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#### Interpretation – “Engagement” requires increasing economic contacts in trade or financial transactions --- that’s distinct from appeasement

Resnick 1 – Dr. Evan Resnick, Ph.D. in Political Science from Columbia University, Assistant Professor of Political Science at Yeshiva University, “Defining Engagement”, Journal of International Affairs, Spring, 54(2), Ebsco

Scholars have limited the concept of engagement in a third way by unnecessarily restricting the scope of the policy. In their evaluation of post-Cold War US engagement of China, Paul Papayoanou and Scott Kastner define engagement as the **attempt** to integrate a target country into the international order through promoting "increased trade and financial transactions."(n21) However, limiting engagement policy to the increasing of economic interdependence leaves out many other issue areas that were an integral part of the Clinton administration's China policy, including those in the diplomatic, military and cultural arenas. Similarly, the US engagement of North Korea, as epitomized by the 1994 Agreed Framework pact, promises eventual normalization of economic relations and the gradual normalization of diplomatic relations.(n22) Equating engagement with economic contacts alone risks neglecting the importance and potential effectiveness of contacts in noneconomic issue areas.

Finally, some scholars risk gleaning only a partial and distorted insight into engagement by restrictively evaluating its effectiveness in achieving only some of its professed objectives. Papayoanou and Kastner deny that they seek merely to examine the "security implications" of the US engagement of China, though in a footnote, they admit that "[m]uch of the debate [over US policy toward the PRC] centers around the effects of engagement versus containment on human rights in China."(n23) This approach violates a cardinal tenet of statecraft analysis: the need to acknowledge multiple objectives in virtually all attempts to exercise inter-state influence.(n24) Absent a comprehensive survey of the multiplicity of goals involved in any such attempt, it would be naive to accept any verdict rendered concerning its overall merits.

A REFINED DEFINITION OF ENGAGEMENT

In order to establish a more effective framework for dealing with unsavory regimes, I propose that we define engagement as the attempt to influence the political behavior of a target state through the comprehensive establishment and enhancement of contacts with that state across multiple issue-areas (i.e. diplomatic, military, economic, cultural). The following is a brief list of the specific forms that such contacts might include:

DIPLOMATIC CONTACTS

Extension of diplomatic recognition; normalization of diplomatic relations

Promotion of target-state membership in international institutions and regimes

Summit meetings and other visits by the head of state and other senior government officials of sender state to target state and vice-versa

MILITARY CONTACTS

Visits of senior military officials of the sender state to the target state and vice-versa

Arms transfers

Military aid and cooperation

Military exchange and training programs

Confidence and security-building measures

Intelligence sharing

ECONOMIC CONTACTS

Trade agreements and promotion

Foreign economic and humanitarian aid in the form of loans and/or grants

CULTURAL CONTACTS

Cultural treaties

Inauguration of travel and tourism links

Sport, artistic and academic exchanges (n25)

Engagement is an iterated process in which the sender and target state develop a relationship of increasing interdependence, culminating in the endpoint of "normalized relations" characterized by a high level of interactions across multiple domains. Engagement is a quintessential exchange relationship: the target state wants the prestige and material resources that would accrue to it from increased contacts with the sender state, while the sender state seeks to modify the domestic and/or foreign policy behavior of the target state. This deductive logic could adopt a number of different forms or strategies when deployed in practice.(n26) For instance, individual contacts can be established by the sender state at either a low or a high level of conditionality.(n27) Additionally, the sender state can achieve its objectives using engagement through any one of the following causal processes: by directly modifying the behavior of the target regime; by manipulating or reinforcing the target states' domestic balance of political power between competing factions that advocate divergent policies; or by shifting preferences at the grassroots level in the hope that this will precipitate political change from below within the target state.

This definition implies that three necessary conditions must hold for engagement to constitute an effective foreign policy instrument. First, the overall magnitude of contacts between the sender and target states must initially be low. If two states are already bound by dense contacts in multiple domains (i.e., are already in a highly interdependent relationship), engagement loses its impact as an effective policy tool. Hence, one could not reasonably invoke the possibility of the US engaging Canada or Japan in order to effect a change in either country's political behavior. Second, the material or prestige needs of the target state must be significant, as engagement derives its power from the promise that it can fulfill those needs. The greater the needs of the target state, the more amenable to engagement it is likely to be. For example, North Korea's receptivity to engagement by the US dramatically increased in the wake of the demise of its chief patron, the Soviet Union, and the near-total collapse of its national economy.(n28)

Third, the target state must perceive the engager and the international order it represents as a potential source of the material or prestige resources it desires. This means that autarkic, revolutionary and unlimited regimes which eschew the norms and institutions of the prevailing order, such as Stalin's Soviet Union or Hitler's Germany, will not be seduced by the potential benefits of engagement.

This reformulated conceptualization avoids the pitfalls of prevailing scholarly conceptions of engagement. It considers the policy as a set of means rather than ends, does not delimit the types of states that can either engage or be engaged, explicitly encompasses contacts in multiple issue-areas, allows for the existence of multiple objectives in any given instance of engagement and, as will be shown below, permits the elucidation of multiple types of positive sanctions.

#### Violation - the plan is appeasement

Times-Dispatch Staff 12

(Jan 22, “Cuba: Patsies,” <http://www.timesdispatch.com/news/cuba-patsies/article_5755996d-246f-5ca4-ada5-14b567a56603.html>, jkim)

The Obama administration's appeasement of the Castro regime in Cuba was meant to improve conditions there. Last January the White House eased travel restrictions. Near the end of the year it opened the door to a prisoner swap to exchange Bill Gross, an American falsely accused of spying, for Rene Gonzalez — who helped Cuba shoot down two civilian planes on a humanitarian mission in 1996.

Along the way the administration also offered to remove Cuba from the list of state sponsors of terrorism, and to cut back efforts at promoting democracy in the island gulag, among other things.

#### The Terror list doesn’t add extra sanctions – they cant solve engagement unless they lift the embargo

TAMAYO¶ 13 [“Analysts: Chesimard’s designation on terror list has no legal impact” <http://www.miamiherald.com/2013/05/04/3379334/analysts-chesimards-designation.html> May]

The labor union representing the New Jersey state troopers complained in 2011 when first lady Michelle Obama invited rapper Common, who had just released a rap titled “Song for Assata,” to a White House musical event.¶ But the “Most Wanted Terrorist” designation carries with it no special sanctions for either Chesimard or Cuba, Coldebella added, despite speculation in Miami that the list means U.S. officials can use any means to try to capture or kill the people on it.¶ “I can see no legal effect of putting her on the list,” he said. “The FBI actually designated her a ‘domestic terrorist’ in 2005, and putting her on the ‘Most Wanted’ list has no additional legal effect.”¶ The Justice Department has “clarified somewhat the conditions under which the government could order a drone strike against an American citizen, and I think it’s fair to say that moving someone onto the ‘Most Wanted’ list doesn’t affect what the government can or cannot do,” he added.¶ Asked about the impact of putting Chesimard on the list, FBI Newark Division public affairs officer Luis Rodriguez said simply, “She was a fugitive that has now been added to the Most Wanted Terrorist” list.¶ Chesimard’s designation to the list caused a media stir because it came amid reports that the Obama administration will not remove Cuba from its list of state sponsors of terrorism. Iran, Syria and Sudan are also on the list.¶ Advocates of improving U.S. relations with Havana had been pushing to take Cuba off the list as the first move in a string of mutual good-will measures that would eventually lead to the lifting of the half-century old U.S. embargo on the island.

#### Violation—lifting the terror list isn’t econoimic engagement, and they don’t remove the terror list—they just discursively reject it

**Voting Issue –**

**Limits – their definition of engagement opens the floodgates for all affs that unilaterally act – destroys indepth education and clash**

**Ground – they will spike out of our disads that have engagement links – destroys predictability and fairness**

### 2

#### Movements against neoliberalism are growing and strong in Latin America and spill over globally - but the plans insistence on US led economic cooperation and integration reverses that – de-linking is key

HARRIS 8 (Richard L Harris: Professor of Global Studies at California State University, Monterey Bay; Managing Editor of the Journal of Developing Societies (SAGE India); and Coordi­nating Editor of Latin American Perspectives (SAGE USA). “Latin America’s Response to Neoliberalism and Globalization,” http://www.nuso.org/upload/articulos/3506\_2.pdf)

The economic, political and social development of the Latin American and Caribbean countries is obstructed by the power relations and international structures that regulate the world capitalist system. The structures of this system provide a hierarchical political and economic exoskeleton that constrains all national efforts to pursue any significant degree of self-directed, inward-oriented, balanced and environmentally sustainable development. Indeed, the geopolitical power structures that preserve and support the world capitalist system have made it almost impossible for the governments of the core as well as the peripheral countries in this system to pursue a path of inward-oriented, equitable, democratically controlled and environmentally sustainable development (Amin 2001b:20). Since the 1980s, inter-American relations and the economic, political and social development of the Latin American and Caribbean states have been shaped by these geo­ political structures and the neoliberal strategic agenda put forward by the government of the United States of America (USA), the major transnational corporations and the three major international financial institutions (IFIs) that operate in the Latin American and Caribbean region (Harris and Nef, 2008). This later group of IFIs includes the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank, and the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB). The policies of these IFIs based in Washington generally follow the dictates of the government of the USA due to the controlling influence that it exercises over these institutions. Their agenda for the Latin American and Caribbean region gives priority to promoting and protecting the interests of the major investors and transnational corporations that are largely based in the USA and operate in the region. It also serves to maintain and strengthen the geopolitical hegemony of the USA over the Western Hemisphere (Harris and Nef). But conditions are changing. Washington’s neoliberal agenda for controlling the capi­ talist development of the Western Hemisphere and maintaining US hegemony over the region is increasingly threatened by a progressive alternative agenda for the regio­ nal integration of the Latin American and Caribbean countries that has begun to gain widespread support in the region. This alternative agenda for the region calls for the autonomous economic development of the region free of the hegemonic control and influence of the USA and the IFIs based in Washington. Not only does this type of development pose a fundamental threat to the hegemony of the USA in the region, it threatens the dominance of transnational capital throughout the Americas. Moreover, it also poses a significant threat to the global expansion and integration of the world capitalist system in general and to the global hegemonic coalition led by the government and transnational corporations of the USA. Today, political and economic strategies are being developed for moving from the prevailing export-oriented neoliberal model of economic development to new in­ ward-oriented models of sustainable development, tailored to the diverse conditions, economic capacities, political structures, natural endowments and cultural values of the societies involved. Moreover, a growing number of international and regional civil society organizations have emerged in recent years to create such alternatives. What the forums, networks, programs, and activities of these various types of organizations reveal is that there is a growing international network of organizations and social movements committed to promoting new, more equitable forms of international cooperation and regulation that support inward-oriented and sustainable development as well as genuine democracy at the regional and national levels. At the same time, these organizations argue that the present global trading regime that has been erected under the WTO should and can be replaced by a new global trading system that replaces the present system of so-called free but in fact unfair trade, with a sys­ tem that ensures «fair trade» and promotes South-South economic exchange and coo­ peration. Most of the progressive alternatives advocated by these organizations and the new left-leaning governments that have been elected to office in the region give priority to aligning the external relations of the countries in the region to the internal needs of the majority of the population. That is to say, decisions about what to export and what to import should be aligned with the needs of the population rather than the interests of transnational capitalists and transnational corporations or the hegemonic interests of the USA. Some of these alternative strategies involve what Walden Bello (2002) has referred to as «deglobalization.» That is to say, they involve unlinking the economies of these peripheral capitalist societies from the advanced capitalist centers of the world economy, particularly in the USA. They also involve throwing off the constraints that have been imposed upon the economic policies and structures of the­ se countries by the IFIs (IMF, World Bank, and IDB), the WTO and the other agents and regulatory regimes that regulate the world capitalist system. In fact, there appears to be growing interest throughout Latin America in revivifying the Pan-American ideal of unification, currently perhaps best expressed in Hugo Chávez’ Bolivarian dream of turning South America into a regional economic hegemon (DeLong, 2005). The governments of Bolivia, Cuba, Ecuador, Nicaragua and Uruguay have indicated they want to join the government of Venezuela in creating a regional union. It has been proposed that this coalescing continental confederation should shift the region’s extra-continental trade towards Europe, Asia and South Africa and away from North America. The prospect of this happening appears to have alarmed Washington more than the increasing number of electoral triumphs of leftist politicians in the region (Delong). There has also been considerable talk in the region about creating a single currency for the South American countries that would be modeled on and perhaps tied to the Euro rather than the US Dollar. This discussion is symptomatic of what appears to be an emerging desire to create an integrated economic and political community that is strikingly different from the type of hemispheric economic integration scheme being pursued by the Washington and its allies in the region (DeLong). Moreover, there is an increasing tendency in the region to find alternatives to trading with the USA. In particular, several Latin American nations (Brazil, Cuba, Venezuela and Chile) have been strengthening their economic relations with Asia, particularly with China. But the widespread popular opposition to neoliberalism and so-called globalization, and the shift to the Left in the region’s politics, represent much more than a serious challenge to US hegemony, they also represent a serious threat to the existing pattern of capitalist development in the region. Central to Washington’s strategy for the hemisphere has been the imposition of a neoliberal model of capitalist development on the region which involves the increasing integration of the region’s economies into a hemispheric ‘free trade’ area or rather a trade bloc that is dominated by the USA. This project is itself an essential part of the strategy of the USA for the domination of the global economy by its transnational corporations. The restructuring of the economies of the region under the mantra of neoliberalism and the banner of globalization has been aimed at giving the USA-based transnational corporations and investors free reign within the region and a strong hemispheric base from which to dominate the world economy In opposition to the neoliberal, polyarchical and globalizing model of development that has been imposed by the government of the USA and its allies in the region, the growing movement for an alternative form of development that is both genuinely democratic, equitable and environmentally sustainable appears to be gaining ground in various parts of Latin America and the Caribbean. This alternative model of development requires the reorganization and realignment of the existing economies in the region. It also requires the replacement of the existing political regimes, which serve the interests of the transnational bloc of social forces that are behind the integration of the region into the new global circuits of accumulation and production that the major trans­ national corporations and the IFIs have been constructing since the 1970s. In addition to fundamental economic changes, most of the existing pseudo-democratic political regimes in the region need to be thoroughly democratized so that they are responsive to and capable of serving the needs and interests of the majority of the people rather than the ruling polyarchies and the transnational corporations operating in the region. An essential requirement for realigning the region’s economies so that they produce people-centered and environmentally sustainable development is the integration of these economies into a regional economic and political union that has the resources, structures and the power to operate independently of the government of the USA and the transnational corporations based in the USA as well as in the European Union and Japan. If this type of regional integration takes place, it will enable the Latin American and Caribbean states to break free of the hegemonic influence of the USA, and reverse the denationalization (‘globalization’) of the Latin American and Caribbean economies. Instead of the corporate-driven hemispheric integration of the region under the hegemony of the USA, a new system of regional economic cooperation and both equitable as well as environmentally sustainable development is desperately needed to improve the lives of the vast majority of the people living in Latin America and the Caribbean. This type of regional, equitable and sustainable development can only be success­ fully carried out by truly democratically elected political leaders with broad-based popular support who are sincerely committed to achieving this alternative rather than the elitist neoliberal model. It probably will also require democratic socialist political institutions and structures of production and distribution. Regionalism has been the dream of the democratic left for some time. The European Union has its origins in the French socialist dream of ending Franco-German enmity through unifying Europe, and African regionalism was the vision of African socialists such as Julius Nyerere of Tanzania who saw regional integration as the only means to progress beyond tribalism and colonialism and create a united and democratic Africa (Faux, 2001:4). Viewed from the perspective of those who want to create a people-cen­ tered, democratic, equitable and environmentally sustainable social order in the Ame­ ricas, the corporate-dominated process of capitalist pseudo-globalization taking place in the region and around the world urgently needs to be replaced by what Samir Amin has referred to as a new system of «pluricentric regulated globalization» (Amin, 2001a). This alternative form of globalization requires the development of regional economic and political unions in Africa, Asia, Latin America, the Caribbean, the Middle East and elsewhere, which collaboratively promote people-centered, democratic and envi­ ronmentally sustainable forms of development on a regional basis. According to Amin, these regional unions of states are needed to collaborate as partners in collecti­ vely regulating the global restructuring of the world economy for the benefit of the vast majority of humanity rather than the transnational corporations and the northern centers of the world capitalist system in the USA, Europe and Japan. This type of regional-based regulative order is needed to regulate and redirect inter­ national economic, social, and political relations so that these relations serve the inte­ rests and needs of the vast majority of the world’s population. The present power structures and regulatory regime of the world capitalist system support the transna­ tional corporate-driven restructuring and denationalization of the economies of both the societies at the core and in the periphery of this system. The Latin American and Caribbean countries need to ‘de-link’ step-by-step from this exploitative and inequitable system. They need to redirect and restructure their eco­ nomies so that they serve the needs of the majority of their people while also protec­ ting their natural resources and ecosystems. The alternative policies of economic, poli­ tical and social development proposed and in some cases adopted by the new leftist leaders, the progressive civil society organizations and their supporters, combined with the project of regional integration associated with the new Unión de Naciones Suramericanas (UNASUR), are significant indications of unprecedented and pro­ found transformation unfolding in the Americas. A growing number of civil society organizations and social movements throughout the Americas are pressuring the governments of the region to follow what the pro­ gressive civil society networks such as the Alianza Social Continental/ Hemispheric Social Alliance (ASC/HSA) describes as a regional model of integration that supports the environmentally sustainable and democratic development of all the societies in the region (see ASC-HSA, 2006). The ASC/HSA also contends that the UNASUR pro­ ject and the Bolivarian dream of unification is threatened by the so-called free trade agreements that Washington has negotiated with Chile, Colombia, Peru, the Central American countries and the Dominican Republic. As the ASC/HSA makes clear in its documents and public information campaigns, these agreements compromise the national sovereignty, obstruct the local production of medicines, threaten public health, facilitate the profit-driven privatization of water and vital services such as health and sanitation, and threaten the survival of indigenous cultures, biodiversity, food sovereignty, and local control over natural resources. The «Alternatives for the Americas» proposal developed by this inter-American network of progressive civil society organizations and social movements calls on all governments in the region to subordinate trade and investments to sustainability and environmental protection as well as social justice and local democratic control over economic and social development (ASC/HSA 2002:5). The growing number and political influence of these kinds of networks, organizations and movements provide unquestionable evidence of the emergence of the social for­ ces and political conditions that Panitch (1996:89) and others (Harris, 1995:301-302; Jo­ nas and McCaughan, 1994) predicted in the 1990s would arise in opposition to neoli­ beralism, corporate-dominated pseudo globalization and the extension and consolida­ tion of the hegemony of the USA. It now seems increasingly possible that these forces and the political mobilization that they have helped to create will transform the politi­ cal regimes in the region as well as the nature of inter-American relations, bring about the regional integration of the Latin American countries and free these countries from US hegemony and the form of ‘turbo-capitalism’ to which they have been subjected. At this point, we can only speak in general terms about the new model(s) of develop­ ment that will replace the neoliberal model of uneven and inequitable development that has pillaged most of the region.

#### The impact is extinction – neoliberalism reduces existence itself to property to be exchanged, producing a drive to a single way of knowing and being – that causes massive structural violence and environmental destruction

LANDER ‘2,

(Edgardo, Prof. of Sociology and Latin American studies at the Venezuelan Central University in Caracas, “Eurocentrism, Modern Knowledges, and the “Natural” Order of Global Capital, Nepantla: Views from South”, 3.2, muse)

Just as resources formerly considered to be commons, or of communal use, were privately appropriated through the enclosure and private appropriation of fields, rivers, lakes, and forests, leading to the expulsion of European peasants from their land and their forced conversion into factory workers during the Industrial Revolution, through biopiracy, legalized by the agreements protecting intellectual property, the ancestral collective knowledge of peoples in all parts of the world is being expropriated and converted into private property, for whose use its own creators must pay. This represents the dispossession or private appropriation of intellectual commons (Shiva 1997, 10). The potential—but also real—impact of these ways of defining and imposing the defense of so-called intellectual property are multiple, yet another expression of the tendency, in the current process of globalization, to concentrate power in Northern businesses and countries, to the detriment of the poor majorities in the South. At stake are matters as critical as the survival of life-forms and choices that do not completely fit within the universal logic of the market, as well as rural nutritional self-sufficiency and access to food and health services for the planet’s underprivileged majorities. As a consequence of the establishment of patents on varieties of life-forms, and the appropriation/expropriation of rural/communal knowledge, by transnational seed and agrochemical companies, the patterns of rural production are changing ever more quickly, on a global scale. Peasants become less and less autonomous, and they depend more and more on expensive consumables they must purchase from transnational companies (Gaia Foundation and GRAIN 1998). These companies have also developed a “terminator” technology deliberately designed so that harvested seeds cannot germinate, forcing peasants to buy new seeds for each planting cycle (Ho and Traavik n.d.; Raghavan n.d.). All of this has had a profound impact, as much on the living conditions of millions of people as on genetic diversity on the planet Earth. The “freedom of commerce” that the interests of these transnational companies increasingly impose on peasants throughout the world is leading to a reduction in the genetic variety of many staple food crops. This reduction in genetic diversity, associated with a engineering view of agriculture and based on an extreme, industrial type of control over each phase of the productive process—with genetically modified seeds and the intensive use of agrochemicals—drastically reduces the auto-adaptive and regenerative ability of ecological systems. And nevertheless, the conservation of biodiversity requires the existence of diverse communities with diverse agricultural and medical systems that utilize diverse species in situ. Economic decentralization and diversification are necessary conditions for biodiversity conservation. (Shiva 1997, 88) Agricultural biodiversity has been conserved only when farmers have total control over their seeds. Monopoly rights regimens for seeds, either in the form of breeders’ rights or patents, will have the same impact on in situ conservation of plant genetic resources as the alienation of rights of local communities has had on the erosion of tree cover and grasslands in Ethiopia, India and other biodiversity-rich regions. (99)12 As much as for preserving genetic diversity—an indispensable condition of life—as for the survival of rural and indigenous peoples and cultures all over the planet—a plurality of ways of knowing must coexist, democratically. Current colonial trends toward an intensified, totalitarian monoculture of Eurocentric knowledge only lead to destruction and death.

#### The alternative is to vote negative to reject neoliberal knowledge production and endorse globalization from below. Refusing neoliberalism’s hegemonic control over knowledge production is essential within the space of this debate – the alternative aligns the ballot with Latin American resistance movements

CHOI ET AL 4

Jung Min, John W Murphy, Manuel J Caro, Professor of Sociology SDSU, Professor of Sociology University of Miami, Professor of Sociology Barry University, Globalization with a Human Face, pg. 6-9

Many critics have begun to wonder why hamburgers and jeans can be globalized, but the spread of themes such as peace or justice is thought by many politicians to be impossible to generalize. What many persons are calling for, especially in the Third World, is an alternative approach to globalization. Along with justice, they want to globalize resistance to current historical trends. They want to call a halt, for example, to the economic hardships and rape of the environment that have accompanied the rise of neoliberalism. This new strategy is referred to in many circles as "globalization from below." The point is that current policies have been driven from above from the capitalist centers around the world—and reflect the economic and cultural interests of these powerful classes. Most other persons, accordingly, are viewed as simply a cheap source of labor or a possible market for cheap goods. And because of this role in the world capitalist system, their opportunities are severely restricted. Even if they conform to the cultural mandates of the market, the likelihood of economic advancement is not very great. This sort of mobility is simply not a part of the role persons play on the economic periphery. What actually occurs, indeed, is that the system of controls, which are found in the economic centers, are reproduced on the periphery, but with more immediate devastation. The imposition of consumerism and materialism, for example, undermine the local economy and community supports, thereby increasing strife and reinforcing local elites and their ties to foreign investors. The old oligarchies are thus strengthened, while local institutions become more dependent on outside intervention. The resulting hierarchy, accordingly, is more powerful than ever before. As might be imagined, globalization from below has a very different agenda. Different values guide economic development, in short, while new ways of organizing society are sought. Instead of profit, for example, the general improvement of a community may be of prime importance. Likewise, emphasis may be placed on strengthening civil society, and thus ,advancing democracy, rather than identifying markets and potential investors. In general, globalization from below is driven by local concerns and the masses of persons who have little influence in corporate boardrooms. These are the people--the majority of the world's inhabitants--who are ignored unless their labor is suddenly profitable. At the core of this new globalization is often the call for a postcapitalist logic. Novel ways of looking at, for example, production and consumption are regularly a part of this project, in addition to new definitions of work and personal and group identity. Central to this scenario is that persons can remake themselves entirely, and nothing is exempt from revision. What proponents of globalization from below have done, in effect, is to seize control of their history and invent a new future. They have decided that history can be made, rather than merely experienced, and that there is no inherent *telos* to this process. The past is nothing, therefore, other than a point of departure of a new course of action. In the truest sense of the term, these activists are utopian thinkers. They are not enamored by reality and are convinced that new social arrangements, which have never existed and may be very difficult to create, are possible. As many students chanted during the 1960s, they are demanding the impossible and do not want to settle for more pragmatic substitutes. They are simply asking that persons strive to fulfill their dreams. But these demands are not based on fantasy. Instead, proponents of globalization from below are trying to emphasize an idea advanced by Marx: that is, nothing that humans imagine is foreign to them. Consequently, utopian ideals or practices are simply inventions that have not , yet been realized. Through effort and determination, and the absence foreign subversion, an economic system that is founded on justice might eventually be enacted. Merely because this vision has not been actualized, does not necessarily signal that such an aim contravenes human nature or is hopelessly flawed. The problem may simply be that persons have been unwilling or unable to purge themselves of certain biases or predispositions, and thus have never embarked on the creation of a new reality. Those who champion globalization from below, however, are not politically naive. They understand that powerful interests that benefit from injustice and inequality have intervened in the past to undermine various utopian projects. The proper dream is important, but so is the ability to implement this vision. These new utopians are thus trying to convince the public to restrain those who want to destroy these projects. What they are saying, in short, is that justice should be given the opportunity to thrive. THE RESTORATION OF COMMUNITY Various critics are saying that only the restoration of a strong sense of community can guarantee the success of globalization. What is meant by community, however, is in dispute. After all, even neoliberals lament the current loss of community that has ensued in the world economy. From their perspective, a community of effective traders would strengthen everyone's position at the marketplace. Advocates of globalization from below, as might be expected, have something very different in mind. They are not calling for the general assimilation of persons to a cosmopolitan ideal, which is thought to instill civility and enforce rationality. Persons who want to join the world market, as was noted earlier, are thought to need a good dose of these traits. Nonetheless, there is a high price for entry into this community—cultural or personal uniqueness must be sacrificed to promote effective economic discourse. Such reductionism, however, is simply unacceptable in a large part of the globe that is beginning to appreciate local customs and the resulting diversity. What these new activists want, therefore, is a community predicated on human solidarity. This sort of community, as Emmanuel Levinas describes, is focused on ethics rather than metaphysics." His point is that establishing order does not require the internalization of a single ideal by all persons, but simply their mutual recognition. The recognition of others as different, but connected to a common fate, is a powerful and unifying principle. Persons are basically united through the recognition and appreciation of their uniqueness. As should be noted, this image is encompassing but not abstract. Uniformity, in other words, is replaced by the juxtaposition of diversity as the cement that binds a community together. Like a montage, a community based on human solidarity is engendered at the boundaries of its various and diverse elements. The genius of this rendition of community is that no one is by nature an outsider, and thus deserving of special treatment. Many of the problems that exist today, in fact, result from persons sitting idly while their neighbors are singled out as different and discriminated against or exploited. When persons view themselves to be fundamentally united, on the other hand, such mistreatment is unlikely, because community members protect and encourage one another. Indeed, this sort of obligation is neither selective nor optional among those who belong to a true community. Basically the idea is that if no one is an outsider, there are no persons or groups to exploit. Such a community, moreover, does not require extraordinary actions on the part of its members to end racism, sexism, or economic exploitation. All that is required is persons refuse to turn away and say nothing when such discrimination is witnessed. By refusing to go along with these practices, any system that survives because of discrimination or exploitation will eventually grind to a halt. Clearly, there is an implicit threat behind current trends of globalization. Because globalization as it is currently defined is inevitable, anyone who expects to be treated as rational and civilized must accept some temporary pain. Old cultural ways will simply have to be abandoned, and a transition to the new economic realities. Those who cannot tolerate the mistreatment of fellow community members any longer appear to be a part of this change, however, they are obligated to bare witness to these abuses. And by refusing to be complicit these actions, business as usual cannot continue. A globalization of can be mounted, therefore, that might be able to create a more humane world. In the face of mounting darkness—increasing economic hardship and degradation—why not seriously entertain the possibility that social life can be organized in less alienating ways? With little left to why not pursue alternative visions?

### 3

**Affirmative teams should instrumentally defend topical action – the role of the ballot is to vote for the team that is more effective at desscriveing a form of debate that is more desirable**

**Failure to do so is a voting issue –**

**1. Clash – they crush the predictable limit on the topic - our strategy is based on the “should” question of the resolution---there are an infinite number of reasons that the scholarship of their advocacy could be a reason to vote affirmative--- these all obviate the only predictable strategies based on topical action---they overstretch our research burden and undermine preparedness for all debates –– the resolution is the only stasis point for fair debate – a stasis point is critical to equitable, predictable ground for both teams - A limited topic that provides for ground for discussion is key to productive decision-making and advocacy skills in every and all facets of life---even if their position is contestable that’s distinct from it being valuably debatable--- T debates also solve any possible turn**

Steinberg & Freeley 8 \*Austin J. Freeley is a Boston based attorney who focuses on criminal, personal injury and civil rights law, AND \*\*David L. Steinberg , Lecturer of Communication Studies @ U Miami, Argumentation and Debate: Critical Thinking for Reasoned Decision Making pp45-¶ Debate is a means of settling differences, so there must be a difference of opinion or a conflict of interest before there can be a debate. If everyone is in agreement on a tact or value or policy, there is no need for debate: the matter can be settled by unanimous consent. Thus, for example, it would be pointless to attempt to debate "Resolved: That two plus two equals four," because there is simply no controversy about this statement. (Controversy is an essential prerequisite of debate. Where there is no clash of ideas, proposals, interests, or expressed positions on issues, there is no debate. In addition, debate cannot produce effective decisions without clear identification of a question or questions to be answered. For example, general argument may occur about the broad topic of illegal immigration. How many illegal immigrants are in the United States? What is the impact of illegal immigration and immigrants on our economy? What is their impact on our communities? Do they commit crimes? Do they take jobs from American workers? Do they pay taxes? Do they require social services? Is it a problem that some do not speak English? Is it the responsibility of employers to discourage illegal immigration by not hiring undocumented workers? Should they have the opportunity- to gain citizenship? Docs illegal immigration pose a security threat to our country? Do illegal immigrants do work that American workers are unwilling to do? Are their rights as workers and as human beings at risk due to their status? Are they abused by employers, law enforcement, housing, and businesses? I low are their families impacted by their status? What is the moral and philosophical obligation of a nation state to maintain its borders? Should we build a wall on the Mexican border, establish a national identification can!, or enforce existing laws against employers? Should we invite immigrants to become U.S. citizens? Surely you can think of many more concerns to be addressed by a conversation about the topic area of illegal immigration. Participation in this "debate" is likely to be emotional and intense. However, it is not likely to be productive or useful without focus on a particular question and identification of a line demarcating sides in the controversy. To be discussed and resolved effectively, controversies must be stated clearly. Vague understanding results in unfocused deliberation and poor decisions, frustration, and emotional distress, as evidenced by the failure of the United States Congress to make progress on the immigration debate during the summer of 2007.¶ Someone disturbed by the problem of the growing underclass of poorly educated, socially disenfranchised youths might observe, "Public schools are doing a terrible job! They are overcrowded, and many teachers are poorly qualified in their subject areas. Even the best teachers can do little more than struggle to maintain order in their classrooms." That same concerned citizen, facing a complex range of issues, might arrive at an unhelpful decision, such as "We ought to do something about this" or. worse. "It's too complicated a problem to deal with." Groups of concerned citizens worried about the state of public education could join together to express their frustrations, anger, disillusionment, and emotions regarding the schools, but without a focus for their discussions, they could easily agree about the sorry state of education without finding points of clarity or potential solutions. A gripe session would follow. But if a precise question is posed—such as "What can be done to improve public education?"—then a more profitable area of discussion is opened up simply by placing a focus on the search for a concrete solution step. One or more judgments can be phrased in the form of debate propositions, motions for parliamentary debate, or bills for legislative assemblies. The statements "Resolved: That the federal government should implement a program of charter schools in at-risk communities" and "Resolved: That the state of Florida should adopt a school voucher program" more clearly identify specific ways of dealing with educational problems in a manageable form, suitable for debate. They provide specific policies to be investigated and aid discussants in identifying points of difference.¶ To have a productive debate, which facilitates effective decision making by directing and placing limits on the decision to be made, the basis for argument should be clearly defined. If we merely talk about "homelessness" or "abortion" or "crime'\* or "global warming" we are likely to have an interesting discussion but not to establish profitable basis for argument. For example, the statement "Resolved: That the pen is mightier than the sword" is debatable, yet fails to provide much basis for clear argumentation. If we take this statement to mean that the written word is more effective than physical force for some purposes, we can identify a problem area: the comparative effectiveness of writing or physical force for a specific purpose.¶ Although we now have a general subject, we have not yet stated a problem. It is still too broad, too loosely worded to promote well-organized argument. What sort of writing are we concerned with—poems, novels, government documents, website development, advertising, or what? What does "effectiveness" mean in this context? What kind of physical force is being compared—fists, dueling swords, bazookas, nuclear weapons, or what? A more specific question might be. "Would a mutual defense treaty or a visit by our fleet be more effective in assuring Liurania of our support in a certain crisis?" The basis for argument could be phrased in a debate proposition such as "Resolved: That the United States should enter into a mutual defense treatv with Laurania." Negative advocates might oppose this proposition by arguing that fleet maneuvers would be a better solution. This is not to say that debates should completely avoid creative interpretation of the controversy by advocates, or that good debates cannot occur over competing interpretations of the controversy; in fact, these sorts of debates may be very engaging. The point is that debate is best facilitated by the guidance provided by focus on a particular point of difference, which will be outlined in the following discussion.

**Only our framework teaches debaters how to speak in the language of experts---that solves cession of science and politics to ideological elites who dominate the argumentative frame**

Hoppe 99 Robert Hoppe is Professor of Policy and knowledge in the Faculty of Management and Governance at Twente University, the Netherlands. "Argumentative Turn" Science and Public Policy, volume 26, number 3, June 1999, pages 201–210 works.bepress.com

ACCORDING TO LASSWELL (1971), policy science is about the production and application of knowledge of and in policy. Policy-makers who desire to tackle problems on the political agenda successfully, should be able to mobilise the best available knowledge. This requires high-quality knowledge in policy. Policy-makers and, in a democracy, citizens, also need to know how policy processes really evolve. This demands precise knowledge of policy.¶ There is an obvious link between the two: the more and better the knowledge of policy, the easier it is to mobilise knowledge in policy. Lasswell expresses this interdependence by defining the policy scientist's operational task as eliciting the maximum rational judgement of all those involved in policy-making.¶ For the applied policy scientist or policy analyst this implies the development of two skills. First, for the sake of mobilising the best available knowledge in policy, he/she should be able to mediate between different scientific disciplines. Second, to optimise the interdependence between science in and of policy, she/he should be able to mediate between science and politics. Hence Dunn's (1994, page 84) formal definition of policy analysis as an applied social science discipline that uses multiple research methods in a context of argumentation, public debate [and political struggle] to create, evaluate critically, and communicate policy-relevant knowledge.¶ Historically, the differentiation and successful institutionalisation of policy science can be interpreted as the spread of the functions of knowledge organisation, storage, dissemination and application in the knowledge system (Dunn and Holzner, 1988; van de Graaf and Hoppe, 1989, page 29). Moreover, this scientification of hitherto 'unscientised' functions, by including science of policy explicitly, aimed to gear them to the political system. In that sense, Lerner and Lasswell's (1951) call for policy sciences anticipated, and probably helped bring about, the scientification of politics.¶ Peter Weingart (1999) sees the development of the science-policy nexus as a dialectical process of the scientification of politics/policy and the politicisation of science. Numerous studies of political controversies indeed show that science advisors behave like any other self-interested actor (Nelkin, 1995). Yet science somehow managed to maintain its functional cognitive authority in politics. This may be because of its changing shape, which has been characterised as the emergence of a post-parliamentary and post-national network democracy (Andersen and Burns, 1996, pages 227-251).¶ National political developments are put in the background by ideas about uncontrollable, but apparently inevitable, international developments; in Europe, national state authority and power in public policy-making is leaking away to a new political and administrative elite, situated in the institutional ensemble of the European Union. National representation is in the hands of political parties which no longer control ideological debate. The authority and policy-making power of national governments is also leaking away towards increasingly powerful policy-issue networks, dominated by functional representation by interest groups and practical experts.¶ In this situation, public debate has become even more fragile than it was. It has become diluted by the predominance of purely pragmatic, managerial and administrative argument, and under-articulated as a result of an explosion of new political schemata that crowd out the more conventional ideologies. The new schemata do feed on the ideologies; but in larger part they consist of a random and unarticulated 'mish-mash' of attitudes and images derived from ethnic, local-cultural, professional, religious, social movement and personal political experiences.¶ The market-place of political ideas and arguments is thriving; but on the other hand, politicians and citizens are at a loss to judge its nature and quality.¶ Neither political parties, nor public officials, interest groups, nor social movements and citizen groups, nor even the public media show any inclination, let alone competency, in ordering this inchoate field. In such conditions, scientific debate provides a much needed minimal amount of order and articulation of concepts, arguments and ideas. Although frequently more in rhetoric than substance, reference to scientific 'validation' does provide politicians, public officials and citizens alike with some sort of compass in an ideological universe in disarray.¶ For policy analysis to have any political impact under such conditions, it should be able somehow to continue 'speaking truth' to political elites who are ideologically uprooted, but cling to power; to the elites of administrators, managers, professionals and experts who vie for power in the jungle of organisations populating the functional policy domains of post-parliamentary democracy; and to a broader audience of an ideologically disoriented and politically disenchanted citizenry.

### 4

#### **Cuba violates human rights**

HRW 13 — Human Rights Watch, 2013 (“Universal Periodic Review: HRW Submission on Cuba,” 16th Universal Periodic Review, May, Available Online at http://www.hrw.org/news/2013/04/18/universal-periodic-review-hrw-submission-cuba, Accessed 07-03-2013)

Cuba remains the only country in Latin America that represses virtually all forms of political dissent. In 2012 the government of Raúl Castro continued to enforce political conformity using short-term detentions, beatings, public acts of repudiation, travel restrictions, and forced exile. During its first UPR review, Cuba rejected all recommendations addressing the arbitrary detentions of political prisoners, the lack of protection of human rights defenders, and restrictions on freedom of expression. Since then, Human Rights Watch has continued documenting cases of serious abuses of these rights. The Cuban government released dozens of political prisoners in 2010 and 2011 on the condition that they accept exile in exchange for their freedom. Yet while the overall number of political prisoners has declined, the government has increasingly relied upon arbitrary arrests and short-term detentions to restrict the basic rights of its critics, including the right to assemble and move about freely. Meanwhile, the government continues to sentence dissidents to long-term prison sentences in closed, summary trials, or hold them for extended periods without charge.

#### 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.

### Case

1. **AGGRESSIVE MILITARY ACTION AGAINST TERRORISTS AND THEIR SPONSORS IS THE ONLY WAY TO END THEIR JIHAD AGAINST THE WEST. THE AFFIRMATIVE’S EMBRACE OF NONVIOLENCE MAKES FUTURE ATTACKS INEVITABLE.**

**MCINERNEY AND VALLELY, 2K4**

(Thomas and Paul, Lt. General USAF (Retired) and Maj. General US Army (Retired), both analysts for Fox News, Endgame: The Blueprint for Victory in the War on Terror, p. 167-8)

After the axis powers declared war on the United States in December 1941, the United States did not limit its response to fortifying the Hawaiian Islands, increasing antisubmarine patrols along the Atlantic Coast, and upgrading the efforts of the FBI to crack rings of domestic Axis sympathizers and capture saboteurs. Osama bin Laden has openly and repeatedly declared war on the United States. The radical Islamists see themselves in jihad against the West, and they see the United States as the leading “Crusader” power. They see moderate Muslims who wish live in peace as traitors. Backed by state sponsors of terror like Iran they have become a global threat just as much as the National Socialists were. Though militarily puny their dreams and their potential danger are grandiose: inflaming a billion Muslims worldwide and creating a radical Islamist empire. To that end they will cooperate with rogue states like North Korea. They will do everything they can to acquire weapons of mass destruction. The bottom line is that they must be stopped. End their state sponsorship, and they wither. Buttress the forces of moderate Islam, encourage freedom and tolerance in Islamic societies grant Muslims in Iraq and Iran the opportunity to vote against tyranny and the mullahs, then the radicals do more than wither, they disappear to the fringes of Muslim society. If we are to stop the spread of radical Islam we cannot be satisfied with the conviction of a failed terrorist bomber, dismantling a terrorist cell, or freezing the bank account of a terrorist front – however necessary all these things are. To rely purely on defensive measures cedes the initiative to the radical Islamists. Instead, we need to take the battle to them. The counteroffensives in Afghanistan and Iraq were first steps to the endgame, they are not the endgame itself. The endgame is taking down the Web of Terror entirely so that the global terror threat dissolves. We have laid out the broad parameters of an active strategy for this war. Despite the best wishes of some, the Web of Terror cannot be talked to death, no “peace process” will work, no foreign aid will suffice unless the countries involved make a commitment – as Libya has apparently done – to forgo jihad, forgo terrorism, forgo weapons of mass destruction.Countries that will not do this willingly must be compelled to do it. Terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction are not something we have to live with; they are something that the rogue states of the Web of Terror have to live without.

1. **TERRORISTS HAVE RELIGIOUS MOTIVATIONS THAT MAKE DISCOURSE AND COMPROMISE MEANINGLESS. THE ONLY WAY TO WIN THE WAR WE ARE IN IS TO KILL THEM BEFORE THEY KILL US.**

**PETERS, 2K4**

(Ralph, Retired Army Officer, “In Praise of Attrition,” *Parameters*, Summer)

Trust me. We don’t need discourses. We need plain talk, honest answers, and the will to close with the enemy and kill him. And to keep on killing him until it is unmistakably clear to the entire world who won. When military officers start speaking in academic gobbledygook, it means they have nothing to contribute to the effectiveness of our forces. They badly need an assignment to Fallujah. Consider our enemies in the War on Terror. Men who believe, literally, that they are on a mission from God to destroy your civilization and who regard death as a promotion are not impressed by elegant maneuvers. You must find them, no matter how long it takes, then kill them. If they surrender, you must accord them their rights under the laws of war and international conventions. But, as we have learned so painfully from all the mindless, left-wing nonsense spouted about the prisoners at Guantanamo, you are much better off killing them before they have a chance to surrender. We have heard no end of blather about network-centric warfare, to the great profit of defense contractors. If you want to see a superb—and cheap—example of “net-war,” look at al Qaeda. The mere possession of technology does not ensure that it will be used effectively. And effectiveness is what matters. It isn’t a question of whether or not we want to fight a war of attrition against religion-fueled terrorists. We’re in a war of attrition with them. We have no realistic choice. Indeed, our enemies are, in some respects, better suited to both global and local wars of maneuver than we are. They have a world in which to hide, and the world is full of targets for them. They do not heed laws or boundaries. They make and observe no treaties. They do not expect the approval of the United Nations Security Council. They do not face election cycles. And their weapons are largely provided by our own societies. We have the technical capabilities to deploy globally, but, for now, we are forced to watch as Pakistani forces fumble efforts to surround and destroy concentrations of terrorists; we cannot enter any country (except, temporarily, Iraq) without the permission of its government. We have many tools—military, diplomatic, economic, cultural, law enforcement, and so on—but we have less freedom of maneuver than our enemies. But we do have superior killing power, once our enemies have been located. Ultimately, the key advantage of a superpower is superpower. Faced with implacable enemies who would kill every man, woman, and child in our country and call the killing good (the ultimate war of attrition), we must be willing to use that power wisely, but remorselessly.We are, militarily and nationally, in a transition phase. Even after 9/11, we do not fully appreciate the cruelty and determination of our enemies. We will learn our lesson, painfully, because the terrorists will not quit. The only solution is to kill them and keep on killing them: a war of attrition. But a war of attrition fought on our terms, not theirs. Of course, we shall hear no end of fatuous arguments to the effect that we can’t kill our way out of the problem. Well, until a better methodology is discovered, killing every terrorist we can find is a good interim solution. The truth is that even if you can’t kill yourself out of the problem, you can make the problem a great deal smaller by effective targeting. And we shall hear that killing terrorists only creates more terrorists. This is sophomoric nonsense. The surest way to swell the ranks of terror is to follow the approach we did in the decade before 9/11 and do nothing of substance. Success breeds success. Everybody loves a winner. The clichés exist because they’re true. Al Qaeda and related terrorist groups metastasized because they were viewed in the Muslim world as standing up to the West successfully and handing the Great Satan America embarrassing defeats with impunity. Some fanatics will flock to the standard of terror, no matter what we do. But it’s far easier for Islamic societies to purge themselves of terrorists if the terrorists are on the losing end of the global struggle than if they’re allowed to become triumphant heroes to every jobless, unstable teenager in the Middle East and beyond. Far worse than fighting such a war of attrition aggressively is to pretend you’re not in one while your enemy keeps on killing you.Even the occupation of Iraq is a war of attrition. We’re doing remarkably well, given the restrictions under which our forces operate. But no grand maneuvers, no gestures of humanity, no offers of conciliation, and no compromises will persuade the terrorists to halt their efforts to disrupt the development of a democratic, rule-of-law Iraq. On the contrary, anything less than relentless pursuit, with both preemptive and retaliatory action, only encourages the terrorists and remaining Baathist gangsters.

1. **GOING SOFT AGAINST THE TERRORISTS WILL RESULT IN MUSHROOM CLOUDS AROUND THE WORLD.**

**ALEXANDER, 2K3**

(Yonah, Professor and Director of the Inter-University for Terrorism Studies in Israel and the United States, “Terrorism Myths and Realities,” *Washington Times*, Aug. 27)

Last week’s brutal suicide bombings in Baghdad and Jerusalem have once again illustrated dramatically that the international community failed thus far at least to understand the magnitude and implications of the terrorist threats to the very survival of civilization itself. Even the United States and Israel have for decades tended to regard terrorism as a mere tactical nuisance or irritant rather than a critical strategic challenge to their national security concerns. It is not surprising, therefore that on September 11, 2001 Americans were stunned by the unprecedented tragedy of 19 al Qaeda terrorists striking a devastating blow at the center of the nation’s commercial and military powers. Likewise, Israel and its citizens, despite the collapse of the Oslo Agreements of 1993 and numerous acts of terrorism triggered by the second intifada that began almost three years ago, are still “shocked” by each suicide attack at a time of intensive diplomatic efforts to revive the moribund peace process through the now revoked cease-fire arrangements (hudna). Why are the United States and Israel, as well as scores of other countries affected by the universal nightmare of modern terrorism surprised by new terrorist “surprises”? There are many reasons, including misunderstanding of the manifold specific factors that contribute to terrorism’s expansion, such as lack of a universal definition of terrorism, the religionization of politics, double standards of morality, weak punishment of terrorists, and the exploitation of the media by terrorist propaganda and psychological warfare. Unlike their historical counterparts, contemporary terrorists have introduced a new scale of violence in terms ofconventional and unconventional threats and impact. The internationalization and brutalization of current and future terrorism make it clear we have entered an Age of Super Terrorism (e.g. biological, chemical, radiological, nuclear, and cyber) with its serious implications concerning national, regional, and global security concerns.

1. **OUR IMPACT IS ABOUT MORE THAN JUST BODY COUNTS. TERRORISM INFLICTS A TOLL ON THE SPIRIT AS WELL. IN A WORLD OF TERRORISM, THERE CAN BE NO VALUE TO LIFE.**

**Beres and Messing 02**

(Louis Rene, Professor of International Law, Department of Political Science, Purdue University. Ph.D., Princeton University; Michael, a radiologist studying the medical effects of terrorism, “In Maiming Israeli Bodies, Bombers Maim the Soul,” *Los Angeles Times* May 21, 2002 L/N]

What, exactly, does the Palestinian suicide bomber really seek? Above all, he wants to transform Jewish pain into Arab power. In maiming and burning Jewish men, women and children, this terrorist reasons that pain, to be purposeful, must point convincingly toward the victim's death but that even survivors must suffer terribly. In the fashion of the torturer, the Palestinian suicide bomber takes what is usually private and incommunicable--the pain contained within the boundaries of the sufferer's body--and exploits it to affect the behavior of others. Consider the personal horror. During the routine rotation of a radiologist in a busy city hospital, a broad variety of patient problems is seen. But things are now very different in Israeli hospitals. With the wave of suicide bombings, unique and hideous trauma has become a regular part of the Israeli physician's daily practice. X-rays of suicide bombing victims often show hundreds of metallic fragments, ranging in size from millimeters to whole nails, grotesquely embedded in the victims' bodies--literally from head to foot. Like so many others across history's killing fields, Arab terrorists have transformed simple devices created for constructive purposes--in this case, nails--into the deadliest of destructive projectiles. Nails, screws, nuts and ball bearings are packed by the suicide bombers into their explosive vests to maximize lethal effects and to inflict unimaginable pain and suffering on innocent Jewish bodies. These maliciously transformed objects are propelled with the force of bullets, penetrating skin, flesh and bone with a furious indifference to civilized human behavior. The nails fly head first, presenting themselves in a strangely surreal yet orderly arrangement within the victims' bodies. Many are embedded shallowly. Others burrow their way in more deeply and lodge under the skin, where the examining physician can actually touch and feel their alien presence. Some take hours of meticulous exploration to remove. Still others violate the body deeper, perforating and lacerating vital organs. CT scans of these victims' heads show blood, air, metal and bone fragments displacing normal brain tissue. The "lucky" patient who survives the initial explosive insult may often require extensive surgery to repair damaged organs. Others may sustain fractures, burns, amputations, vascular injuries, paralysis, blindness or brain damage. A collapsed lung or perforated colon-- ordinarily considered a major injury--is taken as a blessing for such victims of terrorism. Although some of the victims recover physically and return to a "normal" life, many more require a lifetime of rehabilitation. Some are impaired permanently. And all suffer serious psychological harm that needs to be treated. Post-traumatic stress disorder, depression and anxiety affect not only the victims of the attack but all of Israeli society. Anecdotal reports have indicated a dramatic rise in the use of prescription antidepressants and sedatives. How could it be otherwise, in a society living under constant attack by those who cry out, "When the martyr dies a martyr's death, he attains the height of bliss ... "? The Palestinian "martyr's" unheroic weapon has now literally and figuratively penetrated the hearts and souls as well as the bodies of an entire nation. Too often, unfortunately, television and print media are unable or unwilling to transmit the full human measure of such penetration to viewers and readers. The result is that too few peoplearound the world are able to understand the true horror of thePalestinian suicide bomber. For them, Israeli "wounded" are little more than an anesthetized statistic, an abstract list of numbers that elicits barely a nodding sigh of concern.

1. **THE WILLINGNESS TO USE VIOLENCE AGAINST THE EVIL OF TERRORISM IS A MORAL OBLIGATION. THE JUDGE MUST CHOOSE BETWEEN BECOMING AN HONORABLE EXECUTIONER, OR STANDING BY AS MURDERERS MOVE TO DESTROY EVERYTHING THAT IS SACRED.**

**Beres 05**

(Louis Rene, Professor of International Law, Department of Political Science, Purdue University. Ph.D., Princeton University, 1977 “Terrorism's Executioner” The Washington Times May 31, 2005L/N)

Our world is "normally" silent in the face of evil. At worst, many are directly complicit in the maimings and slaughters. At best, the murderers are ignored. In this unchanging world Israel must soon decide whether to face the evil of Palestinian terrorism as a pitiable victim or to use whatever reasonable force is needed to remain alive. The use of force is not inherently evil. Quite the contrary; in opposing terrorist mayhem, force is indispensable to all that is good. In the case of Israel, Palestinian terrorism is unique for its cowardice, its barbarism and its genocidal goal. Were Israel to depend upon the broader international community for relief - upon the so-called road map - its plea would be unheard. All states have a right of self-defense. Israel has every lawful authority to forcibly confront the still-growing evil of Palestinian terror. Facing even biological and nuclear forms of terrorism, it now has the clear legal right to refuse to be a victim and to become an executioner. From the standpoint of providing security to its own citizens, this right even becomes an obligation. Albert Camus would have us all be "neither victims nor executioners," living not in a world in which killing has disappeared ("we are not so crazy as that"), but one wherein killing has become illegitimate. This is a fine expectation, yet the celebrated French philosopher did not anticipate another evil force for whom utter extermination of "the Jews" was its declared object. Not even in a world living under the shadow of recent Holocaust did Camus consider such an absurd possibility. But Israel lacks the quaint luxury of French philosophy. Were Israel to follow Camus' genteel reasoning, perhaps in order to implement Mr. Sharon's disengagement, the result would be another boundless enlargement of Jewish suffering. Before and during the Holocaust, for those who still had an opportunity to flee, Jews were ordered: "Get out of Europe; go to Palestine." When they complied (those who could), the next order was: "Get out of Palestine." For my Austrian-Jewish grandparents, their deaths came on the SS- killing grounds at Riga, Latvia. Had they made it to Palestine, their sons and grandsons would likely have died in subsequent genocidal wars intended to get the Jews "out of Palestine." Failure to use force against murderous evil is invariably a stain upon all that is good. By declining the right to act as a lawful executioner in its struggle with terror, Israel would be forced by Camus' reasoning to embrace its own disappearance. Barring Mr. Sharon's disengagement, the Jewish state would never accept collective suicide. Why was Camus, who was thinking only in the broadest generic terms, so mistaken? My own answer lies in his presumption of a natural reciprocity among human beings and states in the matter of killing. We are asked to believe that as greater numbers of people agree not to become executioners, still greater numbers will follow upon the same course. In time, the argument proceeds, the number of those who refuse to accept killing will become so great that there will be fewer and fewer victims. But Camus' presumed reciprocity does not exist, indeed, can never exist, especially in the jihad-centered Middle East. Here the Islamist will to kill Jews remains unimpressed by Israel's disproportionate contributions to science, industry, medicine and learning. Here there are no Arab plans for a "two- state solution," only for a final solution. In counterterrorism, Jewish executioners must now have an honored place in the government of Israel. Without them, evil would triumph again and again. For Hamas, Islamic Jihad, Hezbollah and Fatah, murdered Jews are not so much a means to an end as an end in themselves. In this unheroic Arab Islamist world, where killing Jews is both a religious mandate and sometimes also a path to sexual ecstasy and personal immortality, an Israeli unwillingness to use necessary force against terror will invite existential terror. Sadly, killing is sometimes a sacred duty. Faced with manifest evil, all decent civilizations must rely, in the end, on the executioner. To deny the executioner his proper place would enable the murderers to leer lasciviously upon whole mountains of fresh corpses.

1. **NONVIOLENCE RESULTS IN PASSIVITY. THIS ALLOWS DICTATORS TO TAKE OVER. EVEN WHEN IT SUCCEEDS, IT IS TOO SLOW AND THIS MAKES IT UNETHICAL.**

**FUTTERMAN, 95**

(J.A.H., Livermore Lab Researcher, “Meditations on the Bomb,” http://www.dogchurch.org/scriptorium/nuke.html)

But is it moral to use force? Those of us who might contemplate calling the police in order to stop a murder must believe that occasionally it is. Further, I maintain that sometimes it may be immoral to do anything else. Remember that Hitler could have been stopped easily by a show of force when he threatened to annex the Sudetenland. That force was not brought to bear in a timely manner is due largely to the pacifist sentiment in Europe and America at the time. Instead of engaging in a minor military expedition which would have forced Hitler to back down, to lose face, and ultimately to lose political power, the world passively sold out Czechoslovakia to him, paving the way for a much more prolonged and bloody conflict later — a conflict that resulted in the development of the first atomic bombs. In other words, I think a reflexive pacifism is no more entitled to a presumption of moral innocence than nuclear weapons work, and that pacifism applied in the wrong way at the wrong time contributed to the development of the nuclear weapons that pacifists now find so abhorrent. In short, pacifism can sometimes help to make wars bigger and worse than they have to be. That said, I admit that I admire non-violent resistance. [4] Remember, however, that non-violent resistance is a sophisticated technique that works only when used by the "right" people at the "right" time against the "right" opponents. For example, the Indians successfully used non-violent resistance to persuade the British to end the Raj, because the British eventually acknowledged that the Indians, led by the British-educated Gandhi, were human beings like themselves. The Nazis, who with their "Master Race" ideology admitted only so-called "Aryans" to the category of human, provide an example counter to that of the British. There were some successful acts of non-violent confrontation against the Nazis, like King Christian of Denmark's public declaration that he would wear the yellow star if it were introduced in his country. He did so in response to the Nazi practice of ordering Jews to wear yellow-starred armbands so that the Nazis could more easily isolate them from their surrounding society. That many Danes followed their king's example helped camouflage many Jews until they could escape to Sweden in fishing boats. [5] Now this resistance worked partly because the Nazis considered the Danes to be "Aryans" like themselves. Had the Poles tried the same thing, the Nazis would have been perfectly happy to use the event as an excuse for liquidating more Poles. Rather than awaken the Nazis' moral sense, non-violent confrontation on the part of the Poles would probably have enabled the Nazis to carry out their agenda in Poland more easily. The other reason these acts succeeded was that overwhelming violence of the Allies had stretched the Nazi forces too thin to suppress massive action by a whole populace, and eventually deprived the Nazis of the time they needed to find other ways to carry out their "final solution." In other words, non-violence resistance alone would have been very slow to work against the Nazis, once they had consolidated their power. And while it slowly ground away at the evil in the Nazi soul, how many millions more would have died, and how much extra time would have been given to Nazi scientists trying to invent atomic bombs to go on those V-2 rockets? The evil of Nazism may well have expended itself, but perhaps after a real "thousand-year Reich," leaving a world populated only by blue-eyed blondes. In other words, if the world had used non-violence alone against the Nazis, the results may have been much worse those of the war.[6] Even when non-violence does succeed, it does so by rallying the majority of the population toward whom it is directed to stop the direct perpetrators of injustice by force — the force of law in the form of the police, the prisons, and the polls — force that necessarily includes the threat of violence. In other words, non-violent resistance harnesses (or co-opts), rather than eliminates violence. In fact, non-violence is sometimes even helped by the threat of violence to achieve its objectives. The non-violence of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was complemented by the willingness to use "any means necessary" of Malcolm X. These two men were sending white America the same message concerning justice and racial equality. If whites failed to respond to the message stated gently, whites would be given the opportunity to respond to it stated violently. It took both statements to achieve the progress made thus far. Now, in situations in which the bully can be overcome by violence and non-violence is hopeless, non-violence can amount to a kind of self-righteous passivity. That is, I may preserve my own sense of moral purity by adhering to non-violence, but it is sometimes far from clear that I am actually doing good. In such cases fighting is not an aggressive effort to destroy the bully, but an assertive attempt to stop the bully from bullying. World War II was ultimately that kind of moral struggle — neither Germany nor Japan was destroyed — they were merely forced to surrender. Now they are among the most economically powerful nations in the world. (One difference between aggressive and assertive use of military power is how you treat your opponents when you win.)

#### They don’t solve all the alt cuases—gitmo, north korea, Syria

#### Terrorism is real and political action is necessary to stop it

**Allison, 10** – professor of government and director of the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard (1/25/10, Graham, “A Failure to Imagine the Worst: The first step toward preventing a nuclear 9/11 is believing it could happen,”

<http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/01/25/a_failure_to_imagine_the_worst?print=yes&hidecomments=yes&page=full>)

In his first speech to the U.N. Security Council, U.S. President Barack Obama challenged members to think about the impact of a single nuclear bomb.He said: "Just one nuclear weapon exploded in a city -- be it New York or Moscow, Tokyo or Beijing, London or Paris -- could kill hundreds of thousands of people." The consequences, he noted, would "destabilize our security, our economies, and our very way of life." Before the Sept. 11, 2001, assault on the World Trade Center and Pentagon, who could have imagined that terrorists would mount an attack on the American homeland that would kill more citizens than Japan did at Pearl Harbor? As then-Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice testified to the 9/11 Commission: "No one could have imagined them taking a plane, slamming it into the Pentagon ... into the World Trade Center, using planes as missiles." For most Americans, the idea of international terrorists conducting a successful attack on their homeland, killing thousands of citizens, was not just unlikely. It was inconceivable. As is now evident, assertions about what is "imaginable" or "conceivable," however, are propositions about our minds, not about what is objectively possible. Prior to 9/11, how unlikely was a megaterrorist attack on the American homeland? In the previous decade, al Qaeda attacks on the World Trade Center in 1993, U.S. embassies in Kenya and Tanzania in 1998, and the USS Cole in 2000 had together killed almost 250 and injured nearly 6,000. Moreover, the organization was actively training thousands of recruits in camps in Afghanistan for future terrorist operations. Thinking about risks we face today, we should reflect on the major conclusion of the bipartisan 9/11 Commission established to investigate that catastrophe. The U.S. national security establishment's principal failure prior to Sept. 11, 2001, was, the commission found, a "failure of imagination." Summarized in a single sentence, the question now is: Are we at risk of an equivalent failure to imagine a nuclear 9/11? After the recent attempted terrorist attack on Northwest Airlines Flight 253, this question is more urgent than ever. The thought that terrorists could successfully explode a nuclear bomb in an American city killing hundreds of thousands of people seems incomprehensible. This essential incredulity is rooted in three deeply ingrained presumptions. First, no one could seriously intend to kill hundreds of thousands of people in a single attack. Second, only states are capable of mass destruction; nonstate actors would be unable to build or use nuclear weapons. Third, terrorists would not be able to deliver a nuclear bomb to an American city. In a nutshell, these presumptions lead to the conclusion: inconceivable. Why then does Obama call nuclear terrorism "the single most important national security threat that we face" and "a threat that rises above all others in urgency?" Why the unanimity among those who have shouldered responsibility for U.S. national security in recent years that this is a grave and present danger? In former CIA Director George Tenet's assessment, "the main threat is the nuclear one. I am convinced that this is where [Osama bin Laden] and his operatives desperately want to go." When asked recently what keeps him awake at night, Secretary of Defense Robert Gates answered: "It's the thought of a terrorist ending up with a weapon of mass destruction, especially nuclear." Leaders who have reached this conclusion about the genuine urgency of the nuclear terrorist threat are not unaware of their skeptics' presumptions. Rather, they have examined the evidence, much of which has been painstakingly compiled here by Rolf Mowatt-Larssen, former head of the CIA's terrorism and weapons-of-mass-destruction efforts, and **much of which remains classified.** Specifically, who is seriously motivated to kill hundreds of thousands of Americans? Osama bin Laden, who has declared his intention to kill "4 million Americans -- including 2 million children." The deeply held belief that even if they wanted to, "men in caves can't do this" was then Pakistani President Pervez Musharraf's view when Tenet flew to Islamabad to see him after 9/11. As Tenet (assisted by Mowatt-Larssen) took him step by step through the evidence, he discovered that indeed they could. Terrorists' opportunities to bring a bomb into the United States follow the same trails along which 275 tons of drugs and 3 million people crossed U.S. borders illegally last year. In 2007, Congress established a successor to the 9/11 Commission to focus on terrorism using weapons of mass destruction. This bipartisan Commission on the Prevention of WMD Proliferation and Terrorism issued its report to Congress and the Obama administration in December 2008. In the **commission's unanimous judgment:** "it is more likely than not that a weapon of mass destruction will be used in a terrorist attack somewhere in the world by the end of 2013." Faced with the possibility of an American Hiroshima, many Americans are paralyzed by a combination of denial and fatalism. Either it hasn't happened, so it's not going to happen; or, if it is going to happen, there's nothing we can do to stop it. Both propositions are wrong. **The countdown to a nuclear 9/11 can be stopped, but only by realistic recognition of the threat, a clear agenda for action, and relentless determination to pursue it.**

#### Utilitarian decision-making is the VITAL INTERNAL LINK to ethical policymaking. Their framework is a moral evasion – deontology is only a guise for avoiding difficult decisions; this allows the worst evils to occur.

Nielsen ‘72

[Kai. Prof of Philosophy @ U of Calgary. “Against Moral Conservatism” Ethics, Vol 82 No 3, April 1972. JSTOR//JVOSS]

Forget the levity of the example and consider the case of the innocent fat man. If there really is no other way of unsticking our fat man and if plainly, without blasting him out, everyone in the cave will drown, then, innocent or not, he should be blasted out. This indeed overrides the principle that the innocent should never be deliberately killed, but it does not reveal a callousness toward life, for the people involved are caught in a desperate situation in which, if such extreme action is not taken, many lives will be lost and far greater misery will obtain. Moreover, the people who do such a horrible thing or acquiesce in the doing of it are not likely to be rendered more callous about human life and human suffering as a result. Its occurrence will haunt them for the rest of their lives and is as likely as not to make them more rather than less morally sensitive. It is not even correct to say that such a desperate act shows a lack of respect for persons. We are not treating the fat man merely as a means. The fat man's person - his interests and rights - are not ignored. Killing him is something which is undertaken with the greatest reluctance. It is only when it is quite certain that there is no other way to save the lives of the others that such a violent course of action is justifiably undertaken. Alan Donagan, arguing rather as Anscombe argues, maintains that "to use any innocent man ill for the sake of some public good is directly to degrade him to being a mere means" and to do this is of course to violate a principle essential to morality, that is, that human beings should never merely be treated as means but should be treated as ends in themselves (as persons worthy of respect). 11 But, as my above remarks show, it need not be the case, and in the above situation it is not the case, that in killing such an innocent man we are treating him merely as a means. The action is universalizable, all alternative actions which would save his life are duly considered, the blasting out is done only as a last and desperate resort with the minimum of harshness and indifference to his suffering and the like. It indeed sounds ironical to talk this way, given what is done to him. But if such a terrible situation were to arise, there would always be more or less humane ways of going about one's grim task. And in acting in the more humane way toward the fat man, as we do what we must do and would have done to ourselves were the roles reversed, we show a respect for his person. 12 In so treating the fat man - not just to further the public good but to prevent the certain death of a whole group of people (that is to prevent an even greater evil than his being killed in this way) - the claims of justice are not overridden either, for each individual involved, if he is reasoning correctly, should realize that if he were so stuck rather than the fat man, he should in such situations be blasted out. Thus, there is no question of being unfair. Surely we must choose between evils here, but is there anything more reasonable, more morally appropriate, than choosing the lesser evil when doing or allowing some evil cannot be avoided? That is, where there is no avoiding both and where our actions can determine whether a greater or lesser evil obtains, should we not plainly always opt for the lesser evil? And is it not obviously a greater evil that all those other innocent people should suffer and die than that the fat man should suffer and die? Blowing up the fat man is indeed monstrous. But letting him remain stuck while the whole group drowns is still more monstrous. The consequentialist is on strong moral ground here, and, if his reflective moral convictions do not square either with certain unrehearsed or with certain reflective particular moral convictions of human beings, so much the worse for such commonsense moral convictions. One could even usefully and relevantly adapt here - though for a quite different purpose - an argument of Donagan's. Consequentialism of the kind I have been arguing for provides so persuasive "a theoretical basis for common morality that when it contradicts some moral intuition, it is natural to suspect that intuition, not theory, is corrupt." 13 Given the comprehensiveness, plausibility, and overall rationality of consequentialism, it is not unreasonable to override even a deeply felt moral conviction if it does not square with such a theory, though, if it made no sense to overrode the bulk of or even a great many of our considered moral convictions, that would be another matter indeed. Anticonsequentialists often point to the inhumanity of people who will sanction such killing of the innocent, but cannot the compliment be returned by speaking of the greater inhumanity, conjoined with evasiveness, of those who will allow even more death and far greater misery and then excuse themselves on the ground that they did not intend the death and misery but merely forbore to prevent it? In such a context, such reasoning and such forbearing to prevent seems to me to constitute a moral evasion. I say it is evasive because rather than steeling himself to do what in normal circumstances would be a horrible and vile act but in this circumstance is a harsh moral necessity, he allows, when he has the power to prevent it, a situation which is still many times worse. He tries to keep his 'moral purity' and avoid 'dirty hands' at the price of utter moral failure and what Kirkegaard called 'double-mindedness.' It is understandable that people should act in this morally evasive way but this does not make it right.

\*\*\*We apologize for the gendered language in this evidence.

#### This is especially true in the context of terrorism

Nye 86 (Joseph S. 1986; Phd Political Science Harvard. University; Served as Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs; “Nuclear Ethics” pg. 18-19)

The significance and the limits of the two broad traditions can be captured by contemplating a hypothetical case.34 Imagine that you are visiting a Central American country and you happen upon a village square where an army captain is about to order his men to shoot two peasants lined up against a wall. When you ask the reason, you are told someone in this village shot at the captain's men last night. When you object to the killing of possibly innocent people, you are told that civil wars do not permit moral niceties. Just to prove the point that we all have dirty hands in such situations, the captain hands you a rifle and tells you that if you will shoot one peasant, he will free the other. Otherwise both die. He warns you not to try any tricks because his men have their guns trained on you. Will you shoot one person with the consequences of saving one, or will you allow both to die but preserve your moral integrity by refusing to play his dirty game? The point of the story is to show the value and limits of both traditions. Integrity is clearly an important value, and many of us would refuse to shoot. But at what point does the principle of not taking an innocent life collapse before the consequentialist burden? Would it matter if there were twenty or 1,000 peasants to be saved? What if killing or torturing one innocent person could save a city of 10 million persons from a terrorists' nuclear device? At some point does not integrity become the ultimate egoism of fastidious self-righteousness in which the purity of the self is more important than the lives of countless others? Is it not better to follow a consequentialist approach, admit remorse or regret over the immoral means, but justify the action by the consequences? Do absolutist approaches to integrity become self-contradictory in a world of nuclear weapons? "Do what is right though the world should perish" was a difficult principle even when Kant expounded it in the eighteenth century, and there is some evidence that he did not mean it to be taken literally even then. Now that it may be literally possible in the nuclear age, it seems more than ever to be self-contradictory.35 Absolutist ethics bear a heavier burden of proof in the nuclear age than ever before.

#### And the Aff’s focus on seemingly foreign warmaking erases on going domestic warfare making racist structural violence inevitable

Loyd 11 (Jenna M. Loyd Syracuse University, American Exceptionalism, Abolition and the Possibilities of Nonkilling Futures, *Nonkilling Geography*, p. 103-124)

While a good deal of critical attention has analyzed how racialized geopolitical imaginations inform and sustain popular support for war-making, there has been much less attention to how racialized imaginations of the domestic sphere also shape understandings of defense, security and organization for violence. The infapolitical line dividing who will count as human (who is griev- able in Butler’s terms) from those whose lives are not grievable is a geopolitical struggle engaged not simply through external or Orientalist logics of for- eignness, but also through the cultivation of internal enemies. For example, the abstract depictions of US war-making on the nightly news are not sepa- rate from racialized depictions of crime. Each set of depictions creates a racialized relationship of spectatorship that fosters viewers’ “material complicity” in state violence, while “dematerializing” its effects and erasing the inter- relation between police violence and war-making (Feldman, 2004).

Criticism of American exceptionalism that focuses on US war-making and empire building abroad, but ignores the systemic practices of state vio- lence domestically, **reproduces exceptionalist lens undergirding US state violence wherever it is practiced**. What disappears in plain sight is the mass violence of border militarization responsible for the deaths of thousands of migrants and a US prison system whose population of 2.3 million people ri- vals that of the nation’s fourth largest city, Houston, Texas. In the US, “governing through crime” builds on and ratifies anti-Black racism, while also serving to police and thereby constitute **gender and sexual difference** (Sub- dury, 2005; Incite!, 2006). Yet, the centrality of confronting anti-Black ra- cism is not frequently understood as fundamental to also ending **Native colonization and genocide and war** (Smith, 2006; Smith, 2010). This makes challenging the systematic, domestic practices of state violence, a site where its exercise is most hegemonic, fundamental to undermining the legal categorizations that create race and structure grievability.

## 2NC

### T

Walsh 13

(Edward T., April 2, “Cuba and the United States: Time to lean forward,” <http://www.newsobserver.com/2013/04/02/2797068/cuba-and-the-united-states-time.html>, jkim)

New Secretary of State John Kerry must decide within a few weeks whether to recommend to President Obama that Cuba be removed from the list of state sponsors of terrorism. Such a collection currently includes Iran, Syria and Sudan.Cuba has been on this list since 1982 and has been under the weight of a 51-year U.S. economicembargo. Removal from the list of state sponsors of terrorism would not impact the status of the embargo and the current trade and travel restrictions it imposes.

**You’re military**

#### Military sanctions aren’t economic sanctions

**Wallensteen 83** – Peter, Director of the Department of Peace and Conflict Research at Uppsala Univ., Sweden, Dilemmas of Economic Coercion: Sanctions in World Politics, p. 89

Sanctions can be applied by many different means, of which economics is only one. There are also diplomatic or military sanctions as well as less conventional forms such as popular demonstrations or mail campaigns.

**Definitional precision is a precondition for *educational, policy-relevant* debates about “engagement”.**

Resnick 1 — Evan Resnick, Ph.D. Candidate in Political Science at Columbia University, holds an M.Phil. in Political Science and an M.A. in Political Science from Columbia University, 2001 (“Defining engagement,” *Journal of International Affairs*, Volume 54, Issue 2, Spring, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via ABI/INFORM Complete)

In matters of national security, establishing a clear definition of terms is a precondition for effective policymaking. Decisionmakers who invoke critical terms in an erratic, ad hoc fashion risk alienating their constituencies. They also risk exacerbating misperceptions and hostility among those the policies target. Scholars who commit the same error undercut their ability to conduct valuable empirical research. Hence, if scholars and policymakers fail rigorously to define "engagement," they undermine the ability to build an effective foreign policy.

### Neolib OV

#### Neolib causes extinction

**1. Environmental collapse – companies privatize seeds and the environment– that leads to monocultures, exploitation, and extinction – that’s Lander**

**2. Structural violence – neoliberalism inherently privileges international institutions and companies - that makes structural violence inevitable because people are seen as a cheap source of labor and doomed to cycles of poverty – that’s Choi - That’s the logic that makes genocide inevitable – people are dehumanized and rendered objects.**

### Framework

#### methodology and ideological foundations are a prerequisite to productive discursive practices – if we win that their discursive challende is neoliberal, reject them ---its fair for both sides because they got infinite prep to decide how they wanted to frame and defend their affirmative

#### their scholarship rigs the game---neoliberal perspectives have a narrow conception of what counts as social science that excludes anything against the neoliberal consensus---all their evidence is self-referential and not objectively true

Joanne SWAFFIELD 12, Professor of Economics at The University of York, 2012, “Can ‘climate champions’ save the planet? A critical reflection on neoliberal social change,” Environmental Politics, Vol. 21, No. 2, p. 248-267

So far, our research with climate champions is consistent with the claim that a neoliberal understanding of human motivations and the processes of social change appears to many people to be the ‘inevitable and natural state’ of the world (Heynen and Robbins 2005, p. 6). In this section, we will argue that when the climate champions talk about their own motives and values and their own reasons for involvement in the climate champion scheme, they provide evidence that the dominance of neoliberalism is incomplete. We argue that the disjuncture between how they conceive of their own values and motives and the values and motives of others suggests that they may be capable of more radical forms of environmental citizenship. The dominance of neoliberalism and the inevitability of resistance Elizabeth Shove has recently argued that a neoliberal understanding of social change dominates climate policymaking and has a significant influence on social science research on climate change. As Shove (2010, p. 1280) suggests: This interpretation both of the problem (one of consumer behaviour and choice) and of potential policy responses (influencing choice) structures the meaning and the method of useful social science. Neoliberalism understands people as ‘autonomous agents of choice and change’ (Shove 2010, p. 1279). Therefore, the study of social change is the study of individual choice – and ‘methodological individualism’ is a prerequisite for ‘useful’ social science (Lukes 2006, p. 6) Moreover, the neoliberal conceptions of the autonomous agent (as an instrumentally rational utility-maximiser) and of ethics (as a matter of subjective preference) further restricts the sources of ‘useful’ social science – to particular branches of psychology and economics, which share these assumptions about the nature of the person. Neoliberalism is not just ‘the only economics in town’ but also ‘the only social science in town’ (Slocum 2004, p. 416).9 Shove (2010, p. 1283) claims that this narrow psychological or ‘behaviour change’ approach to tackling climate change has ‘significant political advantages’: [In] this context, to probe further, to ask how options are structured or to inquire into the ways in which governments maintain infrastructures and economic institutions, is perhaps too challenging to be useful. A neoliberal approach to social change protects the interests of those who benefit from the material-discursive practices of neoliberalism by ensuring that questions about the economic, political and social practices and structures of neoliberalism are silenced. However, the dominance of any discourse is never likely to be complete. As Downing (2008, p. ix) suggests, ‘the history of any cultural phenomenon always involves, alongside the commonsensical or authorized version of events, ulterior narratives, an unspoken set of truths’. As a result, discourses are ‘in a state of constant reconstitution and contestation’ (Carabine 2001, p. 279). We should always expect to find evidence of resistance to a dominant discourse if we look hard enough. We might anticipate that evidence of resistance is most likely in the ‘margins’ of societies – in grassroots movements and local initiatives. However, we want to suggest that even in our interviews with individuals, who were thoroughly embedded in neoliberal material-discursive practices, there was an important challenge to the dominance of neoliberalism.

### Perm

#### Double bind---either the perm severs the plan and its justifications which is a voting issue for fairness because they become a moving target---or the perm fails because its foundation is the preservation of a neoliberal structure built around economic engagement.

#### The perm is mutually exclusive with the alt – Globalization from Below only works if the people are able to exercise political and economic agency – the plan precludes that

“**the general principle of the terrorism list - no** ¶ **aid or trade for terrorism-list countries. The AEDPA went further**, ¶ however**, enhancing the terrorism list's import beyond these** ¶ **economic pressures.” –**

**That’s their ev**

#### The perm is impossible, Choi/Harris says Latin America must de-link from the United States market strategies or neoliberal market strategies will dominant their economies eroding biodiversity and indigenous culture.

#### The plan and perm are the same political strategy---they roll our political opposition into a reform consensus---its coopted by elites to demonstrate neoliberalism’s diversity---the perm is a performative attempt to close off dialogue and preserve an oppressive economic foundation.

Neubauer 12 (Robert J, is a Phd Student at the School of Communications at Simon Fraser University, Vancouver “Dialogue, Monologue, or Something in Between? Neoliberal Think Tanks in the Americas,” http://ijoc.org/ojs/index.php/ijoc/article/viewfile/1481/789)

As Mato (1997, 2003, 2005, 2008) notes, transnational networks are rarely entirely unified, as elites emerge from different nations with their own institutions, histories, cultures, and political priorities. It is thereby telling that one Dialogue publication from 2009 states that “our membership is politically diverse,” including both “Republicans and Democrats from the United States,” as well as supporters of various “parties and political perspectives from elsewhere in the Americas” (IAD, 2009). This diverse ideological and regional representation may account for the fact that many of the IAD’s Latin directors do not consider themselves neoliberals, with some serving in nominally social democratic governments. As President of Chile, Lagos oversaw the establishment of national unemployment insurance and expansions in public education (ICG, n.d.), while Foxley has argued that states “must develop some kind of social protection for those who are left out of the process of globalization” (Public Broadcasting Service [PBS], 2001). Given this divergence from neoliberal orthodoxy, it is plausible that the Dialogue aims to smooth out tensions and establish a rolling consensus around a reform agenda. This may be made easier in that virtually all Dialogue directors emerge from the economic and political institutions of the transnational neoliberal bloc and state apparatus. Tellingly, there neither seems to be labor representatives nor any members of the New Left among the IAD’s Latin directorate. Therefore, it should be unsurprising that even the Dialogue’s “social democrats” seem to have embraced the overall project of regional neoliberalization. For instance, Foxley has come to “appreciate the strength and the power of the market,” even grudgingly commending Pinochet’s economic program for “deregulating the markets” and “opening up the economy” (PBS, 2001). Regardless of occasional social democratic rhetoric, directors have been intimately involved with processes of neoliberal restructuring and transnational state consolidation. Many have worked in top-level posts with neoliberal IFIs: Director David de Ferranti served as a World Bank Vice-President (Results for Development Institute, n.d.); Foxley was a Governor of the World Bank and the IADB (CGD, n.d.); and Iglesias served as President of the IADB (n.d.) for 17 years. Other directors have been involved with neoliberal privatizations. As President of Brazil, Cardoso oversaw the most sweeping privatization program in the country’s history (Epstein, 1998; View from RBC, 2012). He was instrumental in the 1997 privatization of CVRD, now the world’s second largest mining corporation (and a key holding of Dialogue funder AIG). Cardoso also oversaw the 1998 break-up of Telebras, Latin America's biggest telecommunications firm. Board members have also facilitated transnational state formation through the negotiation and implementation of regional free trade agreements. As president of Chile, Lagos signed “expansive trade agreements with the United States, the European Union and South Korea” (Armington, Lettieri, & Slim, 2005); Iglesias chaired the Uruguay Round of GATT negotiations that gave birth to the WTO (IADB, 2010); and Hills served as chief U.S. trade negotiator during the negotiations for NAFTA and the Uruguay Round, at one time declaring that the United States would open up foreign markets “with a crowbar, if necessary” (Uchitelle, 1990).

#### The perm stops current anti-neoliberal movements --- refuse the belief that alternative social orders must be anchored to political movements aimed at institutions --- only explicitly changing social relations before political relations can change the world

Massimo De Angelis 12, Professor of Political Economy and Development at the University of East London, 2012, “Crises, Movements and Commons,” Borderlands E-Journal, Vol. 11, No. 2, p. <http://www.borderlands.net.au/vol11no2_2012/deangelis_crises.pdf>

I begin by arguing that first, in order to ground this question in the broad field of power relations, we must have an understanding of the systemic forces we are up against. Second, the fact that these are systemic forces implies that struggles—even if they seek a radical transformation of the system and even when ‘victorious’—can be absorbed and become part of the system (co-opted), thus renewing it and sustaining it. This gives rise to the first fallacy we have to guard from, what I term the fallacy of the political. This is the belief that a political recomposition following sustained social movements could generate and sustain, through any sort of political representation, a radical change in social relations and systems of social reproduction. I argue this is not possible given the (adaptive) nature of capitalist system. Together with two other fallacies that I briefly discuss (of the model and of the subject) the fallacy of the political points crucially at the need to distinguish between social and political revolution or, in terms of the systems that need to underpin these in order to sustain social and political revolution, between commons and movements. This paper thus discusses the relation between these two (correspondent to the first two contemporary development I have identified above). Commons have as a first goal that of addressing directly the various needs of reproduction of different communities by mobilising the natural and creative resources at their disposal or that they are able to identify and reclaim from other social forces. Often these resources may be pooled across a community (an association for example), but they can also be reclaimed from the detritus left by capital’s accumulation (such as Argentinean cooperatives in factories abandoned by their owners, or empty buildings or land left aside for speculative purposes) or by mass movements against their privatisation (like the Bolivian ‘water war’ in 2001 that saw the mobilisation of grassroots water associations initiating a mass movement). If commons have a long tradition of turning into movements, on the other hand social movements of protest mobilise resources to put forward claims to the state so as to prevent cut in entitlements or demand their extension. Recent movements such as the Arab Spring in 2011 and the Occupy movement in 2011-2012 showed that movements do this by pooling resources and coordinating actions and decisions through inclusive and horizontal decision making processes. Movements therefore are based on commons—without which they could not have materiality—and commons require movements to keep capital’s claims at bay and extend their organisational and productive reach. In the literature on social movements or commons this broad relationship between commons and movements is insufficiently problematised and theorised. To offer an example from the literature on commons, the seminal extensive work of Elinor Ostrom so much focused on the sustainability of commons, offers little guidance on the need for commons to organize vis-à-vis external social forces such as capital in order to be sustainable.1 In what follows, by discussing some relations between commons, movements, and capital, I aim at a first tentative answer to the meta-question: our world can be changed by developing a new mode of production (social revolution through commons) while keeping at bay the old one and reclaiming resources from it (political revolution, through movements).

### Alt

#### The Cuban model represents an effective alternative logic to neoliberalism – it resolves social inequality and environmental destruction while creating high levels of education and health care

Fanelli 8

( Carlo Department of Sociology, York University “‘Cubanalismo’: The Cuban Alternative to Neoliberalism” New Proposals: Journal of Marxism and Interdisciplinary Inquiry, Vol.2, No. 1 (November 2008) Pp. 7-16)//AY

Alternatives to Neoliberalism Do Exist: Limitations, Future Research and Conclusion

As this paper has attempted to integrate through- out this discussion, alternatives to neoliberalism do, in fact, exist. The anti-neoliberal declaration that¶ “another world is possible” simultaneously repre- sents the growing distrust and cynicism in regards to neoliberalism, as well as the mounting optimism that change on a local, national and regional level is achievable. Through struggle, trial and error, mis- takes along the way, and intermittent uncertainties about the success of the revolution, Cubanalismo remains a work in progress that is yet to fully mature. Whereas neoliberalism emerged in the mid-10s as a dominant player in the realm of domestic and foreign policy, this ideology has long standing, deep, and historical roots that date back to classical liber- alism. When considering the material realities of the two frameworks, however, in the case of private-led growth versus state-led development, Cubanalismo has implemented policies that attempt to achieve the “greatest good for the greatest number of peo- ple,” while neoliberalism has all too often created “wealth for some and poverty for many.”When com- paring environment policies, Cubanalismo not only establishes and enforces environmental laws, but also considers the consequences of inaction on people’s health, well-being and social relations. Neoliberalism, on the other hand, considers environmental policies to be a barrier to economic growth and accumulation. When comparing healthcare and education poli-¶ cies, the US (neoliberal) and Cuban (Cubanalismo) citizenry are nearly parallel. The difference is that Cubanalismo offers free and universal healthcare and education for all, whereas neoliberalism treats social expenditures as a commodity to be purchased, consumed and repurchased, which often creates severe differences in accessibility, scope and imple- mentation. Lastly, when comparing the F TAA with ALBA, free trade for the purpose of capital accumu- lation and profit maximization is matched up against needs-based trade for the purpose of self-sufficiency, independence, and the improvement of health and living conditions.¶ Although this paper has presented Cubanalismo as a workable alternative to neoliberalism, it is in no way the only alternative. Rather, Cubanalismo is an example of one tiny Caribbean nation’s efforts to achieve a greater level of equality, prosperity and affluence for the majority of its citizenry and has, in only half a century since the revolution, achieved substantial improvements in healthcare, educa- tion, the economy, and the overall quality of life that few nations in the Global South have been able to achieve. Although the bulk of this paper has focused on comparing the social, environmental and economic realities of Cubanalismo and neoliber- alism, it has omitted significant issues such as race, gender, religion and ethnicity, which constitute sig- nificant and valuable areas for future research. In addition, future explorations may strive to consider how Cubanalismo relates to the larger global strug- gle against neoliberalism as countries of the periphery struggle for equality, subsistence and sovereignty. The significance of Cubanalismo is that it has resisted the pull of neoliberalism, and that regional solidarity in direct confrontation to neoliberalism is transform- ing and challenging the dominant ideologies of the Global North. Through unity, struggle and soli- darity Cubanalismo has demonstrated that despite overwhelming pressure and coercion from the most powerful nation-states alternative modes of socio- economic and environmental polices can and do continue to exist.

### Case

**Their strategy for addressing US hypocracy is fundamentally flawed- Criticism of American exceptionalism that focuses on US war-making ignores the systemic practices of state vio- lence domestically, reproduces exceptionalist lens undergirding US state violence and mass violence of border militarization of the US prison system.**

**Ill finish Lloyd**

Criticism of American exceptionalism that focuses on US war-making and empire building abroad, but ignores the systemic practices of state vio- lence domestically, **reproduces exceptionalist lens undergirding US state violence wherever it is practiced**. What disappears in plain sight is the mass violence of border militarization responsible for the deaths of thousands of migrants and a US prison system whose population of 2.3 million people ri- vals that of the nation’s fourth largest city, Houston, Texas. In the US, “governing through crime” builds on and ratifies anti-Black racism, while also serving to police and thereby constitute **gender and sexual difference** (Sub- dury, 2005; Incite!, 2006). Yet, the centrality of confronting anti-Black ra- cism is not frequently understood as fundamental to also ending **Native colonization and genocide and war** (Smith, 2006; Smith, 2010). This makes challenging the systematic, domestic practices of state violence, a site where its exercise is most hegemonic, fundamental to undermining the legal categorizations that create race and structure grievability.

Focus on the plight of particular supposedly innocent bodies legitmates the domestic supermax and actively prevents systemic criticism

Carlton 8 (Bree Carlton Faculty of Arts Monash University, “Isolation as Counter‐Insurgency: Supermax Prisons and the War on Terror” Proceedings of the 2nd Australian & New Zealand Critical Criminology Conference 19 - 20 June 2008 Sydney, Australia)

Conclusion

This paper has sought to highlight continuities and distinctions between the current treatment of unconvicted terror suspects and other prisoners in civil systems. Moreover, it has outlined the manner in which isolation has been administered as an institutional form of counter‐insurgency or **weapon of war**. Ultimately this paper has argued that coercive practices associated with punitive isolation are central to the institutional operation of power and punishment within high‐security and the official project of behavioural modification and control. The brutal treatment of civil prisoners buried in isolation, however, is rarely countenanced because prisoners are considered ‘beyond redemption and rehabilitation’ (Scraton and Moore, 2005). Their punishment is quietly regarded as defensible, a form of natural justice necessitated by their criminality and dangerousness. On the other hand the treatment of unconvicted terror suspects and the Pendennis defendants more specifically operates as a strategic official performance on two levels. First, it serves as a powerful legitimising exercise for officials. Second it inspires critical commentary and outrage focused around human rights, the lawfulness of conditions and treatment imposed upon those who are **unconvicted and potentially innocent**. While such contributions have made considerable gains for individual cases, there remains a need to confront and **question more comprehensively the extent in which conditions that give rise to abusive excesses in prison are systemic**. The examination of **individual abuse** cases and conditions can **never produce the systemic reform needed** because they are premised on the assumption that **high‐ security institutions are governed by law, transparency and accountability when the documented reality is that they are not.**

**Turns the aff**

Davis 5 (Angela, *Abolition Democracy*, p. 68-76)

In your work on prisonsyou have noted that sexual coercion is fun- damental to prison regimes. The Guantdnamo and Abu Ghraib sexual torture revelations, however, are implanting the idea that such extremes only occur offshore and are rare occurrences. It is as though the prison-industrial system had duplicated itself out- side the States in order to divert attention from the everyday domestic reality of torture and sexual coercion.

The prison-industrial-complex embraces a vast set of institutions from the obvious ones, such as the prisons and the various places of incarceration such as jails, "jails in Indian country," immigrant detention centers, and military prisons to corpora- tions that profit from prison labor or from the sale of products that enable imprisonment, media, other government agencies, etc. **Ideologies play a central role** in consolidating the prison- industrial-complex—for example the marketing of the idea that prisons are necessary to democracy and that they are a major component of the solution of social problems. Through- out the world, racism has become embedded in imprisonment practices: whether in the U.S., Australia, or Europe, you will dis- cover a disproportionate number of people of color and peo- ple from the Global South incarcerated in jails and prisons. The everyday tortures experienced by the inhabitants of domestic prisons in the U.S. have **enabled the justification of the treatment meted out to prisoners** in Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo. As I said earlier, it was hardly accidental that a U.S. prison guard like Charles Graner was recruited to work in Abu Ghraib. He was already familiar with the many ways prison objectifies and dehumanizes its inhabitants.

Yes, this is actually in one of the official reports. It was pointed out that the military actually appointed Graner because of his experience.

Exactly. So the connections do not have to be made from the outside. They are already there to be discovered. As I said before, this is a person whom they must have known had already been the target of at least two lawsuits. In one suit, Graner was accused of throwing a detained man on the floor, kicking and beating him, and placing razorblades in his food. In another lawsuit he was accused of picking up a detainee by the feet and throwing him into a cell.

## 1NR

### Framework OV

**Our interpretation is that the affirmative team should instrumentally defend topical action – this means they need to provide an example of the resolution is a good idea – that’s key to clash – this isn’t an agreement tournament – debates require clash in order to have any value – our impact is decision making – a limited topic is necessary to solve decision making skills – the basis for argumentation needs to be defined in order for there to be clear grounds for argumentation – it’s a question of predictability – if the negative can’t predict what the aff chooses to talk about, it becomes a gripe session where we don’t actually formulate policy in order to solve the problems that exist – clash over an area of controversy is necessary for the policy formulation process which spills over – formulating policies in debate makes us better decision makers in life – that’s Steinberg and Freely – this outweighs –only portable skill - we may not be policy makers later in life, but *no matter what occupation we choose to take*, decision making will be an integral part of being engaged citizens. It’s not about what we learn, but how we learn it. We’ll forget most of the individual pieces of knowledge in this debate, but we’ll remember the skills we employed to answer them.**

Avari et al ‘4

[J. Prof Natural Resources at OSU. “Teaching Students to Make Better Decisions about the Environment: Lessons from Decision Sciences” Journal of Environmental Education, Vol 36 N 1. 2004 Ebsco//GBS-JV]

How do we achieve this goal of facilitating more thoughtful decisions? One strategy involves improving students’ technical knowledge base (e.g., in biology, ecology, chemistry) as a means of creating favorable attitudes toward the promotion of better environmental quality (Ramsey & Rickson, 1976). As many researchers have pointed out, however, focusing on enhancing technical **knowledge without** also teaching problem-solving skills will lead to substantial shortcomings with respect to promoting thoughtful decisions (e.g., see Hungerford, Peyton, & Wilke, 1980). An obvious solution, therefore, is to include in curricula elements that address the need for knowledge about both natural systems and “action” (i.e., decision-making) skills (Simmons, 1991). Yet, as Hungerford and Volk (1990) point out, focusing on the role of human judgments and behavior (in addition to enhancing technical knowledge) in the context of the environment makes instructional planning extremely difficult. In many cases, the added difficulty acts as a deterrent to these integrated curricula and provides de facto reinforcement for the model that enhanced knowledge leads to better decisions. One suggested strategy for overcoming this difficulty is to teach students the skills to critically analyze environmental issues (e.g., how to articulate research questions, obtain information from primary and secondary sources, and interpret data). At the end of such an exercise, students work on the development of “issue-resolution action plans” and then “decide whether they want to actually implement the plan of action” (Hungerford & Volk, 1990, p. 16). We view such an approach as laudable. We would take this suggestion a step further, however, and add that just as students must learn skills for critical analysis, so too must they learn skills for decision making (which includes developing alternative courses of action and making decisions about implementation). Learning these decision-making skills involves two steps: First, students (and in many cases, teachers) must be taught to recognize common obstacles to thoughtful (or high-quality) decision making. Second, they must acquire skills to overcome them. These obstacles and skills are the focus of this article.