, we discover that there are more good people in the world than bad, that the world is in truth moving toward this oneness. This is the Latino good news.

I believe that our greatest meaning in life comes from our solidarity with others, especially the struggling poorest among us. As long as they do not eat, have health care, get a good education, live in decent housing, get treated with respect and dignity, then we all remain incomplete in ourselves and as a nation.

In a time of such propaganda, lies, drastic poverty, violence, racism, and war, in this time when human life seems so dirt cheap, we must proclaim that each person matters, that they matter enormously to us because tu eres mi otro yo.

As a Latino from the border I have reason to feel optimistic about life and our future because in us we carry this deep Latino desire to live out our God-given oneness; at the end of all our human struggles, we will see that it is our oneness that will win over lies, divisions, hate, and racism. In the end the glory will go to those who know how to embrace tu eres mi otro yo. In the end victory comes in our togetherness.

I look at our Latino history in terms of the biblical story of the Exodus: Some have crossed the sea into the Promised Land of no more borders. Others are still in the water trying to make it to land. And some arrived late and are still wandering in the desert. Moses told them to be at the edge of the sea by 10 a.m., but, being Latino, they arrived at noon. They are still out there dreaming and wondering what it will be like when they get to the other side. Some of them are dying without water, acceptance, lack of health care, food, or shelter.
But today we say, "Come, venganse," we are with you because our ministries represent solidarity in the struggle for human rights for all people.

The divisive border wall exists also in our hearts. When the border fence went up, I was part of a march protesting it. I remember walking up to the ugly steel barrier. I put my fingers through the fence, and I felt deep anger. I wanted to tear it down with my bare hands.

I kept remembering the Raramuri children in our parish missions in Mexico's northern Sierra Tarahumara, who do not have enough to eat, whose fathers and brothers search for ways to feed their families. Holding the fence I remembered their empty stomachs. I could hear Ester ask her mother, "Are we going to eat today?"

Holding the fence in my hands, I said a prayer. I asked Jesus to forgive us. And I asked la Virgen de Guadalupe to protect her children. What the fence says is: "I don't want you to be my other self."

Those of us who live on the border question whether the racial make-up of our families has anything to do with the fact that Canada and the Atlantic and Pacific coasts do not have disgusting walls, yet their combined border miles far exceed our 2,000-mile-long southwest border.

This immoral wall along our border and in our nation's heart is causing moral damage to the nation's soul with long-term consequences far beyond the fears we have of terrorists. It says that we have stopped dreaming of the possibilities to help each other as human beings in the land of the free. It says that we have given in to smallness of our hearts because of the fear-filled lies that claim doom when we welcome the strangers in our midst.

This ugly $242 billion wall is a wake-up call that our national leadership has failed to help us and that it is time for us to offer a better vision for national problems. We need to stop the further construction of this wall, tear it down, and make good use of the materials. What we need instead is just, comprehensive immigration reform, which will help America become a decent nation.

This is an historic moment for us. We have never been this close to immigration reform, and we are not backing down because we are not afraid of those who oppose us. I have seen in the faces of Latinos all over the country that we are ready to show our resolve, our conviction, and our dedication to the immigrants and to reform. We want to do what it takes because we deeply believe that justice will triumph over hate, that love will conquer racism, and that common compassion will overcome the lies.

# Off

#### Text: The President of the United States should issue an executive order to will increase government to government economic engagement with Cuba, Mexico, or Venezuela.

#### XO has supreme law of the land.

Nelson 2009

[Anne E. J.D. Candidate, University of Arizona James E. Rogers College of Law, 2010, “Muddled to Medellin: A Legal History of Sole Executive Agreements”, <http://www.arizonalawreview.org/pdf/51-4/51arizlrev1035.pdf>, 1036-1027, accessed 9/21, CC]

Can the President of the United States unilaterally make federal law? For most students of American Government, the knee-jerk reaction to this question is an emphatic "no," as they are taught that it is the legislature's role to create laws and the President's role to see that the laws are faithfully executed. n1 Indeed, the United States' political identity depends on a delicate separation of powers that prevents the President from accumulating too much power. n2 Over time, however, the delicate separation of powers balance has shifted, and this emphatic "no" has [\*1036] transformed into a more muddled "maybe," with the President's use of sole executive agreements.¶ Sole executive agreements present a unique challenge to traditional separation of powers principles. These agreements are legal tools the President can use to unilaterally resolve foreign disputes with other countries. The Supreme Court has upheld the President's authority to enter into sole executive agreements and has broadly held that these agreements, being analogous to treaties, are fit to preempt conflicting state law. Thus, sole executive agreements are a means by which the President can sideline the legislature and unilaterally create federal law.¶ Sole executive agreements have been used since the early days of the Republic. n3 Since the turn of the twentieth century and the rise of the United States as a global power, Presidents have aggressively used sole executive agreements to resolve significant matters of foreign policy. The expansive use of sole executive agreements has attracted debate amongst scholars as to their constitutional validity, why they have been held to preempt federal law, and, most importantly, how the preemptive effect of these agreements could be limited to better harmonize with the Supremacy Clause and traditional separation of powers principles. n4¶ Until recently, the Supreme Court has not provided much guidance to this debate. In a series of decisions, n5 the Supreme Court has sanctioned the use of sole executive agreements and concluded that such agreements can be considered "the supreme Law of the Land." n6 In doing so, the Court has granted sweeping power to the President to effectively create federal law through sole executive agreements without any meaningful limitations.

# Case

#### Consequences Matter

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

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

#### No morality d-rule—nations *aren’t* moral actors. Rational self-interest best metric for action.

Kennan 86 — George F. Kennan, Professor Emeritus at the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton University, served as U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union (1952) and Yugoslavia (1961-1963), 1985 (“Morality and Foreign Policy,” *Foreign Affairs*, Winter 1985/1986, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via JSTOR, p. 216)

Second, let us recognize that the functions, commitments and moral obligations of governments are not the same as those [end page 205] of the individual. Government is an agent, not a principal. Its primary obligation is to the interests of the national society it represents, not to the moral impulses that individual elements of that society may experience. No more than the attorney vis-a-vis the client, nor the doctor vis-a-vis the patient, can government attempt to insert itself into the consciences of those whose interests it represents. Let me explain. The interests of the national society for which government has to concern itself are basically those of its military security, the integrity of its political life and the well-being of its people. These needs have no moral quality. They arise from the very existence of the national state in question and from the status of national sovereignty it enjoys. They are the unavoidable necessities of a national existence and therefore not subject to classification as either "good" or "bad." They may be questioned from a detached philosophic point of view. But the government of the sovereign state cannot make such judgments. When it accepts the responsibilities of governing, implicit in that acceptance is the assumption that it is right that the state should be sovereign, that the integrity of its political life should be assured, that its people should enjoy the blessings of military security, material prosperity and a reasonable opportunity for, as the Declaration of Independence puts it, the pursuit of happiness. For these assumptions the government needs no moral justification, nor need it accept any moral reproach for acting on the basis of them.

#### Turn-

#### Cuba is a violator of human rights

Miami Herald 13 — Miami Herald, 2013 (“Human rights under abuse in Cuba,” Editorial, April 22nd, Available Online at http://www.miamiherald.com/2013/04/22/3358813/human-rights-under-abuse-in-cuba.html#storylink=cpy, Accessed 07-03-2013)

The State Department’s latest report on human-rights practices effectively puts the lie to the idea that the piecemeal and illusory changes in Cuba under Gen. Raúl Castro represent a genuine political opening toward greater freedom.

If anything, things are getting worse. The report, which covers 2012, says the independent Cuban Commission on Human Rights and Reconciliation counted 6,602 short-term detentions during the year, compared with 4,123 in 2011. In March 2012, the same commission recorded a 30-year record high of 1,158 short-term detentions in a single month just before the visit of Pope Benedict XVI.

Among the many abuses cited by the 2012 report are the prison sentences handed out to members of the Unión Patriotica de Cuba, the estimated 3,000 citizens held under the charge of “potential dangerousness,” state-orchestrated assaults against the Damas de Blanco (Ladies in White), the suspicious death of dissident Oswaldo Payá and so on.

As in any dictatorship, telling the truth is a crime: Independent journalist Calixto Ramón Martínez Arias, the first to report on the cholera outbreak in Cuba, was jailed in September for the crime of desacato (insulting speech) and remained there until last week.

The regime is willing to undertake some meek economic reforms to keep people employed. It has even dared to relax its travel requirements to allow more Cubans to leave the country if they can get a passport.

Both of these are short-term survival measures, designed as escape valves for growing internal pressure. But when it comes to free speech, political activity and freedom of association — the building blocks of a free society — the report is a depressing chronicle of human-rights abuses and a valuable reminder that repression is the Castro regime’s only response to those who demand a genuinely free Cuba.

 Fundamental reform? Not a chance.

#### Reject engagement with human rights abusers — *moral duty* to shun.

Beversluis 89 — Eric H. Beversluis, Professor of Philosophy and Economics at Aquinas College, holds an A.B. in Philosophy and German from Calvin College, an M.A. in Philosophy from Northwestern University, an M.A. in Economics from Ohio State University, and a Ph.D. in the Philosophy of Education from Northwestern University, 1989 (“On Shunning Undesirable Regimes: Ethics and Economic Sanctions,” *Public Affairs Quarterly*, Volume 3, Number 2, April, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via JSTOR, p. 17-19)

A fundamental task of morality is resolving conflicting interests. If we both want the same piece of land, ethics provides a basis for resolving the conflict by identifying "mine" and "thine." If in anger I want to smash your [end page 17] face, ethics indicates that your face's being unsmashed is a legitimate interest of yours which takes precedence over my own interest in expressing my rage. Thus ethics identifies the rights of individuals when their interests conflict.

But how can a case for shunning be made on this view of morality? Whose interests (rights) does shunning protect? The shunner may well have to sacrifice his interest, e.g., by foregoing a beneficial trade relationship, but whose rights are thereby protected? In shunning there seem to be no "rights" that are protected. For shunning, as we have seen, does not assume that the resulting cost will change the disapproved behavior. If economic sanctions against South Africa will not bring apartheid to an end, and thus will not help the blacks get their rights, on what grounds might it be a duty to impose such sanctions?

We find the answer when we note that there is another "level" of moral duties. When Galtung speaks of "reinforcing … morality," he has identified a duty that goes beyond specific acts of respecting people's rights. The argument goes like this: There is more involved in respecting the rights of others than not violating them by one's actions. For if there is such a thing as a moral order, which unites people in a moral community, then surely one has a duty (at least prima facie) not only to avoid violating the rights of others with one's actions but also to support that moral order.

Consider that the moral order itself contributes significantly to people's rights being respected. It does so by encouraging and reinforcing moral behavior and by discouraging and sanctioning immoral behavior. In this moral community people mutually reinforce each other's moral behavior and thus raise the overall level of morality. Were this moral order to disintegrate, were people to stop reinforcing each other's moral behavior, there would be much more violation of people's rights. Thus to the extent that behavior affects the moral order, it indirectly affects people's rights. And this is where shunning fits in.

Certain types of behavior constitute a direct attack on the moral order. When the violation of human rights is flagrant, willful, and persistent, the offender is, as it were, thumbing her nose at the moral order, publicly rejecting it as binding her behavior. Clearly such behavior, if tolerated by society, will weaken and perhaps eventually undermine altogether the moral order. Let us look briefly at those three conditions which turn immoral behavior into an attack on the moral order.

An immoral action is flagrant if it is "extremely or deliberately conspicuous; notorious, shocking." Etymologically the word means "burning" or "blazing." The definition of shunning implies therefore that those offenses require shunning which are shameless or indiscreet, which the person makes no effort to hide and no good-faith effort to excuse. Such actions "blaze forth" as an attack on the moral order. But to merit shunning the action must also be willful and persistent. We do not consider the actions of the "backslider," the [end page 18] weak-willed, the one-time offender to be challenges to the moral order. It is the repeat offender, the unrepentant sinner, the cold-blooded violator of morality whose behavior demands that others publicly reaffirm the moral order. When someone flagrantly, willfully, and repeatedly violates the moral order, those who believe in the moral order, the members of the moral community, must respond in a way that reaffirms the legitimacy of that moral order. How does shunning do this?

First, by refusing publicly to have to do with such a person one announces support for the moral order and backs up the announcement with action. This action reinforces the commitment to the moral order both of the shunner and of the other members of the community. (Secretary of State Shultz in effect made this argument in his call for international sanctions on Libya in the early days of 1986.)

Further, shunning may have a moral effect on the shunned person, even if the direct impact is not adequate to change the immoral behavior. If the shunned person thinks of herself as part of the moral community, shunning may well make clear to her that she is, in fact, removing herself from that community by the behavior in question. Thus shunning may achieve by moral suasion what cannot be achieved by "force."

Finally, shunning may be a form of punishment, of moral sanction, whose appropriateness depends not on whether it will change the person's behavior, but on whether he deserves the punishment for violating the moral order. Punishment then can be viewed as a way of maintaining the moral order, of "purifying the community" after it has been made "unclean," as ancient communities might have put it.

Yet not every immoral action requires that we shun. As noted above, we live in a fallen world. None of us is perfect. If the argument implied that we may have nothing to do with anyone who is immoral, it would consist of a reductio of the very notion of shunning. To isolate a person, to shun him, to give him the "silent treatment," is a serious thing. Nothing strikes at a person's wellbeing as person more directly than such ostracism. Furthermore, not every immoral act is an attack on the moral order. Actions which are repented and actions which are done out of weakness of will clearly violate but do not attack the moral order. Thus because of the serious nature of shunning, it is defined as a response not just to any violation of the moral order, but to attacks on the moral order itself through flagrant, willful, and persistent wrongdoing.

We can also now see why failure to shun can under certain circumstances suggest complicity. But it is not that we have a duty to shun because failure to do so suggests complicity. Rather, because we have an obligation to shun in certain circumstances, when we fail to do so others may interpret our failure as tacit complicity in the willful, persistent, and flagrant immorality

#### Turn- Cuban biotech leads to bioterrorism

Suchlicki, Director, Inst. for Cuban & Cuban-American Studies at University of Miami, 13 (Jaime, April 4 2013, Cuba Transition Project, “Cuba’s Continuous Support for Terrorism”, <http://ctp.iccas.miami.edu/FOCUS_Web/Issue188.htm>, Date accessed: 8/17/13, LE)

Iran, Cuba and Venezuela have developed a close and cooperative relationship against the U.S. and in support of terrorism. The three regimes increasingly coordinate their policies and resources in a three way partnership aimed at counteracting and circumventing U.S. policies in the Middle East and Latin America. Within this relationship, Cuba plays a strategic role in terms of geography (proximity to the U.S.), intelligence gathering (both electronic eavesdropping and human espionage) and logistics.

Worrisome to the U.S. are reports that “have uncovered covert operations between Cuba and Iran in the development and testing of electromagnetic weapons that have the capacity to disrupt telecommunication networks, cut power supplies and damage sophisticated computers.” (1) Furthermore, Cuba can easily provide Iran with valuable information from its sophisticated espionage apparatus. Iran is also able to obtain information on biotechnology from Cuba. In the late 1990s, Cuba began “transferring (licensing) both its medical biotechnologies and, along with the technical know-how, implicit capabilities to develop and manufacture industrial quantities of biological weapons,” creating a significant security threat for the United States and Israel. (2)

In addition to its proven technical prowess to interfere and intercept U.S. telecommunications, Cuba has deployed around the world a highly effective human intelligence network. The type of espionage carried out by Ana Belén Montes, the senior U.S. defense intelligence analyst who spied for Cuba during some 16 years until her arrest in 2001, has enabled the Castro regime to amass a wealth of intelligence on U.S. vulnerabilities as well as a keen understanding of the inner-workings of the U.S. security system. Such information and analysis was provided to Saddam Hussein prior to the U.S. invasion of Iraq and would undoubtedly be provided to a strategic ally like Iran. While one may argue that factors such as Iran’s limited military capabilities and sheer distance diminish any conventional concerns, one should expect that Tehran, in case of a U.S.-Iran conflict would launch an asymmetrical offensive against the U.S. and its European allies through surrogate terrorist states and paramilitary organizations. In such a scenario, Cuban intelligence would be invaluable to Iran and its proxies and Cuban territory could be used by terrorist groups to launch operations against the U.S.

#### Bioterrorism causes extinction and outweighs nuclear war

Ochs 02 (Richard, June 9, former president of the Aberdeen Proving Ground Superfund Citizens Coalition, member of the Depleted Uranium Task force of the Military Toxics Project, member of the Chemical Weapons Working Group, "Biological Weapons Must Be Abolished Immediately", http://www.freefromterror.net/other\_articles/abolish.html)

Of all the weapons of mass destruction, the genetically engineered biological weapons, many without a known cure or vaccine, are an extreme danger to the continued survival of life on earth. Any perceived military value or deterrence pales in comparison to the great risk these weapons pose just sitting in vials in laboratories. While a "nuclear winter," resulting from a massive exchange of nuclear weapons, could also kill off most of life on earth and severely compromise the health of future generations, they are easier to control. Biological weapons, on the other hand, can get out of control very easily, as the recent anthrax attacks has demonstrated. There is no way to guarantee the security of these doomsday weapons because very tiny amounts can be stolen or accidentally released and then grow or be grown to horrendous proportions. The Black Death of the Middle Ages would be small in comparison to the potential damage bioweapons could cause. Abolition of chemical weapons is less of a priority because, while they can also kill millions of people outright, their persistence in the environment would be less than nuclear or biological agents or more localized. Hence, chemical weapons would have a lesser effect on future generations of innocent people and the natural environment. Like the Holocaust, once a localized chemical extermination is over, it is over. With nuclear and biological weapons, the killing will probably never end. Radioactive elements last tens of thousands of years and will keep causing cancers virtually forever. Potentially worse than that, bio-engineered agents by the hundreds with no known cure could wreck even greater calamity on the human race than could persistent radiation. AIDS and ebola viruses are just a small example of recently emerging plagues with no known cure or vaccine. Can we imagine hundreds of such plagues? HUMAN EXTINCTION IS NOW POSSIBLE.

#### Drilling Turn

#### A. No drilling in the status quo- only the aff increases incentive

Fargo, The Natural Gas Week, 13 (Jason, July 1st, 2013, The Natural Gas Week , staff writer. “Offshore Drilling Hopes Fade in Cuba After Russian E&P Pulls Rig” Lexis Nexis Academic. Accessed: August 18th, 2013 MB)

Cuba’s efforts to find oil and gas off its shores appear to be foundering, after the last company with an active drilling program abandoned its efforts last month after drilling one well. Russia’s state-owned Zarubezhneft recently said it has suspended its campaign off Cuba’s northwestern coast after apparently encountering geological difficulties during drilling. The company says it will work with Cubapetroleo, Cuba’s state oil company, to modify its drilling program and plans to resume work next year. However, the fact that Zarubezhneft’s drill rig, the Songa Mercur, has departed Cuba well ahead of schedule with no known plans to return suggests a different story. The failure of Zarubezhneft’s well comes after three other wells drilled in recent months by Spain’s Repsol, Petroleos de Venezuela, and a consortium of Malaysia’s Petronas and Russia’s Gazprom Neft all came up dry ( NGW Nov.5’12 ). The Saipem-owned Scarabeo-9 semi-submersible rig, which Repsol commissioned, left Cuba last November after drilling the three wells. Cuba’s offshore geology seems promising for oil and gas development. A 2004 report by the US Geological Survey estimated a mean resource base of 4.6 billion barrels of oil and 9.8 trillion cubic feet of natural gas in the offshore North Cuba Basin. Furthermore, Cuba sits just to the east of a major producing region in the US Gulf of Mexico. Yet the geology and the politics have conspired to make oil and gas projects in Cuba difficult, and probably not worth the effort for most international producers. The main difficulty is the US embargo against Cuba, which prevents US workers and equipment from going to the island and adds substantially to the cost of drilling in Cuba. Jorge Pinon, interim director of the Center for International Energy & Environmental Policy at the University of Texas at Austin, said a Cuban well costs 18%-20% more to drill than wells drilled elsewhere in the Gulf of Mexico. Furthermore, the embargo prohibits any rig with more than 10% US-made components fro

m going to Cuba. Repsol worked assiduously to comply with the law, having the Scarabeo-9 built in China and letting US officials inspect the rig before it went to Cuba. Yet few other companies are likely to want such trouble, particularly given the poor results of Cuban exploration to date.The possibility of drilling off Cuba’s coast – only about 60 miles from south Florida – has also stirred environmental concerns in the US, where the aftereffects of BP’s 2010 Macondo well explosion and oil spill are still being felt.Republican politicians in Florida have taken a particularly tough line against Cuban drilling, as environmental concerns combine with the traditional distaste for the communist regime in Havana. Before Repsol abandoned its efforts in Cuba, there had been calls in the US for Congress to take action against the company, which has a major presence in the US, including in the large Mississippian Lime shale play ( NGW Feb.6’12 ).With the US becoming an ever-more important oil and gas producer, the likelihood that foreign producers will jeopardize their relationship with Washington to drill in Cuba is increasingly slim. Furthermore, many other areas of equal or greater potential exist in the world – including Mexico, where President Enrique Pena Nieto has promised to end state Pemex’s monopoly on oil and gas extraction with a major legislative reform later this year ( NGW May13’13 )..

#### B. That turns case- oil rigs alone release harmful chemicals that hurt ecosystems

Rose, International Technology Education Association, 9(May Annette, February, 2009, assistant professor in the Department of Technology at Ball State University, “The Environmental Impacts of Offshore Oil Drilling”

<http://www2.tec.ilstu.edu/students/tec_304/Rose%20Oil%20Drilling.pdf> p.28, 8/20/13 MB)

There are known detrimental impacts upon the marine environment for all phases of offshore E&P (Patin, 1999). While natural seepages contribute more hydrocarbons to the marine environment by volume, the quick influx and concentration of oil during a spill makes them especially harmfulto localized marine organisms and communities. Plants and animals that become coated in oil perish from mechanical smothering, birds die from hypothermia as their feathers lose their waterproofing, turtles die after ingesting oil-coated food, and animals become disoriented and exhibit other behavior changes after breathing volatile organic compounds. When emitted into the marine environment, oil, produced water, and drilling muds may adversely impact an entire population by disrupting its food chain and reproductive cycle. Marine estuaries are especially susceptible, as hydrocarbons and other toxins tend to persist in the sediments where eggs and young often begin life. However, the severity and effects of oil exposure vary by concentration, season, and life stage. The oil spill from the Ixtoc 1 blowout threatened a rare nesting site of the Kemp’s Ridley sea turtle, an endangered species. Field and laboratory data on the nests of turtle eggs found a significant decrease in survival of hatchlings, and some hatchlings had developmental deformities(Milton, Lutz & Shigenaka, 2003). Marine organisms that live near an existing or sealed wellhead or an oil spill area experience persistent exposure to a complex web of hydrocarbons, petroleum-degrading microbes, and toxic substances associated with drilling muds and produced water. Abundance and diversity of marine life, especially those living near or in the seabed, decline. The growth and reproduction rates of entire populations that live in the water column may decline for months after a spill(Peteiro, Barro, Labarta, & FerńdezFeiriz, 2006), natural defense mechanisms necessary to deal with disease (immune suppression) become compromised (Song et al., 2008), and genetic mutations may occur. Many ofthese toxins(e.g., arsenic, chromium, mercury, and PAH) move up the food chain and biomagnify, i.e., increase in concentration. One of the most disturbing trends is the evidence that common hydrocarbon contaminants(e.g., PAH) act as endocrine disrupters. Endocrine disrupters are chemicals that can act as hormones or anti-hormones in aquatic ecosystems, thus disrupting normal reproductive and developmental patterns(McLachlan, 2000). Evidence also suggests that polychlorinated biphenyls(PCBs), a known carcinogen, also exhibitthese endocrine effects(ATSDR, 2001).

#### Turn-

#### a. Renewables directly raise energy costs – that negatively impacts the economy

Bryce, Manhattan Institute senior fellow, 12

(Robert, Manhattan Institute for Policy Research, February 2012, “THE HIGH COST OF RENEWABLE-ELECTRICITY MANDATES”, Energy Policy & the Environment Report, no. 10, <http://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/eper_10.htm>, accessed 8/18/13, JZ)

RISING ELECTRICITY PRICES AND THEIR IMPACT ON THE ECONOMY

Residential electricity rates are soaring, and they are doing so at the worst possible time. Between 2006 and 2010, the rates increased at a pace faster than inflation. The result: annual electricity costs for the average homeowner are up by about $300 over that time period.[100]

The recent surge in rates reverses a decadeslong trend. In 1960, the inflation-adjusted cost of residential electricity was $0.14 per kilowatt-hour. By 2005, the average cost of a kilowatt-hour delivered to residential customers had fallen to $0.09.[101] But by October 2011, the average cost had surged, to just over $0.12.[102] The U.S. electricity sector, one of the biggest industries in the world, posted sales of $369 billion in 2010.[103]

These rising costs are adding a strain to the U.S. economy at the same time that the country is struggling with persistently high unemployment and record levels of food-stamp usage, up 71 percent since 2007. While there are many reasons for the persistence of unemployment and the soaring food-stamp rolls, it's clear that higher-cost electricity hurts the overall economy as it slows growth and acts as a regressive tax on the poor and the working class. Between the beginning of the recession and June 2011, real median incomes in the U.S. declined by 9.8 percent.[104] That decline means that higher electricity costs are taking a larger percentage of disposable income from low- and middle-income workers.[105]

Although some regulations governing the electricity-generation sector can be justified on health-related grounds—with the quest for cleaner air as a frequently cited goal—the push for renewable energy is largely elective. And that should be a concern, given the regressive nature of higher electricity prices. In her 2009 report for the Oak Ridge National Laboratory about the impact of RPS mandates on low-income consumers, Barbara R. Alexander noted:

The impact of poverty on a household's ability to afford essential utility services is significant. Low-income households have an energy burden (percentage of income that must be spent to keep the heat and lights on) that has increased from 10% to over 25% for those households in the lowest quintile by income over the past decade, reflecting increased prices and essentially flat income for this group. This contrasts with the energy burden of moderate-income households, which is 4% of income on average. Anywhere from 20 to 30% of households in many utility service territories are "low income." The ability of current low income bill payment assistance programs-whether funded through taxes or utility rates-to meet these needs and assure access to affordable electricity service is well documented to be insufficient and likely to be even more so due to the recent economic recession and the downward trend in employment.[106]

The deleterious effect that higher energy prices are having on the poor is well documented. In early 2009, the Wall Street Journal reported "a record number of U.S. households are seeking state assistance to pay their heating bills even as fuel prices have eased recently." The paper said that low-income energyassistance programs in a dozen states had seen applications jump by at least 25 percent. In Texas alone, 150,000 households sought assistance, triple the number recorded a year earlier. Similar increases were seen in Florida. The paper reported that the number of applicants for energy-cost assistance in California more than doubled. "Other states with big jumps included Tennessee at 60%, Arkansas at 50%, Arizona at 35%, Alaska at 34%, New Mexico and Oregon at 26% and Alabama, Massachusetts and New Hampshire at 25%."[107]

The upward surge in families needing assistance with their energy bills continues. In November 2011, the National Energy Assistance Directors' Association (NEADA) reported that 8.9 million low-income families received assistance for energy bills in fiscal year 2011 and "approximately 10 million households are expected to apply for assistance in FY 2012."[108] The group reported that 52 percent of the people surveyed said that "energy bills were more difficult to pay than in the previous year." In December, the group issued another report, which found that the number of military families receiving assistance for their energy bills had increased by 156 percent since 2008.[109]

The continuing need for energy-related financial assistance is occurring at the same time that the federal government is cutting funding for the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP). In fiscal year 2011, total funding for LIHEAP was about $4.5 billion. By late December 2011, the projected amount available for fiscal year 2012 was about $2.6 billion.[110]

CONCLUSION

While many factors are contributing to rising electricity prices, the evidence shows that renewable-energy mandates are a key contributor to the upward price pressure. Given the fragility of the U.S. economy as well as the large number of Americans who are living in poverty or are unemployed or underemployed, policymakers at the state and federal level should:

Do a thorough financial assessment of the impact that renewable-energy mandates have had and will have on electricity prices.

Perform cost-benefit analyses on renewable-energy mandates and, in doing so, provide an estimate of their per-ton cost of carbon-dioxide reduction.

Where necessary, suspend or eliminate renewable energy mandates to ensure that electricity is affordable.

#### b. Economic decline causes multiple scenarios for global escalation

Harris, member of the NIC’s Long Range Analysis Unit, and Burrows, counselor in the National Intelligence Council, 9

[Jennifer and Mathew, 4-9, The Washington Quarterly, “Revisiting the Future: Geopolitical Effects of the Financial Crisis”, http://www.ciaonet.org/journals/twq/v32i2/f\_0016178\_13952.pdf, accessed 6-30-13, HG]

Of course, the report encompasses more than economics and indeed believes the future is likely to be the result of a number of intersecting and interlocking forces. With so many possible permutations of outcomes, each with ample opportunity for unintended consequences, there is a growing sense of insecurity. Even so, history may be more instructive than ever. While we continue to believe that the Great Depression is not likely to be repeated, the lessons to be drawn from that period include the harmful effects on fledgling democracies and multiethnic societies (think Central Europe in 1920s and 1930s) and on the sustainability of multilateral institutions (think League of Nations in the same period). There is no reason to think that this would not be true in the twenty-first as much as in the twentieth century. For that reason, the ways in which the potential for greater conflict could grow would seem to be even more apt in a constantly volatile economic environment as they would be if change would be steadier.

In surveying those risks, the report stressed the likelihood that terrorism and nonproliferation will remain priorities even as resource issues move up on the international agenda. Terrorism’s appeal will decline if economic growth continues in the Middle East and youth unemployment is reduced. For those terrorist groups that remain active in 2025, however, the diffusion of technologies and scientific knowledge will place some of the world’s most dangerous capabilities within their reach. Terrorist groups in 2025 will likely be a combination of descendants of long established groupsÑinheriting organizational structures, command and control processes, and training procedures necessary to conduct sophisticated attacksÑand newly emergent collections of the angry and disenfranchised that become self-radicalized, particularly in the absence of economic outlets that would become narrower in an economic downturn.

The most dangerous casualty of any economically-induced drawdown of U.S. military presence would almost certainly be the Middle East. Although Iran’s acquisition of nuclear weapons is not inevitable, worries about a nuclear-armed Iran could lead states in the region to develop new security arrangements with external powers, acquire additional weapons, and consider pursuing their own nuclear ambitions. It is not clear that the type of stable deterrent relationship that existed between the great powers for most of the Cold War would emerge naturally in the Middle East with a nuclear Iran. Episodes of low intensity conflict and terrorism taking place under a nuclear umbrella could lead to an unintended escalation and broader conflict if clear red lines between those states involved are not well established. The close proximity of potential nuclear rivals combined with underdeveloped surveillance capabilities and mobile dual-capable Iranian missile systems also will produce inherent difficulties in achieving reliable indications and warning of an impending nuclear attack. The lack of strategic depth in neighboring states like Israel, short warning and missile flight times, and uncertainty of Iranian intentions may place more focus on preemption rather than defense, potentially leading to escalating crises

Types of conflict that the world continues to experience, such as over resources, could reemerge, particularly if protectionism grows and there is a resort to neo-mercantilist practices. Perceptions of renewed energy scarcity will drive countries to take actions to assure their future access to energy supplies. In the worst case, this could result in interstate conflicts if government leaders deem assured access to energy resources, for example, to be essential for maintaining domestic stability and the survival of their regime. Even actions short of war, however, will have important geopolitical implications. Maritime security concerns are providing a rationale for naval buildups and modernization efforts, such as China’s and India’s development of blue water naval capabilities. If the fiscal stimulus focus for these countries indeed turns inward, one of the most obvious funding targets may be military. Buildup of regional naval capabilities could lead to increased tensions, rivalries, and counterbalancing moves, but it also will create opportunities for multinational cooperation in protecting critical sea lanes. With water also becoming scarcer in Asia and the Middle East, cooperation to manage changing water resources is likely to be increasingly difficult both within and between states in a more dog-eat-dog world.