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#### China’s influence in Latin America is outpacing the US – its zero sum

**Montesinos, 1/2** – Spanish Reporter correspondent CubaDebate in Madrid (Patricio, “U.S. hysterical with global influence of China and Latin America”, 2014, Cuba Inside the World, http://cubainsidetheworld.wordpress.com/2014/01/02/u-s-hysterical-with-global-influence-of-china-and-latin-america/)//VP

The crumbling empire of [the United States](http://translate.googleusercontent.com/translate_c?depth=1&hl=es&langpair=es%7Cen&rurl=translate.google.com&u=http://www.cubadebate.cu/etiqueta/estados-unidos/&usg=ALkJrhj980D6ZCJK6K_kM41ydCcoJHmIBw) is hysterical and desperate to feed the growing international [China](http://translate.googleusercontent.com/translate_c?depth=1&hl=es&langpair=es%7Cen&rurl=translate.google.com&u=http://www.cubadebate.cu/etiqueta/china/&usg=ALkJrhif5xJ0icJL7EDy4FwwN7PvHEMWUA) and its influence in Latin America, the region is still considered by [White House](http://translate.googleusercontent.com/translate_c?depth=1&hl=es&langpair=es%7Cen&rurl=translate.google.com&u=http://www.cubadebate.cu/etiqueta/casa-blanca/&usg=ALkJrhgpdVGWoWyyPEyUvxOH1FmSnsfa8w) its backyard, and where Beijing intensifies its political, economic and trade ties. According to experts, there are many examples showing that the Asian giant snatches field worldwide to Washington, and particularly in Latin America, to the detriment of the old American dominance on the Patria Grande. China has increased its ties in all spheres with Latin American countries involved in revolutionary processes, such as Venezuela, Bolivia, Nicaragua, Ecuador and Cuba, to name a few, and undertakes joint mega economic and social development in these countries. Among the most recent, the “Big House” in Venezuela, the inter-oceanic canal and railway in Nicaragua and Bolivia, respectively, and the assembly of cars in Cuba, among others already materialized or running.

#### Bolstering US engagement with Cuba undermines China’s presence in the region

Benjamin-Alvadaro ‘6 (Jonathan, Report for the Cuban Research Institute, Florida International University, PhD, Professor of Political Science at University of Nebraska at Omaha, Director of the Intelligence Community Centers of Academic Excellence Program at UNO, Treasurer of the American Political Science Association, “The Current Status and Future Prospects for Oil Exploration in Cuba: A Special,” <http://cri.fiu.edu/research/commissioned-reports/oil-cuba-alvarado.pdf>)

Additionally, Venezuela remains the fourth largest importer of oil to the United States and one can surmise that the existing trade arrangements between the U.S. and Venezuela will remain intact, the evolution of the Bolivarian revolution under Chavez and a growing Chinese presence in the region notwithstanding. Additionally, pursuing such a path would allow United States policymakers to take advantage of what Cuba has to offer in the following areas: domestic technical capabilities; continuing human capital development; strategic positioning in the Caribbean, and an improved diplomatic stature. Cuba, by any measure, possesses a largely untapped technical capacity owing to advanced training and education in the core mathematic and scientific areas. This was clearly demonstrated by its attempt to develop a nuclear energy capability in the 1980s and 1990s whereby thousands of Cubans pursued highly technical career paths leaving Cuba with among the highest ratios of scientists and engineers to the general population in all of the Americas. Moreover, the foundation of Cuba’s vaunted public education system remains intact and increased investment under various scenarios suggests that Cuba will continue to produce a welleducated workforce that will be critical to its future economic vitality. This raises an important consideration that being the role that Cuba will play in the region in the 21st century. It suffices to say that Cuba remains the strategically important state by virtue of its geographical location alone, in efforts against drug and human trafficking and related national and regional security matters. The extent to which a stable Cuban government has cooperated with the U.S. in drug interdiction efforts in the past suggests that the results from improved diplomatic relations between neighbors would have the effect of improving national security concerns related to terrorist activity, illicit weapons transfers and the like. Ultimately, a successful normalization of relations between the U.S. and Cuba in these areas may well enhance and stabilize regional relations that could possibly lessen (or at a minimum, balancing) fears of a Chinese incursion in hemispheric affairs. To lessen those fears it may be useful to review the present structure of joint-venture projects in the energy sector in Cuba to ascertain the feasibility and possible success of such an undertaking become available to American firms. Moreover, it is interesting to note that U.S. firms in the agriculture sector have successfully negotiated and consummated sales to Cuba totaling more than $1 billion dollars over the past four years under conditions that are less than optimal circumstances but have well-served the commercial interests of all parties involved.

#### Chinese influence controls every existential scenario for extinction

**Zhang ’12** (Prof of Diplomacy and IR at the Geneva School of Diplomacy. “The Rise of China’s Political Softpower” 9/4/12 http://www.china.org.cn/opinion/2012-09/04/content\_26421330.htm)

As China plays an increasingly significant role in the world, its soft power must be attractive both domestically as well as internationally. The world faces many difficulties, including widespread poverty, international conflict, the clash of civilizations and environmental protection. Thus far, the Western model has not been able to decisively address these issues; the China model therefore brings hope that we can make progress in conquering these dilemmas. Poverty and development The Western-dominated global economic order has worsened poverty in developing countries. Per-capita consumption of resources in developed countries is 32 times as large as that in developing countries. Almost half of the population in the world still lives in poverty. Western countries nevertheless still are striving to consolidate their wealth using any and all necessary means. In contrast, China forged a new path of development for its citizens in spite of this unfair international order which enabled it to virtually eliminate extreme poverty at home. This extensive experience would indeed be helpful in the fight against global poverty. War and peace In the past few years, the American model of "exporting democracy'" has produced a more turbulent world, as the increased risk of terrorism threatens global security. In contrast, China insists that "harmony is most precious". It is more practical, the Chinese system argues, to strengthen international cooperation while addressing both the symptoms and root causes of terrorism. The clash of civilizations Conflict between Western countries and the Islamic world is intensifying. "In a world, which is diversified and where multiple civilizations coexist, the obligation of Western countries is to protect their own benefits yet promote benefits of other nations," wrote Harvard University professor Samuel P. Huntington in his seminal 1993 essay "The Clash of Civilizations?". China strives for "being harmonious yet remaining different", which means to respect other nations, and learn from each other. This philosophy is, in fact, wiser than that of Huntington, and it's also the reason why few religious conflicts have broken out in China. China's stance in regards to reconciling cultural conflicts, therefore, is more preferable than its "self-centered" Western counterargument. Environmental protection Poorer countries and their people are the most obvious victims of global warming, yet they are the least responsible for the emission of greenhouse gases. Although Europeans and Americans have a strong awareness of environmental protection, it is still hard to change their extravagant lifestyles. Chinese environmental protection standards are not yet ideal, but some effective environmental ideas can be extracted from the China model. Perfecting the China model The China model is still being perfected, but its unique influence in dealing with the above four issues grows as China becomes stronger. China's experiences in eliminating poverty, prioritizing modernization while maintaining traditional values, and creating core values for its citizens demonstrate our insight and sense of human consciousness. Indeed, the success of the China model has not only brought about China's rise, but also a new trend that can't be explained by Western theory. In essence, the rise of China is the rise of China's political soft power, which has significantly helped China deal with challenges, assist developing countries in reducing poverty, and manage global issues. As the China model improves, it will continue to surprise the world.
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#### Interpretation – Economic engagement has to be government to government

**Daga, 13** - director of research at Politicas Publicas para la Libertad, in Bolivia, and a visiting senior policy analyst at the Heritage Foundation (Sergio, “Economics of the 2013-2014 Debate Topic:

U.S. Economic Engagement Toward Cuba, Mexico or Venezuela”, National Center for Policy Analysis, 5/15, <http://www.ncpa.org/pdfs/Message_to_Debaters_6-7-13.pdf>)

Economic engagement between or among countries can take many forms, but this document will focus on government-to-government engagement through 1) international trade agreements designed to lower barriers to trade; and 2) government foreign aid; next, we will contrast government-to-government economic engagement with private economic engagement through 3) international investment, called foreign direct investment; and 4) remittances and migration by individuals. All of these areas are important with respect to the countries mentioned in the debate resolution; however, when discussing economic engagement by the U.S. federal government, some issues are more important with respect to some countries than to others

Violation – they only phase out sanctions
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#### **Engagement is the lynchpin of neoliberal expansion into Cuba**

**Wenston & Woods ’08** – Trotskyist political theorist and author and leading members of the International Marxist Tendency (Fred & Alan, “[Vultures hovering over Cuba after Fidel Castro steps down](http://www.cjournal.info/2008/02/20/vultures-hovering-over-cuba-after-fidel-castro-steps-down/)”, http://www.cjournal.info/2008/02/20/vultures-hovering-over-cuba-after-fidel-castro-steps-down/)//VP

They all pretend to be democrats when it comes to Cuba. In reality they are like vultures waiting for the day they can get their beaks and claws into the flesh of Cuba. What they are after is the end of the economic system brought into being by the Cuban revolution. They want capitalism to return to Cuba. That is what they mean by “democracy”! Another fashionable term these days is “engagement”. While Bush sticks to his guns and insists on the embargo being stepped up, the more intelligent bourgeois, both in the USA and Europe are raising the need for “engagement”, i.e. on removing the embargo and opening up trade channels. Does this wing of the bourgeois have different interests or aims? No, they simply understand better than Bush and his obtuse circle of friends that the best way to re-introduce capitalism into Cuba is to lift the embargo, begin trading, flood Cuba with cash and let the process unfold.¶ That is why it is even more disgusting when we hear some reformist elements on the left advocating such “engagement”.What they are actually doing is giving the bourgeois advice on how to remove this thorn in their side**.¶** All this talk of democracy is in fact a cover for the real aims of imperialism. Not so long ago the Financial Times was giving more sober advice. They were suggesting a “Chinese road” for Cuba accompanied by a lifting of the US-sponsored embargo. The Chinese model would envisage an opening up of Cuba to capitalism accompanied by a firm grip on state power at the top.

#### Neoliberalism causes extinction

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

GENDER MODIFIED

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

#### The alternative is to reject the 1ac to interrogate neoliberal economic engagement with latin America from the starting point of knowledge production- that is a prerequisite to breaking down neoliberalism

**Walsh, 12** – Estudios Culturales Latinoamericanos de la Universidad Andina Simón Bolívar (Catherine, “The Politics of Naming”, Cultural Studies, 26.1, Project Muse)//VP

Cultural Studies, in our project, is constructed and understood as more than a field of ‘study’. It is broadly understand as a formation, a field of possibility and expression. And it is constructed as a space of encounter between disciplines and intellectual, political and ethical projects that seek to combat what Alberto Moreiras called the impoverishment of thought driven by divisions (disciplinary, epistemological, geographic, etc.) and the socio-political-cultural fragmentation that increasingly makes social change and intervention appear to be divided forces (Moreiras 2001). As such, Cultural Studies is conceived as a place of plural-, inter-, transand in-disciplinary (or undisciplined) critical thinking that takes as major concern the intimate relationships between culture, knowledge, politics and economics mentioned earlier, and that sees the problems of the region as both local and global. It is a space from which to search for ways of thinking, knowing, comprehending, feeling and acting that permit us to intervene and influence: a field that makes possible convergence and articulation, particularly between efforts, practices, knowledge and projects that focus on more global justice, on differences (epistemic, ontological, existential, of gender, ethnicity, class, race, nation, among others) constructed as inequalities within the framework of neo-liberal capitalism. It is a place that seeks answers, encourages intervention and engenders projects and proposals. It is in this frame of understanding and practice in our Ph.D. programme in Latin-American Cultural Studies at the Universidad Andina Simo´n Bolı´var, that this broad description-definition continues to take on more concrete characteristics. Here I can identify three that stand out: the inter-cultural, the inter-epistemic and the de-colonial. The inter-cultural has been and still is a central axis in the struggles and processes of social change in the Andean region. Its critical meaning was first affirmed near the end of the 1980s in the Ecuadorian indigenous movement’s political project. Here inter-culturality was positioned as an ideological principal grounded in the urgent need for a radical transformation of social structures, institutions and relationships, not only for indigenous peoples but also for society as a whole. Since then, inter-culturality has marked a social, political, ethical project and process that is also epistemological;6 a project and a process that seek to re-found the bases of the nation and national culture, understood as homogenous and mono-cultural. Such call for re-founding does not to simply add diversity to what is already established, but rather to rethink, rebuild and inter-culturalize the nation and national culture, and with in the terrains of knowledge, politics and life-based visions. It is this understanding of the inter-cultural that is of interest. Concretely, we are interested in the spaces of agency, creation, innovation and encounter between and among different subjects, knowledges, practices and visions. Referring to our project of Cultural Studies as (inter)Cultural Studies, enables and encourages us to think from this region, from the struggles, practices and processes that question Eurocentric, colonial and imperial legacies, and work to transform and create radically different conditions for thinking, encountering, being and coexisting or co-living. In a similar fashion, the inter-epistemic focuses on the need to question, interrupt and transgress the Euro-USA-centric epistemological frameworks that dominate Latin-American universities and even some Cultural Studies programmes. To think with knowledges produced in Latin America and the Caribbean (as well as in other ‘Souths’, including those located in the North) and by intellectuals who come not only from academia, but also from other projects, communities and social movements are, for us, a necessary and essential step, both in de-colonization and in creating other conditions of knowledge and understanding. Our project, thus, concerns itself with the work of inverting the geopolitics of knowledge, with placing attention on the historically subjugated and negated plurality of knowledge, logics and rationalities, and with the political-intellectual effort to create relationships, articulations and convergences between them. The de-colonial element is intimately related to the two preceding points. Here our interest is, on one hand, to make evident the thoughts, practices and experiences that both in the past and in the present have endeavoured to challenge the colonial matrix of power and domination, and to exist in spite of it, in its exterior and interior. By colonial matrix, we refer to the hierarchical system of racial civilizational classification that has operated and operates at different levels of life, including social identities (the superiority of white, heterosexual males), ontological-existential contexts (the dehumanization of indigenous and black peoples), epistemic contexts (the positioning of Euro-centrism as the only perspective of knowledge, thereby disregarding other epistemic rationalities), and cosmological (the control and/or negation of the ancestral-spiritual-territorial-existential bases that govern the life-systems of ancestral peoples, most especially those of African Diaspora and of Abya Yala) (see Quijano 1999). At the centre or the heart of this matrix is capitalism as the only possible model of civilization; the imposed social classification, the idea of ‘humanity’, the perspective of knowledge and the prototype life-system that goes with it defines itself through this capitalistic civilizational lens. As Quijano argues, by defending the interests of social domination and the exploitation of work under the hegemony of capital, ‘the ‘‘racialization’’ and the ‘‘capitalization’’ of social relationships of these models of power, and the ‘‘eurocentralization’’ of its control, are in the very roots of our present problems of identity,’ in Latin America as countries, ‘nations’ and States (Quijano 2006). It is precisely because of this that we consider the de-colonial to be a fundamental perspective. Within our project, the de-colonial does not seek to establish a new paradigm or line of thought but a critically-conscious understanding of the past and present that opens up and suggests questions, perspectives and paths to explore. As such, and on the other hand, we are interested in stimulating methodologies and pedagogies that, in the words of Jacqui Alexander (2005), cross the fictitious boundaries of exclusion and marginalization to contribute to the configuration of new ways of being and knowing rooted not in alterity itself, but in the principles of relation, complement and commitment. It is also to encourage other ways of reading, investigating and researching, of seeing, knowing, feeling, hearing and being, that challenge the singular reasoning of western modernity, make tense our own disciplinary frameworks of ‘study’ and interpretation, and persuade a questioning from and with radically distinct rationalities, knowledge, practices and civilizational-life-systems. It is through these three pillars of the inter-cultural, the inter-epistemic and the de-colonial that we attempt to understand the processes, experiences and struggles that are occurring in Latin America and elsewhere. But it is also here that we endeavour to contribute to and learn from the complex relationships between culture-politics-economics, knowledge and power in the world today; to unlearn to relearn from and with perspectives otherwise. Practices, experiences and challenges In this last section, my interest is to share some of the particularities of our doctorate programme/project, now in its third cycle; its achievements and advancements; and the challenges that it faces in an academic context, increasingly characterized regionally and internationally, by disciplinarity, depolitization, de-subjectivation, apathy, competitive individualism and nonintervention. Without a doubt, one of the unique characteristics of the programme/ project is its students: all mid-career professionals mainly from the Andean region and from such diverse fields as the social sciences, humanities, the arts, philosophy, communication, education and law. The connection that the majority of the students have with social and cultural movements and/or processes, along with their dedication to teaching or similar work, helps to contribute to dynamic debate and discussion not always seen in academia and post-graduate programmes. Similarly, the faculty of the programme stand out for being internationally renowned intellectuals, and, the majority, for their commitment to struggles of social transformation, critical thinking and the project of the doctorate itself. The curriculum offering is based on courses and seminars that seek to foment thinking from Latin American and with its intellectuals in all of their diversity comprehend, confront and affect the problems and realities of the region, which are not only local but global. The pedagogical methodological perspective aforementioned works to stimulate processes of collective thought and allow the participants to think from related formations, experiences and research topics and to think with the differences disciplinary, geographical, epistemic and subjective thereby fracturing individualism by dialoguing, transgressing and inter-crossing boundaries. Trans-disciplinarity, as such, is a fundamental position and process in our project. The fact that the graduate students come from an array of different backgrounds provides a plurality in which the methodologicalpedagogical practice becomes the challenge of collectively thinking, crossing disciplinary backgrounds and creating new positions and perspectives, conceived and formed in a trans-disciplinary way. The majority of courses, seminars and professors, also assume that this is a necessary challenge in today’s world when no single discipline and no single intellectual is capable alone of analyzing, comprehending or transforming social reality. Nevertheless, trans-disciplinary gains continue to be a point of criticism and contention, especially given the present trend to re-discipline the LatinAmerican university. As Edgardo Lander has argued (2000a), this tendency reflects the neo-liberalization of higher education, as well as the increasing conservatism of intellectuals, including those that previously identified as or to continue to identify themselves as progressives and/or leftists. To establish oneself in a discipline or presume truth through a discipline, a common practice today, is to reinstall the geopolitics of knowing. This, in turn, strengthens Euro-USA-centrism as ‘the place’ of theory and knowledge. As such, the subject of dispute is not simply the trans-disciplinary aspect of Cultural Studies but also its ‘indisciplinary’ nature, that is, the effort central to our project to include points of view that come from Latin America and thinkers who are not always connected to academia (see Walsh et al. 2002). Our interest is not, as some claim, to facilitate the agendas or cultural agency of subaltern groups or social movements, promote activism or simply include other knowledge forms, but instead to build a different political-intellectual project a political-intellectual project otherwise. Such project gives centrality to the need to learn to think from, together and with Latin American reality and its actors, thereby stimulating convergences, articulations and inter-culturalizations that aim at creating an academia that is committed to life itself. Such a perspective does not eliminate or deny knowledge conceived in Europe or North America usually named as ‘universal’ or its proponents and thinkers. Instead, it incorporates such knowledge as part of a broader canon and worldview that seeks pluriversality, recognizing the importance of places and loci of enunciation. For our project, all of this serves to highlight the doubly complicated situation that is still in flux. On one hand, there is the negative association with trans-disciplinarity and the academic suppositions that accompany it, particularly in the area of research; this requires that our theses be doubly rigorous. And, on the other hand, there is the geopolitical limitation not only of disciplines but also of academic disciplining. To argue, as we do, that knowledge and thought are also produced outside of universities and, in dialogue with Hall, that political movements also produce and provoke theoretic moments and movements, is to question and challenge the academic logic and the authority of a universal and singular reasoning and science. We will, through such questioning and challenges, always be marginalized, placed on the fringe, under a microscope, criticized and disputed. Because of this, the challenges that we have encountered have been many. On one hand, there are those challenges that many face in the Latin-American academic context: the real difficulties of financing, infrastructure and research support. On the other hand, are the challenges that come with the traditional academic disciplinary structure, its de-politization and de-subjectification. Here the challenge is to transgress the established norms of neutrality, distance and objectivity. It is also to confront the standards that give little relevance to historically subjugated groups, practices and knowledges, and to the interlinking of race, ethnicity, gender and sexuality with the structures and models of power and knowledge. It is to make evident past and present struggles that give real meaning to the arguments of heterogeneity, decoloniality and inter-culturality. Here the criticism and dispute comes from many sides: from those who describe these efforts as too politicized (and, as such, supposedly less ‘academic’), uni-paradigmatic (supposedly limited to only one ‘line of thought’), fundamentalist (supposedly exclusionary of those subjects not marked by the colonial wound) and as obsessed with conflict (and therefore far from the tradition of ‘culture’, its letters and object of study). These challenges together with the tensions, criticisms and disputes that they mark often times make the path more difficult. Still, and at the same time, they allow us to clarify the distinctive and unique aspects of our project and its motivations to continue with its course of construction, insurgence and struggle. Our concern here is not so much with the institutionalizing of Cultural Studies. Better yet, and in a much broader fashion, we are concerned with epistemic inter-culturalization, with the de-colonialization and pluriversalization of the ‘university’, and with a thinking from the South(s). To place these concerns, as argued here, within a perspective and a politics of naming: ‘(inter)Cultural Studies in de-colonial code,’ is to open, not close, paths. Conclusion In concluding the reflections I have presented here, it is useful to return to a fundamental point touched by Stuart Hall: ‘intervention’. In particular and with Hall, I refer to the will to intervene in and transform the world, an intervention that does not simply relate to social and political contexts and fields, but also to epistemology and theory. That is to an intervention and transformation in and a de-colonization of the frameworks and logics of our thinking, knowing and comprehending. To commit oneself in mind, body and spirit as Frantz Fanon argued. To consider Cultural Studies today a project of political vocation and intervention is to position and at the same time build our work on the borders of and the boundaries between university and society. It is to seriously reflect on whom we read and with whom we want and/or need to dialogue and think, to understand the very limits or our knowledge. And precisely because of this, it is to act on our own situation, establishing contacts and exchanges of different kinds in a pedagogicalmethodological zeal to think from and think with, in what I have elsewhere called a critical inter-culturality and de-colonial pedagogy (Walsh 2009). In universities and societies that are increasingly characterized by nonintervention, auto-complacency, individualism and apathy, intervention represents, suggests and promotes a position and practice of involvement, action and complicity. To take on such a position and practice and to make it an integral part of our political-intellectual project is to find not only ethical meaning in work on culture and power, but also to give this work some heart. That is to say, to focus on the ever-greater need and urgency of life. To call these Cultural Studies or critical (inter)Cultural Studies is only one of our options, and part of the politics of naming.
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#### Obama is using PC to hold the line on Iran sanctions now

Haaretz 1/22 Will AIPAC-Obama sanctions clash dent pro-Israel lobby’s clout?, 1/22/14, http://www.haaretz.com/jewish-world/jewish-world-news/1.569900

In previous AIPAC vs. White House dustups, the pro-Israel lobbying group’s strategy was to speak softly and let Congress carry the big stick.¶ But in the American Israel Public Affairs Committee’s face-off with the Obama administration over new Iran sanctions, congressional support may not be so readily available and keeping a low public profile is proving impossible.¶ According to congressional insiders and some of the pro-Israel lobbying group’s former senior executives, AIPAC may soon face a tough choice: Stick out the battle over sanctions and potentially face a reputation-damaging defeat, or reach out to the White House and find a way for both sides to save face.¶ “I don’t believe this is sustainable, the confrontational posture,” said Steve Rosen, a former AIPAC foreign policy chief known for his hawkishness on Iran.¶ The Obama administration has taken a firm line against the sanctions bill backed by AIPAC, warning that the legislation would harm prospects for a achieving a diplomatic solution on the Iranian nuclear issue. Meanwhile, the confrontation has landed AIPAC squarely in the media spotlight and drawn pointed criticism from leading liberal commentators.¶ AIPAC has been stymied by a critical core of Senate Democrats who have sided with the Obama administration in the fight. While AIPAC’s bid to build a veto-busting majority has reached 59 -- eight short of the needed 67 -- it has stalled there in part because Democrats have more or less stopped signing on.¶ Sens. Mark Kirk (R-Ill.) and Robert Menendez (D-N.J.), the bill’s sponsors, rounded up 15 Democrats when the bill was introduced on December 19, just before Congress went on its Christmas recess. Since Congress returned this month, however, they have added just one Democrat, Michael Bennet of Colorado.¶ AIPAC, however, says its bid to pass sanctions is on track.¶ “Our top priority is stopping Iran's nuclear program, and consequently we are very engaged in building support for the Menendez-Kirk bill which now has the bi-partisan co-sponsorship of 59 senators,” AIPAC’s spokesman, Marshall Wittman, wrote in an email to JTA. “This measure would provide our negotiators with critical leverage in their efforts to achieve a peaceful end to Iran's nuclear weapons program.”¶ But in a recent interview with The New Yorker, President Obama appeared confident that backers of the bill would not reach a veto-proof majority.¶ “I don’t think a new sanctions bill will reach my desk during this period, but if it did, I would veto it and expect it to be sustained,” Obama said.¶ A source close to AIPAC said the stall in support for the legislation is due in part to the fact that of 10 committee chairmen opposed to the bill, four are Jewish and have histories of closeness to the pro-Israel community.¶ Non-Jewish lawmakers tend to take their cues on Israel-related issues from their Jewish colleagues -- a common template with lawmakers from other communities -- and this is no different, the source said.¶ AIPAC’s determined push on sanctions is drawing some anger from Democrats. A number of party insiders say that staffers on Capitol Hill are referring openly to AIPAC as an antagonist on the Iran issue in private conversations.¶ “Now it just looks like AIPAC is backing a partisan bill rather than pushing a bipartisan policy to stop Iran," said a former Democratic Hill staffer who deals in Middle Eastern issues and, like many others, asked not to be identified because of the issue’s sensitivity.¶ AIPAC’s efforts have spurred surprisingly blunt criticism from sources that are more known for caution on such matters. The new director of the National Jewish Democratic Council, Rabbi Jack Moline, earlier this month in an interview with JTA accused AIPAC activists of using “strong-arm” tactics on uncommitted senators.¶ Douglas Bloomfield, who served as AIPAC’s legislative director in the 1980s and is now frequently critical of the group, warned that with most Democrats inclined to back Obama on this issue, the confrontational posture taken by AIPAC could wound its reputation down the road.¶ “There could be repercussions across the board with a lot of members of Congress the next time they say they want them to go to the barricades,” he said.¶ AIPAC already is taking some high-profile hits on TV, with liberal commentators accusing the lobby of trying to scuttle a diplomatic settlement with Iran.¶ “The senators from the great state of Israel are against it,” comedian Jon Stewart said last week on “The Daily Show,” accompanied by a graphic of a map of Israel emblazoned with the AIPAC logo. MSNBC host Chris Hayes said the 16 Democratic senators backing the sanctions bill are “afraid” of AIPAC.¶ Rosen said that such exposure, while irritating to AIPAC, would not be a factor in getting the lobby to shift course. More serious would be calls from donors to the group who have ties to Democrats. AIPAC’s reputation as having bipartisan support -- a critical element of its influence -- could be put at risk.¶ “AIPAC puts a premium on bipartisan consensus and maintaining communication with the White House,” said Rosen, who was fired by AIPAC in 2005 after being investigated in a government leak probe, though the resulting charges were dismissed and he later sued AIPAC unsuccessfully for damages.¶ Rosen noted AIPAC’s forthcoming policy conference in March; such conferences routinely feature a top administration official -- the president or vice president, the secretary of state or defense. At least one of these failing to appear “would be devastating to AIPAC’s image of bipartisanship,” he said.¶ A way out for the group would be to quietly negotiate a compromise behind the scenes with the White House, Rosen said.¶ “They don’t want to be seen as backing down,” he said of his former employer, “but the White House is good at helping people backing down without seeming to back down.”¶ AIPAC hardly stands alone in advocating the sanctions, said an official from another Jewish group, noting that support for the bill spanned the breadth of the community from the right-wing Zionist Organization of America to the consensus-oriented Jewish Council for Public Affairs. None of these groups, including AIPAC, wanted a confrontation, the official said.¶ "It's awkward, and the pro-Israel organizations have been looking for a way to climb down from this question,” said the official, who asked not to be identified.¶ However, the official said, the Obama administration has taken a confrontational approach. The official cited a pointed remark by National Security Council spokeswoman Bernadette Meehan who suggested earlier this month that congressional backers of the sanctions legislation actually favor war with Iran and “should be up front with the American public and say so.”¶ “There seems to be a concerted effort by the White House to say we’re not going to blink," said the Jewish organizational official.

**democrats don’t like the plan and it is high visibility**

**LeoGrande, 13** – is a professor in the department of government at American University's School of Public Affairs (William, “The Danger of Dependence: Cuba's Foreign Policy After Chavez”, 02 Apr 2013, http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/12840/the-danger-of-dependence-cubas-foreign-policy-after-chavez)//eek

But the momentum in Washington soon dissipated in the face of more pressing foreign policy priorities, opposition from Congress, even among some Democrats, and resistance from an inertial State Department bureaucracy more comfortable with the familiar policy of the past -- its failure notwithstanding -- than the risk of trying something new. As a former senior State Department official explained, high-visibility foreign policy changes of this magnitude only happen if the president demands that they happen, and Obama's attention was focused elsewhere. In December 2009, Cuba's arrest of Alan Gross, a consultant for the U.S. Agency for International Development's "democracy promotion" programs, brought all progress to a halt. At the end of Obama's first term, relations with Cuba were not much better than at the start.

#### Deal key to prevent war

Shank and Gould 9/12 Michael Shank, Ph.D., is director of foreign policy at the Friends Committee on National Legislation. Kate Gould is legislative associate for Middle East policy at FCNL, No Iran deal, but significant progress in Geneva, 9/12/13, http://communities.washingtontimes.com/neighborhood/cause-conflict-conclusion/2013/nov/12/no-iran-deal-significant-progress-geneva/

Congress should welcome, not stubbornly dismiss, diplomatic efforts to finalize the interim accord and support the continued conversation to reach a more comprehensive agreement. The sanctions that hawks on the Hill are pushing derail such efforts and increase the prospects of war. ¶ There is, thankfully, a growing bipartisan contingent of Congress who recognizes that more sanctions could undercut the delicate diplomatic efforts underway. Senator Carl Levin, D-Mich., chair of the Senate Armed Services Committee, cautioned early on that, “We should not at this time impose additional sanctions.” ¶ Senator Tim Johnson, D-S.D., chair of the Banking Committee, is still weighing whether to press forward with new sanctions in his committee. Separately, as early as next week, the Senate could vote on Iran sanctions amendments during the chamber’s debate on the must-pass annual defense authorization bill.¶ This caution against new sanctions, coming from these more sober quarters of the Senate, echoes the warnings from a wide spectrum of former U.S. military officials against new sanctions. There is broad recognition by U.S. and Israeli security officials that the military option is not the preferred option; a diplomatic one is. ¶ This widespread support for a negotiated solution was highlighted last week when 79 national security heavyweights signed on to a resounding endorsement of the Obama Administration’s latest diplomatic efforts.¶ Any member of Congress rejecting a diplomatic solution moves the United States toward another war in the Middle East. Saying no to this deal-in-the-works, furthermore, brings the world no closer toward the goal of Iran giving up its entire nuclear program. Rather, it would likely result in an unchecked Iranian enrichment program, while the United States and Iran would teeter perilously close on the brink of war. ¶ A deal to prevent war and a nuclear-armed Iran is within reach and it would be dangerous to let it slip away. Congress can do the right thing here, for America’s security and Middle East’s stability, and take the higher diplomatic road. Pandering to harsh rhetoric and campaign contributors is no way to sustain a foreign policy agenda. It will only make America and her assets abroad less secure, not more. The time is now to curb Iran’s enrichment program as well as Congress’s obstructionism to a peaceful path forward.

#### US-Iran war causes global nuclear war and collapses the global economy

Avery 11/6 John Scales, Lektor Emeritus, Associate Professor, at the Department of Chemistry, University of Copenhagen, since 1990 he has been the Contact Person in Denmark for Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs, An Attack On Iran Could Escalate Into Global Nuclear War, 11/6/13, http://www.countercurrents.org/avery061113.htm

Despite the willingness of Iran's new President, Hassan Rouhani to make all reasonable concessions to US demands, Israeli pressure groups in Washington continue to demand an attack on Iran. But such an attack might escalate into a global nuclear war, with catastrophic consequences.¶ As we approach the 100th anniversary World War I, we should remember that this colossal disaster escalated uncontrollably from what was intended to be a minor conflict. There is a danger that an attack on Iran would escalate into a large-scale war in the Middle East, entirely destabilizing a region that is already deep in problems.¶ The unstable government of Pakistan might be overthrown, and the revolutionary Pakistani government might enter the war on the side of Iran, thus introducing nuclear weapons into the conflict. Russia and China, firm allies of Iran, might also be drawn into a general war in the Middle East. Since much of the world's oil comes from the region, such a war would certainly cause the price of oil to reach unheard-of heights, with catastrophic effects on the global economy.¶ In the dangerous situation that could potentially result from an attack on Iran, there is a risk that nuclear weapons would be used, either intentionally, or by accident or miscalculation. Recent research has shown that besides making large areas of the world uninhabitable through long-lasting radioactive contamination, a nuclear war would damage global agriculture to such a extent that a global famine of previously unknown proportions would result.¶ Thus, nuclear war is the ultimate ecological catastrophe. It could destroy human civilization and much of the biosphere. To risk such a war would be an unforgivable offense against the lives and future of all the peoples of the world, US citizens included.

## Multilat

#### Multilateralism fails – its unsustainable and it can’t solve anything

**Held et al, 13** – Master of University College and Professor of Politics and International Relations, at the University of Durham, and Director of Polity Press and General Editor of Global Policy (David, “Gridlock: the growing breakdown of global cooperation,” ProQuest, 5/24/2013, http://search.proquest.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/docview/1355105016) // MS

\*\*\*Edited for ablest language

Economic and political shifts in large part attributable to the successes of the post-war multilateral order are now amongst the factors grinding that system into gridlock. The Doha round of trade negotiations is deadlocked, despite eight successful multilateral trade rounds before it. Climate negotiators have met for two decades without finding a way to stem global emissions. The UN is ~~paralyzed~~ in the face of growing insecurities across the world, the latest dramatic example being Syria. Each of these phenomena could be treated as if it was independent, and an explanation sought for the peculiarities of its causes. Yet, such a perspective would fail to show what they, along with numerous other instances of breakdown in international negotiations, have in common. Global cooperation is gridlocked across a range of issue areas. The reasons for this are not the result of any single underlying causal structure, but rather of several underlying dynamics that work together. Global cooperation today is failing not simply because it is very difficult to solve many global problems - indeed it is - but because previous phases of global cooperation have been incredibly successful, producing unintended consequences that have overwhelmed the problem-solving capacities of the very institutions that created them. It is hard to see how this situation can be unravelled, given failures of contemporary global leadership, the weaknesses of NGOs in converting popular campaigns into institutional change and reform, and the domestic political landscapes of the most powerful countries. A golden era of governed globalization In order to understand why gridlock has come about it is important to understand how it was that the post-Second World War era facilitated, in many respects, a successful form of 'governed globalization' that contributed to relative peace and prosperity across the world over several decades. This period was marked by peace between the great powers, although there were many proxy wars fought out in the global South. This relative stability created the conditions for what now can be regarded as an unprecedented period of prosperity that characterized the 1950s onward. Although it is by no means the sole cause, the UN is central to this story, helping to create conditions under which decolonization and successive waves of democratization could take root, profoundly altering world politics. While the economic record of the postwar years varies by country, many experienced significant economic growth and living standards rose rapidly across significant parts of the world. By the late 1980s a variety of East Asian countries were beginning to grow at an unprecedented speed, and by the late 1990s countries such as China, India and Brazil had gained significant economic momentum, a process that continues to this day. Meanwhile, the institutionalization of international cooperation proceeded at an equally impressive pace. In 1909, 37 intergovernmental organizations existed; in 2011, the number of institutions and their various off-shoots had grown to 7608 (Union of International Associations 2011). There was substantial growth in the number of international treaties in force, as well as the number of international regimes, formal and informal. At the same time, new kinds of. Postwar institutions created the conditions under which a multitude of actors could benefit from forming multinational companies, investing abroad, developing global production chains, and engaging with a plethora of other social and economic processes associated with globalization. These conditions, combined with the expansionary logic of capitalism and basic technological innovation, changed the nature of the world economy, radically increasing dependence on people and countries from every corner of the world. This interdependence, in turn, created demand for further institutionalization, which states seeking the benefits of cooperation provided, beginning the cycle anew. This is not to say that international institutions were the only cause of the dynamic form of globalization experienced over the last few decades. Changes in the nature of global capitalism, including breakthroughs in transportation and information technology, are obviously critical drivers of interdependence. However, all of these changes were allowed to thrive and develop because they took place in a relatively open, peaceful, liberal, institutionalized world order. By preventing World War Three and another Great Depression, the multilateral order arguably did just as much for interdependence as microprocessors or email (see Mueller 1990; O'Neal and Russett 1997). Beyond the special privileges of the great powers Self-reinforcing interdependence has now progressed to the point where it has altered our ability to engage in further global cooperation. That is, economic and political shifts in large part attributable to the successes of the post-war multilateral order are now amongst the factors grinding that system into gridlock. Because of the remarkable success of global cooperation in the postwar order, human interconnectedness weighs much more heavily on politics than it did in 1945. The need for international cooperation has never been higher. Yet the "supply" side of the equation, institutionalized multilateral cooperation, has stalled. In areas such as nuclear proliferation, the explosion of small arms sales, terrorism, failed states, global economic imbalances, financial market instability, global poverty and inequality, biodiversity losses, water deficits and climate change, multilateral and transnational cooperation is now increasingly ineffective or threadbare. Gridlock is not unique to one issue domain, but appears to be becoming a general feature of global governance: cooperation seems to be increasingly difficult and deficient at precisely the time when it is needed most. It is possible to identify four reasons for this blockage, four pathways to gridlock: rising multipolarity, institutional inertia, harder problems, and institutional fragmentation. Each pathway can be thought of as a growing trend that embodies a specific mix of causal mechanisms. Each of these are explained briefly below. Growing multipolarity. The absolute number of states has increased by 300 percent in the last 70 years, meaning that the most basic transaction costs of global governance have grown. More importantly, the number of states that "matter" on a given issue--that is, the states without whose cooperation a global problem cannot be adequately addressed--has expanded by similar proportions. At Bretton Woods in 1945, the rules of the world economy could essentially be written by the United States with some consultation with the UK and other European allies. In the aftermath of the 2008-2009 crisis, the G-20 has become the principal forum for global economic management, not because the established powers desired to be more inclusive, but because they could not solve the problem on their own. However, a consequence of this progress is now that many more countries, representing a diverse range of interests, must agree in order for global cooperation to occur. Institutional inertia. The postwar order succeeded, in part, because it incentivized great power involvement in key institutions. From the UN Security Council, to the Bretton Woods institutions, to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, key pillars of the global order explicitly grant special privileges to the countries that were wealthy and powerful at the time of their creation. This hierarchy was necessary to secure the participation of the most important countries in global governance. Today, the gain from this trade-off has shrunk while the costs have grown. As power shifts from West to East, North to South, a broader range of participation is needed on nearly all global issues if they are to be dealt with effectively. At the same time, following decolonization, the end of the Cold War and economic development, the idea that some countries should hold more rights and privileges than others is increasingly (and rightly) regarded as morally bankrupt. And yet, the architects of the postwar order did not, in most cases, design institutions that would organically adjust to fluctuations in national power. Harder problems. As independence has deepened, the types and scope of problems around which countries must cooperate has evolved. Problems are both now more extensive, implicating a broader range of countries and individuals within countries, and intensive, penetrating deep into the domestic policy space and daily life. Consider the example of trade. For much of the postwar era, trade negotiations focused on reducing tariff levels on manufactured products traded between industrialized countries. Now, however, negotiating a trade agreement requires also discussing a host of social, environmental, and cultural subjects - GMOs, intellectual property, health and environmental standards, biodiversity, labour standards--about which countries often disagree sharply. In the area of environmental change a similar set of considerations applies. To clean up industrial smog or address ozone depletion required fairly discrete actions from a small number of top polluters. By contrast, the threat of climate change and the efforts to mitigate it involve nearly all countries of the globe. Yet, the divergence of voice and interest within both the developed and developing worlds, along with the sheer complexity of the incentives needed to achieve a low carbon economy, have made a global deal, thus far, impossible (Falkner et al. 2011; Victor 2011). Fragmentation. The institution-builders of the 1940s began with, essentially, a blank slate. But efforts to cooperate internationally today occur in a dense institutional ecosystem shaped by path dependency. The exponential rise in both multilateral and transnational organizations has created a more complex multilevel and multi-actor system of global governance. Within this dense web of institutions mandates can conflict, interventions are frequently uncoordinated, and all too typically scarce resources are subject to intense competition. In this context, the proliferation of institutions tends to lead to dysfunctional fragmentation, reducing the ability of multilateral institutions to provide public goods. When funding and political will are scarce, countries need focal points to guide policy (Keohane and Martin 1995), which can help define the nature and form of cooperation. Yet, when international regimes overlap, these positive effects are weakened. Fragmented institutions, in turn, disaggregate resources and political will, while increasing transaction costs. In stressing four pathways to gridlock we emphasize the manner in which contemporary global governance problems build up on each other, although different pathways can carry more significance in some domains than in others. The challenges now faced by the multilateral order are substantially different from those faced by the 1945 victors in the postwar settlement. They are second-order cooperation problems arising from previous phases of success in global coordination. Together, they now block and inhibit problem solving and reform at the global level

#### **Your ev cites tons of other hotspots that you don’t solve**

David **Bosco** **1AC author 2006** (a senior editor at Foreign Policy magazine) July 2006 “Forum: Keeping an eye peeled for World War III” <http://www.post-gazette.com/pg/06211/709477-109.stm_>

The understanding that small but violent acts can spark global conflagration is etched into the world's consciousness. The reverberations from Princip's shots in the summer of 1914 ultimately took the lives of more than 10 million people, shattered four empires and dragged more than two dozen countries into war. ¶ This hot summer, as the world watches the violence in the Middle East, the awareness of peace's fragility is particularly acute. The bloodshed in Lebanon appears to be part of a broader upsurge in unrest. Iraq is suffering through one of its bloodiest months since the U.S.-led invasion in 2003. Taliban militants are burning schools and attacking villages in southern Afghanistan as the United States and NATO struggle to defend that country's fragile government. Nuclear-armed India is still cleaning up the wreckage from a large terrorist attack in which it suspects militants from rival Pakistan. The world is awash in weapons, North Korea and Iran are developing nuclear capabilities, and long-range missile technology is spreading like a virus. ¶ Some see the start of a global conflict. "We're in the early stages of what I would describe as the Third World War," former House Speaker Newt Gingrich said recently. Certain religious Web sites are abuzz with talk of Armageddon. There may be as much hyperbole as prophecy in the forecasts for world war. But it's not hard to conjure ways that today's hot spots could ignite. ¶ Consider the following scenarios: ¶ Targeting Iran: As Israeli troops seek out and destroy Hezbollah forces in southern Lebanon, intelligence officials spot a shipment of longer-range Iranian missiles heading for Lebanon. The Israeli government decides to strike the convoy and Iranian nuclear facilities simultaneously. After Iran has recovered from the shock, Revolutionary Guards surging across the border into Iraq, bent on striking Israel's American allies. Governments in Syria, Jordan, Egypt and Saudi Arabia face violent street protests demanding retribution against Israel -- and they eventually yield, triggering a major regional war. ¶ Missiles away: With the world's eyes on the Middle East, North Korea's Kim Jong Il decides to continue the fireworks show he began earlier this month. But this time his brinksmanship pushes events over the brink. A missile designed to fall into the sea near Japan goes astray and hits Tokyo, killing a dozen civilians. Incensed, the United States, Japan's treaty ally, bombs North Korean missile and nuclear sites. North Korean artillery batteries fire on Seoul, and South Korean and U.S. troops respond. Meanwhile, Chinese troops cross the border from the north to stem the flow of desperate refugees just as U.S. troops advance from the south. Suddenly, the world's superpower and the newest great power are nose to nose. ¶ Loose nukes: Al-Qaida has had Pakistani President Pervez Musharraf in its sights for years, and the organization finally gets its man. Pakistan descends into chaos as militants roam the streets and the army struggles to restore order. India decides to exploit the vacuum and punish the Kashmir-based militants it blames for the recent Mumbai railway bombings. Meanwhile, U.S. special operations forces sent to secure Pakistani nuclear facilities face off against an angry mob. ¶ The empire strikes back: Pressure for democratic reform erupts in autocratic Belarus. As protesters mass outside the parliament in Minsk, president Alexander Lukashenko requests Russian support. After protesters are beaten and killed, they appeal for help, and neighboring Poland -- a NATO member with bitter memories of Soviet repression -- launches a humanitarian mission to shelter the regime's opponents. Polish and Russian troops clash, and a confrontation with NATO looms. ¶ As in the run-up to other wars, there is today more than enough tinder lying around to spark a great power conflict. The question is how effective the major powers have become at managing regional conflicts and preventing them from escalating. After two world wars and the decades-long Cold War, what has the world learned about managing conflict? ¶ The end of the Cold War had the salutary effect of dialing down many regional conflicts. In the 1960s and 1970s, every crisis in the Middle East had the potential to draw in the superpowers in defense of their respective client states. The rest of the world was also part of the Cold War chessboard. Compare the almost invisible U.N. peacekeeping mission in Congo today to the deeply controversial mission there in the early 1960s. (The Soviets were convinced that the U.N. mission was supporting a U.S. puppet, and Russian diplomats stormed out of several Security Council meetings in protest.) From Angola to Afghanistan, nearly every Cold War conflict was a proxy war. Now, many local crises can be handed off to the humanitarians or simply ignored.¶ But the end of the bipolar world has a downside. In the old days, the two competing superpowers sometimes reined in bellicose client states out of fear that regional conflicts would escalate. Which of the major powers today can claim to have such influence over Tehran or Pyongyang?¶ Today's world has one great advantage: None of the leading powers appears determined to reorder international affairs as Germany was before both world wars and as Japan was in the years before World War II.

#### 1. War is impossible – Chinese democratization will facilitate cooperation

**Friedberg, 05** (Aaron L. Friedberg, Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton University. International Security, Vol. 30, No. 2 (Fall 2005) http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/is3002\_pp007-045\_friedberg.pdf)

Liberal optimists believe that, although it is still far from finished, the process of democratization is already well under way in China.20 This process is being driven largely by economic development, which, in turn, is being accelerated by China’s increasing openness to trade. Rising per capita incomes are creating a growing Chinese middle class. In Europe and North America, and more recently in Asia, those whose rising incomes allow them to do more than attend to the struggle for daily existence have been the prime movers behind progress toward democracy, and there is every reason to hope that they will play a similar role in China.21 Liberals also believe that, in addition to stirring the desire for political rights, economic development creates an objective, functional need for political liberalization. Without courts, contracts, and a reliable rule of law, economic progress will surely falter. Moreover, in an era in which sustained growth depends increasingly on free flows of information, regimes that seek to restrict speech and control communications will be at a fatal disadvantage. Over time, if it wishes even to approach the levels of well-being already attained by its advanced industrial counterparts (all of which are democracies), China too must become democratic.22 As it does, the liberal optimists expect that its relations with the United States will stabilize and that, ultimately, it will enter into the democratic “zone of peace.” Although the process may take time fully to unfold, before too long open conflict between the United States and a democratic China will be as improbable as war among the members of the European Union appears to be today.

The risk of Russia war is low and concedes their model is flawed

Barrett et. Al. 13 [Anthony M., Global Catastrophic Risk Institute, Seth D. Baum- Center for Research on Environmental Decisions, Columbia University, Kelly R. Hostetler- Department of Geography, Pennsylvania State University, 2013, “Analyzing and Reducing the Risks of Inadvertent Nuclear War Between the United States and Russia”, <http://sethbaum.com/ac/fc_NuclearWar.pdf>, ALB]

Given that no nuclear war between the United States and the USSR or Russia has¶ occurred in the last four decades, relatively low war probability predictions seem intuitively¶ more likely than relatively high war probability predictions. Statistical significance tests may¶ provide a more quantitative check of the sensibility of the estimates of the model. For example,¶ with the use of a binomial distribution to find the confidence interval for an event probability p,¶ given that zero such events has yet occurred in n independent random trials, p lies within the¶ interval [0, u] with (1 – α) confidence, where gives the upper limit of the confidence¶ interval.69 If using α = 0.05 to find u as the upper limit of a 95 percent confidence interval, and¶ given n = 37 independent trials (i.e. each year from 1975 to 2012) without an event occurring,¶ then u = 0.08. In other words, given that there has been no inadvertent nuclear war between the¶ United States and Russia during the 37-year period for which this paper assumes its modeled¶ systems and response procedures have been in place, there could be a statistical argument for¶ rejecting (with 95 percent confidence) a probabilistic model that produced a best estimate (i.e. a¶ mean value) for annual nuclear war probability above 0.08. Because the model used in this paper¶ produce best estimates of annual probability of inadvertent U.S.-Russia war that are well below¶ 0.08, this statistical test does not suggest rejecting the model’s estimates with 95 percent¶ confidence. However, many readers may intuitively feel that even an annual nuclear war¶ probability of eight percent seems too high to be useful discriminator of the model’s validity. In¶ any case, it could be more productive to check or revise specific assumptions or parameters¶ within the model, such as with additional data on rates and probabilities of false-alarm events,¶ when new information becomes available. It could also be useful to use additional empirical data¶ to check assumptions of the model that were based primarily on mathematical-modeling¶ reasoning rather than on empirical data, because of the limited amounts of empirical data¶ available. One example is the assumption in Equation 4 that MDC false alarm resolution times¶ are exponentially distributed.

## Enviro

#### No warming extinction

**Carter et. Al 11–** Robert, PhD, Adjuct Research Fellow, James Cook University, Craig Idso, PhD, Chairman at the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, Fred Singer, PhD, President of the Science and Environmental Policy Project, Susan Crockford, evolutionary biologist with a specialty in skeletal taxonomy , paleozoology and vertebrate evolution, Joseph D’Aleo, 30 years of experience in professional meteorology, former college professor of Meteorology at Lyndon State College, Indur Goklany, independent scholar, author, and co-editor of the Electronic Journal of Sustainable Development, Sherwood Idso, President of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, Research Physicist with the US Department of Agriculture, Adjunct Professor in the Departments of Geology, Botany, and Microbiology at Arizona State University, Bachelor of Physics, Master of Science, and Doctor of Philosophy, all from the University of Minnesota, Madhav Khandekar, former research scientist from Environment Canada and is an expert reviewer for the IPCC 2007 Climate Change Panel, Anthony Lupo, Department Chair and Professor of Atmospheric Science at the University of Missouri, Willie Soon, astrophysicist at the Solar and Stellar Physics Division of the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics, Mitch Taylor (Canada) (March 8th, “[Surviving](file:///C%3A%5CMarc%5CDesktop%5CSurviving) the Unpreceented Climate Change of the IPCC” <http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2011/mar/8mar2011a5.html>) Jacome

On the other hand, they indicate that some biologists and climatologists have pointed out that "many of the predicted increases in climate have happened before, in terms of both magnitude and rate of change (e.g. Royer, 2008; Zachos *et al*., 2008), and yet biotic communities have remained remarkably resilient (Mayle and Power, 2008) and in some cases thrived (Svenning and Condit, 2008)." But they report that those who mention these things are often "placed in the 'climate-change denier' category," although the purpose for pointing out these facts is simply to present "a sound scientific basis for understanding biotic responses to the magnitudes and rates of climate change predicted for the future through using the vast data resource that we can exploit in fossil records." Going on to do just that, Willis *et al*. focus on "intervals in time in the fossil record when atmospheric CO2 concentrations increased up to 1200 ppm, temperatures in mid- to high-latitudes increased by greater than 4°C within 60 years, and sea levels rose by up to 3 m higher than present," describing studies of past biotic responses that indicate "the scale and impact of the magnitude and rate of such climate changes on biodiversity." And what emerges from those studies, as they describe it, "is evidence for rapid community turnover, migrations, development of novel ecosystems and thresholds from one stable ecosystem state to another." And, most importantly in this regard, they report "there is very little evidence for broad-scale extinctions due to a warming world." In concluding, the Norwegian, Swedish and UK researchers say that "based on such evidence we urge some caution in assuming broad-scale extinctions of species will occur due solely to climate changes of the magnitude and rate predicted for the next century," reiterating that "the fossil record indicates remarkable biotic resilience to wide amplitude fluctuations in climate.

#### Rescource wars won’t escalate

**Salehyan, 07** – Assistant Professor of Political Science at University of Northern Texas (Idean, “The New Myth About Climate Change”, Foreign Policy, August 2007, May 29th 2010, <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/story/cms.php?story_id=3922>, KONTOPOULOS)

Dire scenarios like these may sound convincing, but they are misleading. Even worse, they are irresponsible, for they shift liability for wars and human rights abuses away from oppressive, corrupt governments. Additionally, focusing on climate change as a security threat that requires a military response diverts attention away from prudent adaptation mechanisms and new technologies that can prevent the worst catastrophes. First, aside from a few anecdotes, there is little systematic empirical evidence that resource scarcity and changing environmental conditions lead to conflict. In fact, several studies have shown that an abundance of natural resources is more likely to contribute to conflict. Moreover, even as the planet has warmed, the number of civil wars and insurgencies has decreased dramatically. Data collected by researchers at Uppsala University and the International Peace Research Institute, Oslo shows a steep decline in the number of armed conflicts around the world. Between 1989 and 2002, some 100 armed conflicts came to an end, including the wars in Mozambique, Nicaragua, and Cambodia. If global warming causes conflict, we should not be witnessing this downward trend. Furthermore, if famine and drought led to the crisis in Darfur, why have scores of environmental catastrophes failed to set off armed conflict elsewhere? For instance, the U.N. World Food Programme warns that 5 million people in Malawi have been experiencing chronic food shortages for several years. But famine-wracked Malawi has yet to experience a major civil war. Similarly, the Asian tsunami in 2004 killed hundreds of thousands of people, generated millions of environmental refugees, and led to severe shortages of shelter, food, clean water, and electricity. Yet the tsunami, one of the most extreme catastrophes in recent history, did not lead to an outbreak of resource wars. Clearly then, there is much more to armed conflict than resource scarcity and natural disasters. Second, arguing that climate change is a root cause of conflict lets tyrannical governments off the hook. If the environment drives conflict, then governments bear little responsibility for bad outcomes. That’s why Ban Ki-moon’s case about Darfur was music to Khartoum’s ears. The Sudanese government would love to blame the West for creating the climate change problem in the first place. True, desertification is a serious concern, but it’s preposterous to suggest that poor rainfall—rather than deliberate actions taken by the Sudanese government and the various combatant factions—ultimately caused the genocidal violence in Sudan. Yet by Moon’s perverse logic, consumers in Chicago and Paris are at least as culpable for Darfur as the regime in Khartoum.

#### Biodiversity collapse is inevitable – multiple barriers

**European Commission, 08** (July 17, 2008, “Planning for the inevitable: the impact of climate change on biodiversity,” http://ec.europa.eu/environment/integration/research/newsalert/pdf/116na6.pdf, Hensel)

Many scientific reports suggest that unavoidable changes in climate will happen over the next 40-50 years as a result of past emissions. Areas seen as most vulnerable to climate change include the Mediterranean and southern Europe, mountain and sub-arctic areas, and densely occupied floodplains and coastal zones. Annual temperatures could increase by 2.0-6.3 degrees centigrade by 2100. Rainfall could also increase by 1-2 per cent per decade for northern Europe and decrease by 1 per cent in southern Europe. Events affecting habitats and biodiversity will include heat waves, droughts, storms and rising sea levels. The impact may cause species to move towards the north and **an increase in extinction rates**. Mitigation remains the key focus of climate change policy, with less attention given to understanding how to adapt to inevitable rising temperatures. The pressures of climate change present a major challenge, not just for biodiversity policy, but also for land use policy, which affects biodiversity. The EU’s 2006 Biodiversity Communication and its Action Plan set an agenda for action to halt the loss of biodiversity by 2010, as agreed in the Gothenburg summit, 2001. However, biodiversity continues to decline under pressure from land use change and development. For example, as water supplies for urban populations shrink, building new infrastructures may place stress on existing ground and surface water systems and the flora and fauna that rely on it. The research 1 reviewed land use plans and policy in three countries: France, the Netherlands and the UK. It looked at their use of natural resources, management of water and coastal zones, plans for designated sites and case studies on urban, rural, inland and coastal sites. The policies were examined for their ability to account for biodiversity adaptation to climate change and to identify ways of integrating ‘spatial planning’ and biodiversity policy. Spatial planning has a broader sense than ‘land use’, in that it accounts for all activities and interests that concern a particular area. The authors found that although dynamic biodiversity is becoming more fully realised in spatial planning policy, existing EU directives such as the Birds Directive (CEC 1979), the Habitats Directive (CEC 1992), and the Natura 2000 network set up to create a network of protected sites, by themselves cannot fully protect landscape features necessary to support biodiversity under a period of prolonged climate change. They recommend ‘climate-proofing’ plans through the use of Environmental Impact Assessment and Strategic Environmental Assessment. Land use plans should be integrated with the adoption of common objectives, time horizons and boundaries. The study also highlighted the need for more flexible responses to climate change, with stakeholders safeguarding habitats in between protected areas. This would result in more robust conservation planning across whole landscapes, reducing fragmentation of sites and creating corridors and networks for wildlife. International cooperation was also found to be critical, as wildlife moves across national boundaries. Integration with agriculture, transport and water sectors would also lead to a better capacity to adapt to climate change. Barriers to putting a fully effective policy in place include: planning time-scales that are too short, a lack of consensus on intervention measures, uncertainty on the actual impact of climate change impacts, conflicts of interest and public opinion which is sensitive to change, especially in treasured landscapes.

**No extinction**

**The Economist, 09** (The Economist, January 15, 2009, “Second life: Biologists debate the scale of extinction in the world’s tropical forests,” http://www.economist.com/node/12926042, Hensel)

A RARE piece of good news from the world of conservation: the global extinction crisis may have been overstated. The world is unlikely to lose 100 species a day, or half of all species in the lifetime of people now alive, as some have claimed. The bad news, though, is that the lucky survivors are tiny tropical insects that few people care about. The species that are being lost rapidly are the large vertebrates that conservationists were worried about in the first place. This new view of the prospects for biodiversity emerged from a symposium held this week at the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, DC, but the controversy over how bad things really are has been brewing since 2006. That was when Joseph Wright of the Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute in Panama and Helene Muller-Landau of the University of Minnesota first suggested that the damage might not be as grim as some feared. They reasoned that because population growth is slowing in many tropical countries, and people are moving to cities, the pressure to cut down primary rainforest is falling and agriculturally marginal land is being abandoned, allowing trees to grow. This regrown “secondary” forest is crucial to the pair’s analysis. Within a few decades of land being abandoned, half of the original biomass has returned. Depending on what else is nearby, these new forests may then be colonised by animals and additional plants, and thus support many of the species found in the original forest. Dr Wright and Dr Muller-Landau therefore reckon that in 2030 reasonably unbroken tropical forest will still cover more than a third of its natural range, and after that date its area—at least in Latin America and Asia—could increase. Much of this woodland will be secondary forest, but even so they suggest that in Africa only 16-35% of tropical-forest species will become extinct by 2030, in Asia, 21-24% and, in Latin America, fewer still. Once forest cover does start increasing, **the rate of extinction should dwindle**.

# 2NC

## Multilat

#### Multilat not coming & multiple alt causes

Multilat not coming due to china rise/power shift to China as well as weak international institutions (those are required yo)
alt causes:
1) decentralized power makes coop difficult
2) limits of capitalism/ differences internationally regarding globalization (not resolved w/ embargo lol)
3) ineffective leaders bc changing political times (ie low approval ratings)
4) governments in general cannot deal effectively with foreign relations (snowden is a g8 example)

Lodhi 1/21 [Dr Maleeha Lodhi, special adviser to the Jang Group/Geo and a former envoy to the US and the UK, January 21, 2014, “Power in a changing world”, http://www.thenews.com.pk/Todays-News-9-227611-Power-in-a-changing-world]

Much conference discussion inevitably revolved around questions about whether the world was moving in a multipolar or nonpolar direction. Some argued there would be three sets of economic poles in the future: US, China and the European Union. Others saw the Sino-US balance of power as the defining trend.¶ In my intervention I argued that as the power shift from the West to China continues to gather pace, how this global transition is managed will be a key determinant of international stability, especially as calculations will be more difficult for countries to make in a setting of decentralised power where the modalities of exercising power will also be more complex.¶ Others raised the question of what China’s rise would mean. One speaker made several trenchant observations about why discussion of this often ends not with a conclusion, but with a question: how will China behave? Is this due to a subconscious desire in the West not to see a non-democratic country succeed at a time when the West itself is mired in self-doubt? ¶ Is there a connection, he asked, between ‘fear of China’ and weakening of the democratic ideal in the West, indicated by declining interest and participation in politics. Such questioning also reflected implicit admiration by the West of China’s ability to think, plan and act long-term, while Western democracies remained gridlocked and often at the mercy of special interests. Is fear of China more a critique of the state of affairs in the West than of China’s conduct?¶ In another session the long term forces shaping the global future were identified by a speaker as: 1) the limits of capitalism and the fact that globalisation doesn’t always work for everyone; 2) leaders are increasingly ineffective because traditional levers of power do not work in an environment marked by power diffusion and rise of new actors. This is reflected in the low public ratings that political leaders receive in opinion surveys; and 3) shortcomings of the present systems of governance to live up to current challenges and manage tomorrow’s world.¶ The related themes of empowerment of individuals and diminishing state capacity echoed in most sessions. As did the ‘expectations gap’. Popular protests across the world, from Greece and Turkey to Brazil, all urge the need for governments to rearrange relations with their citizens and perform more competently to meet public demands. ¶ There was agreement that a more multipolar world required multilateral institutions to be strengthened, even reconfigured. But concern was voiced about the lack of international consensus on how to do this. From this it was concluded that the present weaknesses of the multilateral system are likely to continue.

## K

#### Assign the case zero risk because their scholarship rigs the game --- market dogma chooses what is published

Ignacio **Ramonet 97**, Professeur Agrégé and chief editor of Le Monde Diplomatique. “The One and Only Way of Thinking. The Post-Development Reader. 1997. Pp. 179-1.

In today’s democracies, more and more free citizens feel bogged down, stuck in a sort of glutinous doctrine which imperceptibly wraps itself around all rebellious thinking, inhibiting, disrupting, ~~paralyzing~~ and finally suppressing it. This doctrine is the one and only way of thinking, the sole one authorized by an invisible and ubiquitous opinion police. After the fall of the Berlin Wall, the collapse of the Communist regimes and the demoralization of socialism, the arrogance, the effrontery and the insolence of this new Gospel have reached such heights that one can, without exaggeration, describe this ideological frenzy as modern dogmatism. What is the one and only way of thinking? It is the translation into ideological terms that claim to be universal of economic interests, particularly those of international capital. It could be said that it was formulated and defined from 1944 onwards, at Bretton Woods. Its principal sources are the great economic and financial institutions – the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the European Commission, the Banque de France, and so on – which, in order to diffuse their ideas throughout the world, finance various research centres, universities and foundations, which in turn refine and disseminate the holy writ. This anonymous discourse is taken up and reproduced by the leading purveyors of economic information and especially by the ‘bibles’ of investors and stockbrokers – The Wall Street Journal, The Financial Times, The economist, The Far Eastern Economic Review, Les Echos, Reuters, etc., which are often the property of the big industrial or financial groups. Almost everywhere, faculties of economics, journalists, writers, and politicians end up imbibing the main commandments of these new legal tablets, and, through the networks of the mass media, they are repeated ad nauseam. As we all know, in our media-oriented societies repetition is as good as proof. The first principle of the one and only way of thinking is all the more convincing in that an inattentive Marxist would in no way deny it: economics is more important than politics. It is on the basis of such a principle that, for example, an instrument as important in the hands of the executive as the Banque de France was, without any real opposition, made independent in 1994 and, to some extent, ‘protected from political vagaries’. ‘The Banque de France is independent, a-political and transpartisan’ stated its governor, M Jean-Claude Trichet, who added, however: ‘We demand that the public debt be reduced’, and ‘we follow a stable currency strategy.’1 As if these two objectives were not political! In the name of ‘realism’ and ‘pragmatism’, the economy is put in charge. As M. Alain Minc put it: ‘Capitalism cannot collapse, it is the natural state of society. Democracy is not the natural state of society. The market is.’2 An economy, it goes without saying, that has been stripped of any social concern, which is a sort of pathetic dross, weighing us down, causing regression and crisis. The other key concepts of the one and only way of thinking are well known: the market, an idol whose ‘invisible hand corrects the quirks and dysfunctionalities of capitalism’, and particularly the financial markets, whose ‘signals direct and determine the general movement of the economy’, competition and competitiveness, which ‘stimulate business and make it dynamic, leading to permanent and beneficial modernization’; free exchange, without boundaries, ‘a factor in the uninterrupted development of trade, and therefore of societies’; globalization, both of the production of manufactured goods and of financial flows; the international division of labour, which ‘moderates union claims and lowers the cost of wages’; strong currencies, ‘a stabilizing factor’; deregulation; privatization; liberalization, and so on. Always, it is ‘less of the State’ and a constant arbitration in favour of revenue returning to capital to the detriment of labour. And indifference as to ecological costs. Constant repetition, in all the media, of this catechism3 by almost all politcians, from right to left,4 gives it such an intimidating force that it stifles all attempts at free thinking and makes it very difficult to resist this new obscurantism.5 One almost gets to the point of believing that 17.4 million unemployed Europeans, the urban chaos, the general precariousness of life, the corruption, the suburbs aflame, the ecological pillage, the return to racism, integralism and religious extremism, and the rising tide of the marginalized: that all these are just mirages, reprehensible hallucinations in this best of all possible worlds which is constructing, for our anaesthetized consciousness, the one and only way of thinking.

#### Lifting the embargo would force liberalization upon Cuba, destroy its domestic industries, and integrate it into the global neoliberal order.

**Gonzalez, 03** – Law Professor the Seattle UniversitySchool of Law (Carmen, Assistant Professor, Seattle University School of Law, Tulane Environmental Law Journal, Vol. 16, p. 685, 2003, “Seasons of Resistance: Sustainable Agriculture and Food Security in Cuba”, http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=987944)//VP

Notwithstanding these problems, the greatest challenge to the agricultural development strategy adopted by the Cuban government in the aftermath of the Special Period is likely to be external—the renewal of trade relations with the United States. From the colonial era through the beginning of the Special Period, economic development in Cuba has been constrained by Cuba’s relationship with a series of primary trading partners. Cuba’s export-oriented sugar monoculture and its reliance on imports to satisfy domestic food needs was imposed by the Spanish colonizers, reinforced by the United States, and maintained during the Soviet era.410 It was not until the collapse of the socialist trading bloc and the strengthening of the U.S. embargo that Cuba was able to embark upon a radically different development path. Cuba was able to transform its agricultural development model as a consequence of the political and economic autonomy occasioned by its relative economic isolation, including its exclusion from major international financial and trade institutions.411 Paradoxically, while the U.S. embargo subjected Cuba to immense economic hardship, it also gave the Cuban government free rein to adopt agricultural policies that ran counter to the prevailing neoliberal model and that protected Cuban farmers against ruinous competition from highly subsidized agricultural producers in the United States and the European Union.412 Due to U.S. pressure, Cuba was excluded from regional and international financial institutions, including the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, and the Inter-American Development Bank.413 Cuba also failed to reach full membership in any regional trade association and was barred from the negotiations for the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA).414 However, as U.S. agribusiness clamors to ease trade restrictions with Cuba, the lifting of the embargo and the end of Cuba’s economic isolation may only be a matter of time.415 It is unclear how the Cuban government will respond to the immense political and economic pressure from the United States to enter into bilateral or multilateral trade agreements that would curtail Cubansovereignty and erode protection for Cuban agriculture.416 If Cuba accedes to the dictates of agricultural trade liberalization, it appears likely that Cuba’s gains in agricultural diversification and food self-sufficiency will be undercut by cheap, subsidized food imports from the United States and other industrialized countries.417 Furthermore, Cuba’s experiment with organic and semi-organic agriculture may be jeopardized if the Cuban government is either unwilling or unable to restrict the sale of agrochemicals to Cuban farmers—as the Cuban government failed to restrict U.S. rice imports in the first half of the twentieth century.418 Cuba is once again at a crossroads—as it was in 1963, when the government abandoned economic diversification, renewed its emphasis on sugar production, and replaced its trade dependence on the United States with trade dependence on the socialist bloc. In the end, the future of Cuban agriculture will likely turn on a combination of external factors (such as world market prices for Cuban exports and Cuba’s future economic integration with the United States) and internal factors (such as the level of grassroots and governmental support for the alternative development model developed during the Special Period). While this Article has examined the major pieces of legislation that transformed agricultural production in Cuba, and the government’s implementation of these laws, it is important to remember that these reforms had their genesis in the economic crisis of the early 1990s and in the creative legal, and extra-legal, survival strategies developed by ordinary Cubans.419 The distribution of land to thousands of small producers and the promotion of urban agriculture were in response to the self-help measures undertaken by Cuban citizens during the Special Period. As the economic crisis intensified, Cuban citizens spontaneously seized and cultivated parcels of land in state farms, along the highways, and in vacant lots, and started growing food in patios, balconies, front yards, and community gardens. Similarly, the opening of the agricultural markets was in direct response to the booming black market and its deleterious effect on the state’s food distribution system. Finally, it was the small private farmer, the neglected stepchild of the Revolution, who kept alive the traditional agroecological techniques that formed the basis of Cuba’s experiment with organic agriculture. The survival of Cuba’s alternative agricultural model will therefore depend, at least in part, on whether this model is viewed by Cuban citizens and by the Cuban leadership as a necessary adaptation to severe economic crisis or as a path-breaking achievement worthy of pride and emulation.

The history of Cuban agriculture has been one of resistance and accommodation to larger economic and political forces that shaped the destiny of the island nation. Likewise, the transformation of Cuban agriculture has occurred through resistance and accommodation by Cuban workers and farmers to the hardships of the Special Period. The lifting of the U.S. economic embargo and the subjection of Cuba to the full force of economic globalization will present an enormous challenge to the retention of an agricultural development model borne of crisis and isolation. Whether Cuba will be able to resist the re-imposition of a capital-intensive, export-oriented, import-reliant agricultural model will depend on the ability of the Cuban leadership to appreciate the benefits of sustainable agriculture and to protect Cuba’s alternative agricultural model in the face of overwhelming political and economic pressure from the United States and from the global trading system.

#### Neoliberalism must be rejected in every shape and form – ethical obligation – alt is specifically in the language of inclusion of every citizen - that’s the key to solvency

Harvey, 09 (David Harvey; Professor of anthropology and geography at the graduate center of the city University of New York; Organizing for the anti-capitalist transition; <http://seminario10anosdepois.wordpress.com/>)//VP

A revolutionary politics that can grasp the nettle of endless compound capital ¶ accumulation and eventually shut it down as the prime motor of human history ¶ requires a sophisticated understanding of how social change occurs. The ¶ failings of past endeavors to build a lasting socialism and communism have to ¶ be avoided and lessons from that immensely complicated history must be ¶ learned. Yet the absolute necessity for a coherent anti-capitalist revolutionary ¶ movement must also be recognized. The fundamental aim of that movement is ¶ to assume social command over both the production and distribution of ¶ surpluses.¶ We urgently need an explicit revolutionary theory suited to our times. I propose ¶ a "co-revolutionary theory" derived from an understanding of Marx's account of ¶ how capitalism arose out of feudalism. Social change arises through the ¶ dialectical unfolding of relations between seven moments within the body ¶ politic of capitalism viewed as an ensemble or assemblage of activities and ¶ practices:¶ a) technological and organizational forms of production, exchange, and ¶ consumption¶ b) relations to nature¶ c) social relations between people¶ d) mental conceptions of the world, embracing knowledges and cultural ¶ understandings and beliefs¶ e) labor processes and production of specific goods, geographies, services, or ¶ affects¶ f) institutional, legal and governmental arrangements¶ g) the conduct of daily life that underpins social reproduction.¶ Each one of these moments is internally dynamic and internally marked by ¶ tensions and contradictions (just think of mental conceptions of the world) but ¶ all of them are co-dependent and co-evolve in relation to each other. The ¶ transition to capitalism entailed a mutually supporting movement across all ¶ seven moments. New technologies could not be identified and practices without ¶ new mental conceptions of the world (including that of the relation to nature ¶ and social relations). Social theorists have the habit of taking just one of these ¶ moments and viewing it as the "silver bullet" that causes all change. They are all wrong. ¶ It is the dialectical motion across all of these moments that really counts even ¶ as there is uneven development in that motion.¶ When capitalism itself undergoes one of its phases of renewal, it does so ¶ precisely by co-evolving all moments, obviously not without tensions, struggles, ¶ fights, and contradictions. But consider how these seven moments were ¶ configured around 1970 before the neoliberal surge and consider how they look ¶ now, and you will see they have all changed in ways that re-define the operative ¶ characteristics of capitalism viewed as a non-Hegelian totality.¶ An anti-capitalist political movement can start anywhere (in labor processes, ¶ around mental conceptions, in the relation to nature, in social relations, in the ¶ design of revolutionary technologies and organizational forms, out of daily life, ¶ or through attempts to reform institutional and administrative structures ¶ including the reconfiguration of state powers). The trick is to keep the political ¶ movement moving from one moment to another in mutually reinforcing ways. ¶ This was how capitalism arose out of feudalism and this is how something ¶ radically different called communism, socialism, or whatever must arise out of ¶ capitalism. Previous attempts to create a communist or socialist alternative ¶ fatally failed to keep the dialectic between the different moments in motion and ¶ failed to embrace the unpredictabilities and uncertainties in the dialectical ¶ movement between them. Capitalism has survived precisely by keeping the ¶ dialectical movement between the moments going and constructively embracing ¶ the inevitable tensions, including crises.

#### Concepts such as multilateralism are threat constructions to maintain elite power

**Bialasiewicz et al, 07** a Department of Geography, Royal Holloway University of London (Luiza Bialasiewicz, 2007, “Performing security: The imaginative geographies of current US strategy”, Political Geography, 405-422)//ah

It is telling just how spatialised some of these speciﬁcations become when worked through in detail. Already in 2000, PNAC argued that the major military mission is no longer to deter Soviet expansionism, but to ‘‘secure and expand zones of democratic peace; deter rise of new great-power competitor; defend key regions; exploit transformation of war’’ (PNAC, 2000: 2). They suggested that rather than the Cold War’s ‘‘potential global war across many theatres’’, the concern now is for several ‘‘potential theatre wars spread across the globe’’ fought against ‘‘separate and distinct adversaries pursuing separate and distinct goals’’ (2000: 2, 3). To counter such threats, the US needs to station its troops broadly, and their presence ‘‘in critical regions around the world is the visible expression of the extent of America’s status as a superpower and as the guarantor of liberty, peace and stability’’ (2000: 14). They claimed that while US security interests have ‘‘expanded’’, and that its forces ‘‘provide the ﬁrst line of defense in what may be 410 L. Bialasiewicz et al. / Political Geography 26 (2007) 405e422Author's personal copy described as the ‘American security perimeter’’’, at the same time ‘‘the worldwide archipelago of U.S. military installations has contracted’’ (2000: 14, 15). Because the security perimeter ‘‘has expanded slowly but inexorably’’ since the end of the Cold War, US forces e ‘‘the cavalry on the new American frontier’’ e ‘‘must be positioned to reﬂect the shifting strategic landscape’’ (2000: 14, 15). Equally, their use of the term ‘homeland’ drew strongly on its use in the Clinton administration e and preﬁgured the creation of the Ofﬁce for Homeland Security under G.W. Bush, with the concept strengthened by both the PATRIOT acts and the establishment of U.S. Northern Command. Again, **it is essential that we conceptualize these strategies as both containing and making imaginative geographies; specifying the ways ‘‘the world is’’ and, in so doing, actively (re)making that same world**. This goes beyond merely the military action or aid programmes that governments follow, but indicates a wider concern with the production of ways of seeing the world, which percolate through media, popular imaginations as well as political strategy. These performative imaginative geographies are at the heart of this paper and will re-occur throughout it. Our concern lies speciﬁcally with the ways in which the US portrays e and over the past decade has portrayed e certain parts of the world as requiring involvement, as threats, as zones of instability, as rogue states, ‘‘states of concern’’, as ‘‘global hotspots’’, as well as the associated suggestion that by bringing these within the ‘‘integrated’’ zones of democratic peace, US security e both economically and militarily e can be preserved. Of course, the translation of such imaginations into actual practice (and certainly results) is never as simple as some might like to suggest. Nonetheless, what we wish to highlight here is how these strategies, in essence, produce the effect they name. This, again, is nothing new: the United States has long constituted its identity at least in part through discourses of danger that materialize others as a threat (see Campbell, 1992). Equally, much has been written about the new set of threats and enemies that emerged to ﬁll the post-Soviet void e from radical Islam through the war on drugs to ‘‘rogue states’’ (for a critical analyses see, among others, Benjamin & Simon, 2003; Stokes, 2005; on the genealogies of the idea of ‘‘rogue states’’ see Blum, 2002; Litwak, 2000).

#### Neoliberalism kills economic and political stability

Albo, Department of Political Science, York University, 06 (Gregory, “The Unexpected Revolution: Venezuela Confronts Neoliberalism”, Presentation at the University of Alberta, International Development Week, 1/06, <http://socialistproject.ca/theory/venezuela_praksis.pdf>)//AS

First, neoliberalism has consolidated across Latin America over the last two decades, as intemational debt repayments and economic crisis pushed state after state to abandon postwar models of import substitution development for fiscal austerity and export strategies to earn foreign exchange.7 The results have been anything but satisfying: except in a few cases for a few periods, GDP growth across Latin America has been sluggish since the l980s, barely exceeding l percent per year since 2000, with per capita output often even declining, as it has since 2000. Venezuela's economic decline over this period has been as stark as any: from l978 to 1990 real GDP fell almost continuously, only systematically recovering with the American boom of the l990s, but with negative GDP growth rates again retuming with the political turmoil of 2002-3. With the oil industry back in production at historically high world prices, economic growth has booming in Venezuela since 2004, as discussed below.8 The adoption of export-oriented economic strategies and liberalised capital movements across Latin America make moves toward more "˜inward' strategies to meet basic needs singular and fraught with obstacles. The nascent developmental - most often authoritarian - states of the past have, moreover, been gutted of bureaucratic capacities during the long reign of structural adjustlnent policies. In Venezuela, the structural adjustment policies came in the political u-tum of the l989 Carlos Perez govemment toward neoliberalism, partly at the prompting of the IMF, and after the collapse of the banking sector in the early 1990s the agreements with the IMF in 1994 and 1996. But as the fifth largest oil producer in the world and with global oil prices staying well above $50 US a barrel since 2004, Venezuela now has a conjunctural advantage that frees some of these constraints.Â° The political tumioil of the attempted coup and disruption of oil production, however, caused economic damage in the billions that is still being made up

#### Specifically, neoliberal policies are the root cause of violence, oppression, warming, and instability– the price to pay is too high

**Greenberg, 12**, - Ph.D in Anthropology at University of Michigan (James B., Thomas Weaver (Ph.D. in Anthropology at University of California at Berkeley), Anne Browning-Aiken (Ph.D. in Anthropology at University of Arizona), William L. Alexander (Professor of Anthropology at University of Arizona), “The Neoliberal Transformation of Mexico,” *Neoliberalism and Commodity Production in Mexico,* University Press of Colorado, pp 334-335)//SG

Neoliberalism also underlies the growing problems of crime and violence affecting Mexico more broadly. The policies that ruined smallholder agriculture also made the country receptive to growing marijuana and poppies, thereby open- ing spaces into which drug cartels moved (see the chapter by Emanuel and chapter 9 by Weaver, this volume). The money from the drug trade has had a pernicious effect on Mexican society, creating extensive problems of corruption and increas- ing levels of violence (Campbell 2009).Neoliberal policies have driven millions of Mexicans into economic exile and helped turn Mexico into a major source of drugs. Both drugs and victims of structural violence spill across the border, as does the violence that too often accompanies them, reminding us that we live in a global society and thatneoliberalism in Mexico also has direct consequences for the United States.As we have seen with the near collapse of global financial mar- kets, problems are contagious in an increasingly integrated global economy. Just as the consequences of neoliberal policies in Mexico spill over into the United States, the impacts of US applications of neoliberalism reverberate in Mexico. As the popular saying goes, “When the United States catches a cold, Mexico catches pneumonia.” Tight credit affects commodity chains, so the consequences of the neoliberal debacle in US financial markets are felt strongly in Mexico. In sum, our major area of unease regarding neoliberalism is that, as an eco- nomic framework, the lopsided version of development it delivers comes at too high a price.While neoliberalism may further global capitalism’s frantic drive for expansion and increased profit, it has not resolved intra- and inter-nation prob- lems of inequality, environmental degradation, unequal distribution of resources and gains, global warming, lack of healthcare, instability of pension funds, cor- ruption, and clientelism. Instead, it has increased violence and oppression and generally worsened working and living conditions.
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## China DA

**Zero risk of nuclear terrorism**

**Chapman 12** 5/22, \*Stephen Chapman is a columnist and editorial writer for the Chicago Tribune, “CHAPMAN: Nuclear terrorism unlikely,” http://www.oaoa.com/articles/chapman-87719-nuclear-terrorism.html, AJ

Ever since Sept. 11, 2001, Americans have had to live with the knowledge that the next time the terrorists strike, it could be not with airplanes capable of killing thousands but atomic bombs capable of killing hundreds of thousands. The prospect has created a sense of profound vulnerability. It has shaped our view of government policies aimed at combating terrorism (filtered through Jack Bauer). It helped mobilize support for the Iraq war. Why are we worried? Bomb designs can be found on the Internet. Fissile material may be smuggled out of Russia. Iran, a longtime sponsor of terrorist groups, is trying to acquire nuclear weapons. A layperson may figure it’s only a matter of time before the unimaginable comes to pass. Harvard’s Graham Allison, in his book “Nuclear Terrorism,” concludes, “On the current course, nuclear terrorism is inevitable.” But remember: After Sept. 11, 2001, we all thought more attacks were a certainty. Yet al-Qaida and its ideological kin have proved **unable to mount a second strike**. Given their inability to do something simple — say, shoot up a shopping mall or set off a truck bomb — it’s reasonable to ask whether they have a chance at something much more ambitious. Far from being plausible, argued Ohio State University professor John Mueller in a presentation at the University of Chicago, “**the likelihood that a terrorist group will come up with an atomic bomb seems to be vanishingly small**.” The events required to make that happen comprise a multitude of Herculean tasks. First, a terrorist group has to get a bomb or fissile material, perhaps from Russia’s inventory of decommissioned warheads. If that were easy, one would have already gone missing. Besides, those devices are probably no longer a danger, since weapons that are not maintained quickly become what one expert calls “radioactive scrap metal.” If terrorists were able to steal a Pakistani bomb, they would still have to defeat the arming codes and other safeguards designed to prevent unauthorized use. As for Iran, no nuclear state has ever given a bomb to an ally — for reasons even the Iranians can grasp. Stealing some 100 pounds of bomb fuel would require help from rogue individuals inside some government who are prepared to jeopardize their own lives. Then comes the task of building a bomb. It’s not something you can gin up with spare parts and power tools in your garage. It requires millions of dollars, a safe haven and advanced equipment — plus people with specialized skills, lots of time and a willingness to die for the cause. Assuming the jihadists vault over those Himalayas, they would have to deliver the weapon onto American soil. Sure, drug smugglers bring in contraband all the time — but seeking their help would confront the plotters with possible exposure or extortion. This, like every other step in the entire process, means expanding the circle of people who know what’s going on, multiplying the chance someone will blab, back out or screw up. That has heartening implications. If al-Qaida embarks on the project, it has only a minuscule chance of seeing it bear fruit. Given the formidable odds, **it probably won’t bother**. None of this means we should stop trying to minimize the risk by securing nuclear stockpiles, monitoring terrorist communications and improving port screening. But it offers good reason to think that in this war, it appears, the **worst eventuality is one that will never happen**.

## Iran Sanctions DA

#### We control time frame and magnitude – deal failure draws in global powers and goes nuclear within months

PressTV 11/13

Global nuclear conflict between US, Russia, China likely if Iran talks fail, 11/13/13, http://www.presstv.ir/detail/2013/11/13/334544/global-nuclear-war-likely-if-iran-talks-fail/

A global conflict between the US, Russia, and China is likely in the coming months should the world powers fail to reach a nuclear deal with Iran, an American analyst says.¶ “If the talks fail, if the agreements being pursued are not successfully carried forward and implemented, then there would be enormous international pressure to drive towards a conflict with Iran before [US President Barack] Obama leaves office and that’s a very great danger that no one can underestimate the importance of,” senior editor at the Executive Intelligence Review Jeff Steinberg told Press TV on Wednesday. ¶ “The United States could find itself on one side and Russia and China on the other and those are the kinds of conditions that can lead to miscalculation and general roar,” Steinberg said. ¶ “So the danger in this situation is that if these talks don’t go forward, we could be facing a global conflict in the coming months and years and that’s got to be avoided at all costs when you’ve got countries like the United States, Russia, and China with” their arsenals of “nuclear weapons,” he warned. ¶ The warning came one day after the White House told Congress not to impose new sanctions against Tehran because failure in talks with Iran could lead to war.

#### Iran nuclearization causes Middle East prolif – causes nuclear war – no deterrent effect

Rynhold 11/14 Jonathan Rynhold is a senior researcher at the BESA Center for Strategic Studies and a senior lecturer in the Department of Political Studies at Bar-Ilan University, Payback: The real cost of the Iraq War is a nuclear Iran, 11/14/13, http://www.haaretz.com/opinion/.premium-1.557999

 For if Iran becomes a threshold nuclear state, Saudi Arabia will immediately take delivery of the nuclear weapons that sit waiting for it in Pakistan. Egypt and Turkey will follow suit. An American nuclear umbrella did not stop Britain and France developing an independent deterrent and it did not stop Japan becoming a nuclear threshold state. So it is highly unlikely that America's Middle Eastern allies will be more compliant.¶ Proliferation of nuclear weapons in an already unstable region, means the chances of a crisis leading to the actual use of these weapons is much greater than during the Cold War. Furthermore, in some of these countries there is a chance that radical groups, unconstrained by the pragmatic calculations of governments' that wish to remain alive and in power, may get hold of these weapons and use them. The idea that the U.S. or Europe can dismiss such eventualities because they will happen in 'far away countries about whom we know little' is hubris. It will not take the Iranians and others long to develop long-range missiles – indeed the Saudis already have such missiles and, given the Arab 'Spring' who knows how stable that regime is and what might replace it.

#### 2) PC key – 30 Senators up for grabs

Sargent 12/20 Greg, Washington Post, Divide deepens among Democrats on Iran, 12/20/13, http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/plum-line/wp/2013/12/20/divide-deepens-among-democrats-on-iran/

At his presser today, President Obama reiterated his opposition to Congress passing any bill now imposing new sanctions on Iran. He repeated that his goal is to prevent Iran from gaining nuclear weapons, and said he would prefer to accomplish this through diplomacy, adding: “I would think that would be the preference on Capitol Hill.”¶ Translation: By imperiling the prospect of a long term diplomatic solution curbing Iran’s nuclear program, Congress would be making war more likely.¶ I’m told that Senator Barbara Boxer, a leading opponent of a new sanctions bill and a senior member of the Foreign Relations Committee, is working behind the scenes to persuade other Senate Democrats to oppose against any such bill if it comes up for a vote.¶ “I’m definitely talking to my colleagues and making the case that a rush to a new sanctions bill could disrupt these sensitive negotiations with Iran,” Boxer says, in a statement emailed my way.¶ That raises an interesting question: What if this bill comes to a vote and goes down in the Senate?¶ Already, Democrats are divided on the push for a new sanctions bill. Senators Robert Menendez and Chuck Schumer are leading the push for the bill, and they have been joined by 11 other Democratic Senators. On the other hand, 10 Dem Senators — all committee chairs — have come out against the sanctions bill, arguing in a letter to Harry Reid that “new sanctions would play into the hands of those in Iran who are most eager to see the negotiations fail.”¶ That leaves at least 30 Dem Senators who may be up for grabs.¶ This means that, in addition to the organizing that Boxer is undertaking, you’re all but certain to see more pressure be brought to bear on Democrats to back off of Congressional action right now. (There is also pressure on them to support the new sanctions bill, but the organizing that’s taking place against it is getting less attention.) As HuffPo reported yesterday, liberal groups like MoveOn and CREDO are already pillorying senators Menendez and Schumer for undermining the negotiations and playing into GOP efforts to fracture Dem unity on Iran. Pressure will probably be brought to bear on undecided Dems, too.¶ Senate aides say they are not ready to predict whether the Iran sanctions bill will or won’t pass. Right now 13 Republicans have signed on to the Menendez-Schumer bill. But you could conceivably see Republican Senators like Rand Paul and Mike Lee, who have been more suspicious of the use of American power abroad than neocons or GOP internationalists have traditionally been, come out against the bill. I’ve asked Senator Paul’s office where he stands and haven’t received an answer. What will he say?¶ There will also be tremendous pressure brought to bear from both sides on Harry Reid, who has yet to say whether he’ll allow it to come to a vote. If more Dems come out against the bill, it will become harder for him to bring it to a vote.¶ It remains very possible that the bill will pass the Senate, and if the White House is right, that could imperil the chances of a long term diplomatic breakthrough. But it’s also possible the bill will fail, which would be a major rebuke to the hawks.

#### 3) Obama’s political capital is key – assumes all thumpers

Balakrishnan 12/1Bhaskar, The Hindu Business Line, Time to end Iran's isolation, 12/1/13, Lexis

When the US Congress meets on December 9, it will no doubt take stock of the situation. Congress is the determining factor in easing general economic sanctions, something Iran desperately seeks, while the US President has powers to provide only limited relief. A Bill on more sanctions has been passed in the House by a huge bipartisan majority (400-22), and a similar Bill in the Senate is under active consideration. Considerable political capital and persuasion will be needed to get the Senate to hold off on more sanctions.¶ The gains¶ Iran has much to gain from a comprehensive agreement with the P5 plus Germany. (P5 refers to the five permanent members of the UN Security Council. Along with Germany — P5+1 — they are making diplomatic efforts over Iran's nuclear programme.) Lifting the sanctions would provide the benefits of economic growth for its population. The regime would find it easier to manage demands for greater freedom. A civil nuclear programme could grow rapidly. Conventional arms purchases and technology transfers would greatly strengthen the country. Its dominant position in the Gulf and as the leader of Shia Muslims would be recognised. The US and western allies would benefit from Iran's retreat from the nuclear weapons threshold. The nuclear non-proliferation movement would be strengthened and countries that emulate Iran's quest for nuclear weapons capability, discouraged. ¶ The success of diplomacy would stabilise the oil markets and boost world markets. Iran would be a counter to the Taliban-Al Qaeda influence in Afghanistan. ¶ Further, President Rouhani's success could well boost moderate candidates in the 2016 parliamentary elections in Iran.¶ However, Israel and Saudi Arabia oppose the interim agreement. ¶ The way forward¶ The US Congress is a major problem for the Obama administration in getting the sanctions lifted. There is deep suspicion over Iran's intentions, rightwing hostility, and bitter division over domestic issues such as healthcare and government spending. The approaching 2014 congressional election has also cast its shadow. Obama needs to be encouraged to go further by the international community. It is hoped that Iran's leaders will also realise the importance of gaining support from the US Congress

**Political opposition outweighs the turn**

**Ratliff, 13 -** research fellow and former curator of the Americas Collection at the Hoover Institution. He is also a research fellow of the Independent Institute. An expert on Latin America, China, and US foreign policy, he has written extensively on how traditional cultures and institutions influence current conditions and on prospects for economic and political development in East/Southeast Asia and Latin America (William, “Cuba's Tortured Transition” 1/30,

<http://www.hoover.org/publications/defining-ideas/article/139281>

A New Policy to Cuba Since the early 1990s U.S. “proactive” policies have done more to stoke than reduce domestic tensions in Cuba, though we profess to seek a “peaceful transition.” Most U.S. legislators have supported pro-embargo Cuban-Americans even though Gallup polls have long shown that most Americans favor diplomatic relations with Havana and lifting the embargo. On balance, politicians don’t think Cuba policy is important enough to be worth stirring up the hornets in the still fairly militant and well-financed pro-embargo lobby. Not only have all presidential candidates including Obama supported the embargo, most have resisted even seriously discussing it.

#### Negotiations are genuine – concrete concessions are on the table

Joyner 9/20

Professor of Law at the University of Alabama School of Law (Dan, “Rouhani’s WaPo Op-ed, Trip to the UN, Major New Concession, and an Opportunity Not to be Missed” http://armscontrollaw.com/)

Many will have already read Iranian President Hassan Rouhani’s op-ed published yesterday in the Washington Post. Part of an interesting trend lately, begun with Russian President Putin’s op-ed in the NYT last week, of foreign leaders trying to speak directly to the American people through leading American media outlets. Rouhani’s op-ed is just the most recent installment in a number of statements by the new Iranian president, including through a Twitter account, in which he has tried to strike a much more conciliatory and positive tone with the West and with Israel than his predecessor Mahmoud Ahmadinejad. He has said repeatedly that he is willing to negotiate on a real and meaningful basis with the West in order to resolve the dispute over Iran’s nuclear program.¶ It has been reported that President Obama and President Rouhani have already exchanged letters, in a very rare instance of direct communication between US and Iranian leaders. Further, in what appears to be a significant sign of goodwill, the US Treasury department has twice this year eased some provisions of its sanctions on Iran.¶ In the midst of these positive signs of a changed tone and willingness on the part of both sides to cooperate productively in negotiations regarding Iran’s nuclear program, President Rouhani will be traveling to the United Nations in New York next week, for his first address to the UN General Assembly.¶ In perhaps the most significant sign yet of Iran’s commitment to serious negotiations with the West over its nuclear program, the German magazine Der Spiegel reported a few days ago that President Rouhani is prepared to offer as a concession something that President Ahmadinejad would never have considered offering – the decommissioning of of the Fordow enrichment facility. The decommissioning of Fordow has been one of the P5+1′s longstanding demands in the negotiations. I wrote about it in one of my very first ACL posts last summer, including the explicit rejection of this idea by Iran’s IAEA representative at the time. The Der Spiegel report says that Rouhani may even make this offer publicly during his UN visit next week.¶ It it’s true that Rouhani is willing to put the decommissioning of Fordow on the table, then people can stop their dismissal of Rouhani’s recent statements as a charm offensive without any real substance. The decommissioning of Fordow would be a major concession by Iran to Western demands, and would, as part of a negotiated package deal, deserve a reciprocal major concession on the part of the P5+1, in the form of real and meaningful sanctions relief for Iran.¶ I think that the current circumstances of Rouhani’s election and mandate from the Iranian people, and his expressed willingness to negotiate productively and to put major concessions on the table, represent a historic opportunity that President Obama would be a fool to miss. I think he has a real chance here to do something that would re-earn him his Nobel Peace Prize – negotiate an accord with Iran over its nuclear program that will significantly reduce international tension surrounding this longstanding dispute, that has harmed the reputation of the US and the EU in the world, seriously damaged the perceived credibility of the IAEA, and harmed millions of Iranian civilians through international sanctions that courts in the EU have repeatedly found to be unlawful.

#### Iran negotiating in good faith – Khamenei and Revolutionary Guard on board

Escobar 11/15

Pepe Escobar is the author of Globalistan: How the Globalized World is Dissolving into Liquid War, France clueless on Iran, Asia Times, 11/15/13, http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Middle\_East/MID-01-151113.html

Assorted European diplomats have been spinning, off the record, that yes, there was a nearly done deal, but the Iranian delegation still had to go back to Tehran to get ultimate approval from Supreme Leader Ayatollah Khamenei. That's exactly the line that Kerry followed during the week. ¶ The whole saga restarts next Wednesday. There is no question Iranian President Hassan Rouhani and Foreign Minister Zarif made sure the IAEA would be able to attest, from inside Iran, that goodwill is still the name of the game. This is how they controlled their own opposition - the hard line Revolutionary Guards.

#### 1) Iran sanctions won’t pass now – continued pressure from Obama is key

Bowman 1/23 Michael, Voice of America, Support Slipping for Iran Sanctions in US Senate, 1/23/14, http://www.voanews.com/content/support-slipping-for-iran-sanctions-in-senate/1836453.html

CAPITOL HILL - More Democratic senators are quietly signaling their opposition to a bill that spells out new sanctions against Iran if negotiations to limit the country's nuclear program do not yield a final accord. **The bill retains bipartisan support in both houses of Congress, but passage is seen as increasingly unlikely in the Democratic-led Senate** **amid an intense lobbying effort by the Obama administration to hold off on sanctions while international negotiations proceed.** Senators Patty Murray and Elizabeth Warren are the latest Democrats to announce their opposition to the Iran sanctions bill currently before Congress. In a letter to constituents in Washington state, Murray said **"the administration should be given time to negotiate a strong verifiable comprehensive agreement" on Iran's nuclear program**. At the same time, she pledged to work "to swiftly enact sanctions" if the talks ultimately fail. Similarly, a spokeswoman for Warren says the Massachusetts senator "does not support imposing additional sanctions through new legislation while diplomatic efforts to achieve a long-term agreement are ongoing." The sanctions bill has 16 Democratic co-sponsors, near-unanimous support among Republicans, and the backing of politically potent pro-Israeli U.S. lobbying groups. **But 11 Senate committee chairs, including Murray, currently oppose the bill.** Among Democrats who signed on to the measure late last year, some have grown less vocal in their defense and promotion of the measure in recent weeks. Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid has neither explicitly promised a vote on the bill, nor ruled it out. Congressional expert William Galston of the Brookings Institution **says pressure from President Barack Obama appears to be swaying a growing number of Democratic lawmakers.**"The White House is determined to prevent this from happening," he said. "The administration believes in the marrow of its bones that the executive branch is the lead negotiator in the matter and that it deserves a chance to conduct its own foreign policy." **Iran says any new sanctions would violate last year's interim nuclear accord and spell the end of negotiations**