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**Immigration reform will pass --- pc is key and Obama is pushing.**

McMorris-Santoro 10/15

Evan, BuzzFeed Staff, Obama Has Already Won The Shutdown Fight And He’s Coming For Immigration Next, 10/15/13, http://www.buzzfeed.com/evanmcsan/obama-has-already-won-the-shutdown-fight-and-hes-coming-for

As the fiscal fight roiling Washington nears its end, the White House is already signaling that it plans to use the political momentum it has gained during the shutdown fight to charge back into the immigration debate. And this time, Democratic pollsters and advocates say, they could actually win.¶ The final chapter of the current crisis hasn’t been written yet, but Democrats in Washington are privately confident that they’ll emerge with the upper hand over the conservatives in Congress who forced a government shutdown. And sources say the administration plans to use its victory to resurrect an issue that was always intended to be a top priority of Obama’s second-term agenda.¶ Advocates argue the post-fiscal crisis political reality could thaw debate on the issue in the House, which froze in earlier this year after the Senate passed a bipartisan immigration bill that was led by Republican Sen. Marco Rubio and Democratic Sen. Chuck Schumer.¶ “It’s at least possible with sinking poll numbers for the Republicans, with a [GOP] brand that is badly damaged as the party that can’t govern responsibly and is reckless that they’re going to say, ‘All right, what can we do that will be in our political interest and also do tough things?’” said Frank Sharry, executive director of the immigration reform group America’s Voice. “That’s where immigration could fill the bill.”¶ The White House and Democrats are “ready” to jump back into the immigration fray when the fiscal crises ends, Sharry said. And advocates are already drawing up their plans to put immigration back on the agenda — plans they’ll likely initiate the morning after a fiscal deal is struck.¶ “We’re talking about it. We want to be next up and we’re going to position ourselves that way,” Sharry said. “There are different people doing different things, and our movement will be increasingly confrontational with Republicans, including civil disobedience. A lot of people are going to say, ‘We’re not going to wait.’”¶ The White House isn’t ready to talk about the world after the debt limit fight yet, but officials have signaled strongly they want to put immigration back on the agenda.¶ Asked about future strategic plans after the shutdown Monday, a senior White House official said, “That’s a conversation for when the government opens and we haven’t defaulted.” But on Tuesday, Press Secretary Jay Carney specifically mentioned immigration when asked “how the White House proceeds” after the current fracas is history.¶ “Just like we wish for the country, for deficit reduction, for our economy, that the House would follow the Senate’s lead and pass comprehensive immigration reform with a big bipartisan vote,” he said. “That might be good for the Republican Party. Analysts say so; Republicans say so. We hope they do it.”¶ The president set immigration as his next priority in an interview with Univision Tuesday.¶ “Once that’s done, you know, the day after, I’m going to be pushing to say, call a vote on immigration reform,” Obama said. He also set up another fight with the House GOP on the issue.¶ “We had a very strong Democratic and Republican vote in the Senate,” Obama said. “The only thing right now that’s holding it back is, again, Speaker Boehner not willing to call the bill on the floor of the House of Representatives.”¶ Don’t expect the White House effort to include barnstorming across the country on behalf of immigration reform in the days after the fiscal crisis ends, reform proponents predict. Advocates said the White House has tried hard to help immigration reform along, and in the current climate that means trying to thread the needle with Republicans who support reform but have also reflexively opposed every one of Obama’s major policy proposals.¶ Democrats and advocates seem to hope the GOP comes back to immigration on its own, albeit with a boost from Democrats eager to join them. Polls show Republicans have taken on more of the blame from the fiscal battle of the past couple of weeks. But Tom Jensen, a pollster with the Democratic firm Public Policy Polling, said moving to pass immigration reform could be just what the doctor ordered to get the public back on the side of the Republicans.¶ “We’ve consistently found that a sizable chunk of Republican voters support immigration reform, and obviously a decent number of Republican politicians do too,” Jensen said. “After this huge partisan impasse, they may want to focus on something that’s not quite as polarized, and immigration would certainly fit the bill since we see voters across party lines calling for reform.”

**House GOP members empirically oppose the plan Cuban drilling
Stephens and Clovin, 11**, Sarah, Executive Director of the Center for Democracy in the Americas, and Jake, Vice President for Global Trade Issues at the National Foreign Trade Council (“US-Cuba policy, and the race for oil drilling”, 9/29, The Hill, http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/foreign-policy/184661-us-cuba-policy-and-the-race-for-oil-drilling)//LA
Due to the fact that the drilling involves Cuba, American companies and workers cannot lend their expertise to what could be a risky operation.  U.S. economic sanctions prevent our private sector from helping Cuba drill safely and paralyze the U.S. government, which ought to be convening bilateral discussions on best practices and coordinating disaster response.  In fact, the U.S. has no emergency response agreement with Cuba for oil spills.  While some specific licenses have been granted to permit U.S. firms to conduct limited transactions with Cuba, current sanctions bar the United States from deploying the kind of clean-up equipment, engineers, spare parts for blow-out prevention, chemical dispersants, and rigs to drill relief wells that would be needed to address an oil crisis involving Cuba. One welcomed development came earlier this month, when William Reilly, a former head of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and co-chair of the Commission that investigated the Deepwater Horizon disaster, led a group of experts to Cuba to take a look at their plans.  While the administration has done well giving permission to Mr. Reilly, as well as to other experts, to discuss the problem with Cuban counterparts, it should move more aggressively to work with the Cuban government to cooperate on plans for safe drilling and responding to a possible crisis. Rather than moving forward, some in the U.S. Congress would make the problem worse.  Rep. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (FL-R), who criticized Mr. Reilly’s visit to Cuba as “giving credibility to the regime’s dangerous oil-drilling scheme,” has offered legislation to try and stop Repsol from drilling.  Rep. Vern Buchanan (FL-R) would deny Repsol the right to drill in U.S. waters if it helped Cuba drill in its waters.   Thirty-four members of both parties have written Repsol directly, threatening the company if it drills with Cuba.  Yet this tactic can’t work.  Even if they could deter Repsol from drilling – which is unlikely – they cannot stop Cuba and partners from countries like China, Russia, and Venezuela, from using the rig and searching for oil. At some point, it is likely that drilling will begin and the United States ought to do what it can to prepare for that eventuality.  The U.S. government should facilitate access by Cuba and its drilling partners to the resources they need to drill safely.  President Obama should instruct the Treasury Department to issue a blanket general license now that would allow private industry to provide what oil expert Jorge Piñon calls ”any conceivable response” in the event of a crisis. As we have already done with Mexico and Canada, the U.S. should join Cuba in crafting a crisis response agreement covering on-scene coordinators, a joint response team, response coordination centers, rapid notification protocols, customs and immigration procedures, and communications.  The plan should be written, signed, tested, and implemented as quickly as possible. Earlier this year, the Deep Water Horizon Commission, which Mr. Reilly co-chaired, said in its final report “that neither BP nor the federal government was prepared to deal with a spill” of its magnitude or complexity; that industry and policy makers were lulled by a “culture of complacency” that resulted in 5 million barrels of oil being dumped into the Gulf. Having seen this movie once before, complacency is inexcusable.  Politics should not blind Washington to the reality of the situation unfolding off of our shores.

**Key to the economy**

**Krudy ‘13** [Edward. Politics for Reuters. “Analysis: Immigration Reform could Boost US Economic Growth” Reuters, 1/29/13 ln]

**The sluggish U.S. economy could get a lift** if President Barack Obama and a bipartisan group of senators succeed in what could be the biggest overhaul of the nation's immigration system since the 1980s. Relaxed immigration rules could **encourage entrepreneurship**, increase demand for housing, raise tax revenues and help reduce the budget deficit, economists said. By helping more immigrants enter the country legally and allowing many illegal immigrants to remain, the United States could help offset a slowing birth rate and put itself in a stronger demographic position than aging Europe, Japan and China. "**Numerous industries in the U**nited **S**tates **can't find the workers they need, right now even in a bad economy**, to fill their orders and expand their production as the market demands," said Alex Nowrasteh, an immigration specialist at the libertarian Cato Institute. The emerging **consensus among economists** is that **immigration** provides a net benefit. It **increases** **demand** and productivity, helps drive innovation and lowers prices, although there is little agreement on the size of the impact on economic growth. President Barack Obama plans to launch his second-term push for a U.S. immigration overhaul during a visit to Nevada on Tuesday and will make it a high priority to win congressional approval of a reform package this year, the White House said. The chances of major reforms gained momentum on Monday when a bipartisan group of senators agreed on a framework that could eventually give 11 million illegal immigrants a chance to become American citizens. Their proposals would also include means to keep and attract workers with backgrounds in science, technology, engineering and mathematics. This would be aimed both at foreign students attending American universities where they are earning advanced degrees and high-tech workers abroad. An estimated 40 percent of scientists in the United States are immigrants and studies show immigrants are twice as likely to start businesses, said Nowrasteh. Boosting legal migration and legalizing existing workers could add $1.5 trillion to the U.S. economy over the next 10 years, estimates Raul Hinojosa-Ojeda, a specialist in immigration policy at the University of California, Los Angeles. That's an annual increase of 0.8 percentage points to the economic growth rate, **currently stuck at about 2 percent**. REPUBLICANS' HISPANIC PUSH Other economists say the potential benefit to growth is much lower. Richard Freeman, an economist at Harvard, believes most of the benefits to the economy from illegal immigrants already in the United States has already been recorded and legalizing their status would produce only incremental benefits. While opposition to reform lingers on both sides of the political spectrum and any controversial legislation can easily meet a quick end in a divided Washington, the chances of substantial change seem to be rising. Top Republicans such as Governor Bobby Jindal of Louisiana are not mincing words about the party's need to appeal to the Hispanic community and foreign-born voters who were turned off by Republican candidate Mitt Romney's tough talk in last year's presidential campaign. A previous Obama plan, unveiled in May 2011, included the creation of a guest-worker program to meet agricultural labor needs and something similar is expected to be in his new proposal. The senators also indicated they would support a limited program that would allow companies in certain sectors to import guest workers if Americans were not available to fill some positions. An additional boost to growth could come from rising wages for newly legalized workers and higher productivity from the arrival of more highly skilled workers from abroad. Increased tax revenues would help federal and state authorities plug budget deficits although the benefit to government revenues will be at least partially offset by the payment of benefits to those who gain legal status. In 2007, the Congressional Budget Office estimated that proposed immigration reform in that year would have generated $48 billion in revenue from 2008 to 2017, while costing $23 billion in health and welfare payments. There is also unlikely to be much of a saving on enforcement from the senators' plan because they envisage tougher border security to prevent further illegal immigration and a crackdown on those overstaying visas. One way to bump up revenue, according to a report co-authored by University of California, Davis economist Giovanni Peri, would be to institute a cap-and-trade visa system. Peri estimated it could generate up to $1.2 billion annually. Under such a system, the government would auction a certain number of visas employers could trade in a secondary market. "A more efficient, more transparent and more flexible immigration system would help firms expand, contribute to more job creation in the United States, and slow the movement of operations abroad," according to a draft report, soon to be published as part of a study by the Hamilton Project, a think tank. There was no immediate sign that either the Obama or the senators' plan would include such a system. The long-term argument for immigration is a demographic one. Many developed nations are seeing their populations age, adding to the burden of pension and healthcare costs on wage-earners. Immigration in the United States would need to double to keep the working-age population stable at its current 67 percent of total population, according to George Magnus, a senior independent economic adviser at UBS in London, While Magnus says a change of that magnitude may prove too politically sensitive, the focus should be on attracting highly skilled and entrepreneurial immigrants in the way Canada and Australia do by operating a points system for immigrants rather than focusing mainly on family connections. "The trick is to shift the balance of migration towards those with education (and) skills," he added. HARD ROAD Academics at major universities such as Harvard and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology often lament that **many of their top foreign graduates end up returning to their home countries because visas are hard to get.** "We have so much talent that is sitting here in the universities," said William Kerr, a professor at Harvard Business School. "I find it very difficult to swallow that we then make it so hard for them to stay." The last big amnesty for illegal immigrants was in 1986 when President Ronald Reagan legalized about 3 million already in the country. Numerous studies have shown that subsequently their wages rose significantly. Research on how immigration affects overall wages is inconclusive. George Borjas at Harvard says immigration has created a small net decrease in overall wages for those born in the United States, concentrated among the low-skilled, while Giovani Peri at UC Davis found that immigration boosts native wages over the long run. Hinojosa-Ojeda stresses that any reform needs to make it easier for guest workers to enter the country to avoid a new build-up of illegal workers. "If we don't create a mechanism that can basically bring in 300,000 to 400,000 new workers a year into a variety of labor markets and needs, we could be setting ourselves up for that again," said Hinojosa-Ojeda. Nowrasteh at Cato also believes an expanded guest worker program would stem illegal immigration and allow industries to overcome labor shortages. He found that harsher regulations in recent years in Arizona were adversely affecting agricultural production, increasing financial burdens on business and even negatively impacting the state's struggling real estate market. Some large companies have fallen foul of tougher enforcement regulations. Restaurant chain Chipotle Mexican Grill Inc fired roughly 500 staff in 2010 and 2011 after undocumented workers were found on its payrolls. Putting the chill on other employers, it is now subject of an ongoing federal criminal investigation into its hiring. "**The current system doesn't seem to work for anyone**," Chipotle spokesman Chris Arnold said.

**Nuclear war**

**Harris and Burrows 9**

Mathew, PhD European History @ Cambridge, counselor in the National Intelligence Council (NIC) and Jennifer is a member of the NIC’s Long Range Analysis Unit “Revisiting the Future: Geopolitical Effects of the Financial Crisis” <http://www.ciaonet.org/journals/twq/v32i2/f_0016178_13952.pdf>

Increased Potential for Global Conflict

Of course, the report encompasses more than economics and indeed believes the future is likely to be the result of a number of intersecting and interlocking forces. With so many possible permutations of outcomes, each with ample Revisiting the Future opportunity for unintended consequences, there is a growing sense of insecurity. Even so, **history may be more instructive than ever**. While we continue to believe that **the Great Depression** is not likely to be repeated, the **lessons** to be drawn from that period **include the harmful effects on fledgling democracies and multiethnic societies** (think Central Europe in 1920s and 1930s) **and** on the **sustainability of multilateral institutions** (think League of Nations in the same period). **There is no reason to think that this would not be true in the twenty-first as much as in the twentieth century.** For that reason, the ways in which **the potential for greater conflict could grow** would seem to be even more apt **in a constantly volatile economic environment** as they would be if change would be steadier. In surveying those risks, the report stressed the likelihood that terrorism and nonproliferation will remain priorities even as resource issues move up on the international agenda. **Terrorism’s appeal will decline if economic growth continues in the Middle East and youth unemployment is reduced.** For those terrorist groups that remain active in 2025, however, the diffusion of technologies and scientific knowledge will place some of the world’s most dangerous capabilities within their reach. **Terrorist groups** in 2025 **will** likely be a combination of descendants of long established groups\_inheriting organizational structures, command and control processes, and training procedures necessary to conduct sophisticated attacks\_and newly emergent collections of the angry and disenfranchised that **become self-radicalized, particularly in the absence of economic outlets that would become narrower in an economic downturn. The most dangerous casualty of any economically-induced drawdown of U.S. military presence would** almost certainly **be the Middle East**. Although Iran’s acquisition of nuclear weapons is not inevitable, **worries** about a nuclear-armed Iran **could lead states in the region to develop new security arrangements with external powers, acquire additional weapons, and consider pursuing their own nuclear ambitions**. It is not clear that the type of stable deterrent relationship that existed between the great powers for most of the Cold War would emerge naturally in the Middle East with a nuclear Iran. Episodes of low intensity **conflict** and terrorism taking place under a nuclear umbrella **could lead to an unintended escalation and broader conflict** if clear red lines between those states involved are not well established. **The close proximity of potential nuclear rivals** combined with underdeveloped surveillance capabilities and mobile dual-capable Iranian missile systems also **will produce inherent difficulties** in achieving reliable indications and warning of an impending nuclear attack. The lack of strategic depth in neighboring states like Israel, **short warning and missile flight times, and uncertainty** of Iranian intentions **may place more focus on preemption** rather than defense, potentially **leading to escalating crises.** 36 Types of **conflict** that the world continues to experience, such as **over resources, could reemerge**, particularly if **protectionism grows and there is a resort to neo-mercantilist practices. Perceptions** of renewed energy scarcity will drive countries to take actions to assure their future access to energy supplies. In the worst case, this **could result in interstate conflicts if government leaders deem assured access to energy resources,** for example, to be **essential for** maintaining domestic stability and the **survival of their regime**. Even actions short of war, however, will have important geopolitical implications. Maritime security concerns are providing a rationale for naval buildups and modernization efforts, such as China’s and India’s development of blue water naval capabilities. **If** the **fiscal stimulus focus for** these **countries indeed turns inward, one of the most obvious funding targets may be military. Buildup of regional** naval **capabilities could lead to increased tensions, rivalries, and counterbalancing moves**, but it also will create opportunities for multinational cooperation in protecting critical sea lanes. **With water** also **becoming scarcer in Asia and the Middle East, cooperation to manage changing water resources is likely to be increasingly difficult both within and between states in a more dog-eat-dog world.**
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#### Interpretation – economic engagement only includes the use of economic tools for contact

Jakstaite, 10 - Doctoral Candidate Vytautas Magnus University Faculty of Political Sciences and Diplomacy (Lithuania) (Gerda, “CONTAINMENT AND ENGAGEMENT AS MIDDLE-RANGE THEORIES” BALTIC JOURNAL OF LAW & POLITICS VOLUME 3, NUMBER 2 (2010), DOI: 10.2478/v10076-010-0015-7)

The approach to engagement as economic engagement focuses exclusively on economic instruments of foreign policy with the main national interest being security. Economic engagement is a policy of the conscious development of economic relations with the adversary in order to change the target state‟s behaviour and to improve bilateral relations.94 Economic engagement is academically wielded in several respects. It recommends that the state engage the target country in the international community (with the there existing rules) and modify the target state‟s run foreign policy, thus preventing the emergence of a potential enemy.95 Thus, this strategy aims to ensure safety in particular, whereas economic benefit is not a priority objective. Objectives of economic engagement indicate that this form of engagement is designed for relations with problematic countries – those that pose a potential danger to national security of a state that implements economic engagement. Professor of the University of California Paul Papayoanou and University of Maryland professor Scott Kastner say that economic engagement should be used in relations with the emerging powers: countries which accumulate more and more power, and attempt a new division of power in the international system – i.e., pose a serious challenge for the status quo in the international system (the latter theorists have focused specifically on China-US relations). These theorists also claim that economic engagement is recommended in relations with emerging powers whose regimes are not democratic – that is, against such players in the international system with which it is difficult to agree on foreign policy by other means.96 Meanwhile, other supporters of economic engagement (for example, professor of the University of California Miles Kahler) are not as categorical and do not exclude the possibility to realize economic engagement in relations with democratic regimes.97 Proponents of economic engagement believe that the economy may be one factor which leads to closer relations and cooperation (a more peaceful foreign policy and the expected pledge to cooperate) between hostile countries – closer economic ties will develop the target state‟s dependence on economic engagement implementing state for which such relations will also be cost-effective (i.e., the mutual dependence). However, there are some important conditions for the economic factor in engagement to be effective and bring the desired results. P. Papayoanou and S. Kastner note that economic engagement gives the most positive results when initial economic relations with the target state is minimal and when the target state‟s political forces are interested in development of international economic relations. Whether economic relations will encourage the target state to develop more peaceful foreign policy and willingness to cooperate will depend on the extent to which the target state‟s forces with economic interests are influential in internal political structure. If the target country‟s dominant political coalition includes the leaders or groups interested in the development of international economic relations, economic ties between the development would bring the desired results. Academics note that in non-democratic countries in particular leaders often have an interest to pursue economic cooperation with the powerful economic partners because that would help them maintain a dominant position in their own country.98 Proponents of economic engagement do not provide a detailed description of the means of this form of engagement, but identify a number of possible variants of engagement: conditional economic engagement, using the restrictions caused by economic dependency and unconditional economic engagement by exploiting economic dependency caused by the flow. Conditional economic engagement, sometimes called linkage or economic carrots engagement, could be described as conflicting with economic sanctions. A state that implements this form of engagement instead of menacing to use sanctions for not changing policy course promises for a target state to provide more economic benefits in return for the desired political change. Thus, in this case economic ties are developed depending on changes in the target state‟s behaviour.99 Unconditional economic engagement is more moderate form of engagement. Engagement applying state while developing economic relations with an adversary hopes that the resulting economic dependence over time will change foreign policy course of the target state and reduce the likelihood of armed conflict. Theorists assume that economic dependence may act as a restriction of target state‟s foreign policy or as transforming factor that changes target state‟s foreign policy objectives.100 Thus, economic engagement focuses solely on economic measures (although theorists do not give a more detailed description), on strategically important actors of the international arena and includes other types of engagement, such as the conditional-unconditional economic engagement.

#### ‘Its’ means ownership

GEGT, 05 – Glossary of English Grammar Terms (2005, Using English, http://www.usingenglish.com/glossary/possessive-pronoun.html)//VP

Mine, yours, his, hers, its, ours, theirs are the possessive pronouns used to substitute a noun and to show possession or ownership. EG. This is your disk and that's mine. (Mine substitutes the word disk and shows that it belongs to me.)

#### Violation – the aff establishes a framework for future engagement without actually economically engaging – it just normalizes relations

#### Voting Issue-

#### A) Limits – including indirect incentives is a limits disaster

Resnik, 1– Assistant Professor of Political Science at Yeshiva University (Evan, Journal of International Affairs, “Defining Engagement” v54, n2, political science complete)

DEFINING ENGAGEMENT TOO BROADLY

A second problem associated with various scholarly treatments of engagement is the tendency to define the concept too broadly to be of much help to the analyst. For instance, Cha's definition of engagement as any policy whose means are "non-coercive and non-punitive" is so vague that essentially any positive sanction could be considered engagement. The definition put forth by Alastair lain Johnston and Robert Ross in their edited volume, Engaging China, is equally nebulous. According to Johnston and Ross, engagement constitutes "the use of non-coercive methods to ameliorate the non-status quo elements of a rising power's behavior."(n14) Likewise, in his work, Rogue States and US Foreign Policy, Robert Litwak defines engagement as "positive sanctions."(n15) Moreover, in their edited volume, Honey and Vinegar: Incentives, Sanctions, and Foreign Policy, Richard Haass and Meghan O'Sullivan define engagement as "a foreign policy strategy that depends to a significant degree on positive incentives to achieve its objectives."(n16)As policymakers possess a highly differentiated typology of alternative options in the realm of negative sanctions from which to choose--including covert action, deterrence, coercive diplomacy, containment, limited war and total war--it is only reasonable to expect that they should have a similar menu of options in the realm of positive sanctions than simply engagement. Equating engagement with positive sanctions risks lumping together a variety of discrete actions that could be analyzed by distinguishing among them and comparing them as separate policies.

#### B) Precision – only direct economic transfers are engagement – key to predictability

Resnik, 1– Assistant Professor of Political Science at Yeshiva University (Evan, Journal of International Affairs, “Defining Engagement” v54, n2, political science complete)

Thus, a rigid conceptual distinction can be drawn between engagement and appeasement. Whereas both policies are positive sanctions--insofar as they add to the power and prestige of the target state--engagement does so in a less direct and less militarized fashion than appeasement. In addition, engagement differs from appeasement by establishing an increasingly interdependent relationship between the sender and the target state. At any juncture, the sender state can, in theory, abrogate such a relationship at some (ideally prohibitive) cost to the target state.(n34) Appeasement, on the other hand, does not involve the establishment of contacts or interdependence between the appeaser and the appeased. Territory and/or a sphere of influence are merely transferred by one party to the other either unconditionally or in exchange for certain concessions on the part of the target state.

#### **C) Negative ground – they allow affs that don’t spend any money – means we don’t get spending or tradeoff disads – no predictable source to garner offense from**
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#### Text: The United States federal government should normalize trade relations with Cuba except barriers to giving technology and expertise for oil production and exploration in Cuba.

**CP does the entirety of the aff except for normalizing relations over oil – functional and competition is good –**

**A) Logical decision-making**

**B) Most real world**

#### Normalizing trade relations ensures rush toward expansive drilling—purely exploratory now – causes spills

Claver-Carone, 08 – director of the US-Cuba Democracy PAC (Mauricio, “How the Cuban embargo protects the environment,” *The New York Times*, July 25, Online: <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/07/25/opinion/25iht-edcarone.1.14793496.html>)//VP

For almost a decade now, the Castro regime has been lauding offshore lease agreements. It has tried Norway's StatoilHydro, India's state-run Oil & Natural Gas Corporation, Malaysia's Petronas and Canada's Sherritt International. Yet, there is no current drilling activity off Cuba's coasts. The Cuban government has announced plans to drill, then followed with postponements in 2006, 2007 and this year. Clearly, foreign oil companies anticipate political changes in Cuba and are trying to position themselves accordingly. It is equally clear they are encountering legal and logistical obstacles preventing oil and gas exploration and development. Among the impediments are well-founded reservations as to how any new discovery can be turned into product. Cuba has very limited refining capacity, and the U.S. embargo prevents sending Cuban crude oil to American refineries. Neither is it financially or logistically viable for partners of the current Cuban regime to undertake deep-water exploration without access to U.S. technology, which the embargo prohibits transferring to Cuba. The prohibitions exist for good reason. Fidel Castro expropriated U.S. oil company assets after taking control of Cuba and has never provided compensation. Equally important, foreign companies trying to do business with Cuba still face a lot of expenses and political risks. If, or when, the Cuban regime decides again to expropriate the assets of these companies, there is no legal recourse in Cuba.

#### Spills destroy the ecosystem —magnified by higher concentration of unique wildlife post-BP spill

Malik, 10 – Masters in Philosophy at Oxford University (Stephanie, “Ethical Questions Surrounding the BP Oil Spill,” *Practical Ethics*, June 29, Online: <http://blog.practicalethics.ox.ac.uk/2010/06/ethical-questions-surrounding-the-bp-oil-spill/>)//VP

Conspicuously absent from Obama’s address was genuine acknowledgment of the sheer magnitude of the damage the spill will have for years to come on the wildlife in the Gulf and the ecosystem generally. Some of the immediate effects of a spill are obvious – there is no shortage of gut-wrenching images of wildlife doused in oil and seabirds suffocating while frantically and frivolously preening themselves. But some types of ecological damage are hard to measure and can take years to document. The miles long underwater plumes of oil will likely poison and suffocate life across the food chain, with damage that according to scientists could endure for a decade or more. Many of the creatures that die will sink to the bottom, making mortality estimates difficult. Damage to the reproduction rate of sea turtles may take years to play out. Unique to the Deepwater Horizon spill is not only how deep it is, but also the huge quantity of chemical dispersants sprayed on the surface and at the leak on the seafloor. The problem with dispersants is two-fold in that oil is not only directly toxic to many of the creatures in the Gulf like pelicans, sea turtles, fish, and dolphins, but also microbes in the water that eat the oil suck oxygen out of the water at a massive rate, with levels of oxygen depletion that could be lethal to many other creatures in the water. Moreover the dispersants that are used to fight the oil are also consumed by the microbes—speeding up the rate of oxygen depletion in the Gulf even further. What is especially worrying is that on top of this dangerously low levels of oxygen are already a concern as, according the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, huge numbers of fish, dolphins, and even sharks, are already crowding into exceptionally shallow waters near the shores of Alabama and Florida in order to escape the oil. There's also little scientific understanding of how the dispersants might affect the deep-water ecosystem. Legal protection of wildlife in the Gulf is thin. There are no laws that exist simply to protect animal interests. U.S. law protects animals as property. That means laws designed to protect animals exist only to protect the interests of their owners or the public. “Most of the wild animals affected by the BP spill do not have any legal protections at all, and there is no penalty that can be imposed for suffocating them with oil, destroying their habitats and otherwise harming them,” said Justin Goodman, a representative of PETA.

#### Specifically oil drilling in Cuba would devastate biodiversity.

Kozloff, 10 – writer for the Huffington Post and PhD in Latin American History from Oxford (Nikolas, “Left Must Fine Tune its Position on Cuba Embargo in Light of Oil Spill,” *Monga Bay*, May 26, Online: <http://news.mongabay.com/2010/0526-kozloff_cuba.html>)//VP

From an environmental point of view, the prospect of offshore oil development going forward is not something to be taken lightly. Cuba is the most biologically diverse of all Caribbean islands and sports spectacular white sand beaches, vast coral reefs, and a wide range of fish populations. Cuba’s coastline and mangroves serve as breeding grounds for hundreds of species of fish as well as other marine organisms. Ocean currents carry important fish larvae from Cuba into U.S. waters, which in turn help to replenish ailing American fisheries. The U.S. and Cuba share an ancient deepwater coral system stretching all the way up to North Carolina. In addition, Cuba has more than 4,000 islets which support important reef fish such as grouper. The islets also support sea turtles, dolphins and manatees [the latter already in danger as a result of BP’s oil spill as I recently pointed out]. Crucially important, the islets serve as refuges for endangered species.

#### That causes extinction

Craig 03 – Associate Professor of Law at the Indiana University School of Law (Robin Kundis Craig, 2003, “Taking Steps Toward Marine Wilderness Protection? Fishing and Coral Reef Marine Reserves in Florida and Hawaii” http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=1289250)//VP

Biodiversity and ecosystem function arguments for conserving marine ecosystems also exist, just as they do for terrestrial ecosystems, but these arguments have thus far rarely been raised in political debates. For example, besides significant tourism values - the most economically valuable ecosystem service coral reefs provide, worldwide - coral reefs protect against storms and dampen other environmental fluctuations, services worth more than ten times the reefs' value for food production. n856 Waste treatment is another significant, non-extractive ecosystem function that intact coral reef ecosystems provide. n857 More generally, "ocean ecosystems play a major role in the global geochemical cycling of all the elements that represent the basic building blocks of living organisms, carbon, nitrogen, oxygen, phosphorus, and sulfur, as well as other less abundant but necessary elements." n858 In a very real and direct sense, therefore, human degradation of marine ecosystems impairs the planet's ability to support life. Maintaining biodiversity is often critical to maintaining the functions of marine ecosystems. Current evidence shows that, in general, an ecosystem's ability to keep functioning in the face of disturbance is strongly dependent on its biodiversity, "indicating that more diverse ecosystems are more stable." n859 Coral reef ecosystems are particularly dependent on their biodiversity. [\*265] Most ecologists agree that the complexity of interactions and degree of interrelatedness among component species is higher on coral reefs than in any other marine environment. This implies that the ecosystem functioning that produces the most highly valued components is also complex and that many otherwise insignificant species have strong effects on sustaining the rest of the reef system. n860 Thus, maintaining and restoring the biodiversity of marine ecosystems is critical to maintaining and restoring the ecosystem services that they provide. Non-use biodiversity values for marine ecosystems have been calculated in the wake of marine disasters, like the Exxon Valdez oil spill in Alaska. n861 Similar calculations could derive preservation values for marine wilderness. However, economic value, or economic value equivalents, should not be "the sole or even primary justification for conservation of ocean ecosystems. Ethical arguments also have considerable force and merit." n862 At the forefront of such arguments should be a recognition of how little we know about the sea - and about the actual effect of human activities on marine ecosystems. The United States has traditionally failed to protect marine ecosystems because it was difficult to detect anthropogenic harm to the oceans, but we now know that such harm is occurring - even though we are not completely sure about causation or about how to fix every problem. Ecosystems like the NWHI coral reef ecosystem should inspire lawmakers and policymakers to admit that most of the time we really do not know what we are doing to the sea and hence should be preserving marine wilderness whenever we can - especially when the United States has within its territory relatively pristine marine ecosystems that may be unique in the world. We may not know much about the sea, but we do know this much: if we kill the ocean we kill ourselves, and we will take most of the biosphere with us. The Black Sea is almost dead, n863 its once-complex and productive ecosystem almost entirely replaced by a monoculture of comb jellies, "starving out fish and dolphins, emptying fishermen's nets, and converting the web of life into brainless, wraith-like blobs of jelly." n864 More importantly, the Black Sea is not necessarily unique.

## 4

#### Text: The United States federal government should remove its blockade against Cuba.

**We compete textually - we use the term blockade instead of normalize trade relations.**

#### Using economic language like “normalize trade relations,” and economic sanctions to describe the blockade is distinct from the blockade

**CubavsBlockade 7** (Cuba vs Blockade. Cuban people web site. 2007. http://www.cubavsbloqueo.cu/Default.aspx?tabid=434)//JuneC//

US Blockade against Cuba: simile of the Ripe Fruit¶ ¶ Havana(PL). The United States conceives the blockade on Cuba as a means to fulfill its historic goal to dominate or annex the island, considered state policy by successive US administrations.¶ ¶ The wish to break Cuba has been a priority issue in the agenda of US administrations since the foundation of that nation and has marked White House policy toward Cuba over the last 44 years by applying strong economic sanctions.¶ ¶ Experts agree this is nothing new for Washington, to impose its will on the island by force and constraint, paying no attention to International Law and against Cubans´will.¶ ¶ The intention of controlling Cuba, including annexation, goes back to the 18th Century and was defended as state policy by presidents Thomas Jefferson (1801-1809), James Madison (1809-1817) and John Quincy Adams (1825-1829).¶ ¶ According to historians, successive US governments considered the island as a ripe fruit that should inevitably fall in the hands of the powerful United States, simile held up by geographic proximity of both nations.¶ ¶ In that sense, history registers Washington´s intervention in the Spanish-Cuban War at the end of the 19th Century. Spain was already beaten when the United States assumed in an opportunistic way the control of the island and allowed for formal independence to be achieved in 1902.¶ ¶ Such a formality only materialized after establishing the Platt Amendment, which gave the US the right to intervene militarily in Cuba every time it esteemed it appropriate.¶ ¶ For over half a century, the interests of big US monopolies dominated the Cuban nation, turning this country into an economic colony under the political and military rule of the United States.¶ ¶ According to official figures, US capital investments in the island exceeded by 1959 the figure of one billion pesos (equivalent to US dollars), putting Cuba at the head of the list of US investment in Latin America.¶ ¶ The struggle of Cubans for their independence ended in January, 1959 with the victory of the Revolution headed by Fidel Castro, after which there were a lot of measures approved and designed to recover the country´s wealth, and at the service of the people.Such regulations affected directly US interests on Cuban soil and triggered an immediate response from the White House, opposing a sanction to every revolutionary measure.The obstacles imposed by Washington in order to destroy the newly formed Revolution gave way to a total blockade designed to vanquish the Cuban population by hunger and diseases, and still trying until this day by strengthening the economic siege.With the purpose of isolating this Caribbean nation, Washington imposed the blockade on February 3, 1962, by stopping US imports of Cuban products or those imported from or through this island.¶¶The ban on sale of US products to Cuba is also part of the blockade which has caused losses to the Cuban economy for 79.3 billion US dollars over more than four decades.¶¶The legal framework on which the US bases its policy toward Cuba insists on calling the blockade embargo, unilateral sanction which comprises the application of war time measures.¶ ¶ The Cuban government insists this country does not represent or has ever meant a threat for US national security, hence there are no arguments to extend what in the United States is called a situation of national emergency.¶ ¶ Cubans consider the US government is settling the score on them for having built a different society just 90 miles from its coasts, showing another type of regime is possible, for which Washington cannot forgive them.¶ ¶ At present Cubans continue trying to survive, as they´ve done for more than forty years, the blockade under which seven out of every 10 Cubans have been born, compelled from birth to negotiate the limitations imposed by the siege.¶

#### Imperialist rhetoric causes imperialism, racism and dehumanization

**Kim 4** (Soonsik Kim. Professor in the English Department al Myongji University in Seoul. Korea. Ph.D. in compulsive literature from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. “Colonial and Postcolonial Discourse in the Novels of Yŏm Sang-sŏp, Chinua Achebe, and Salman Rushdie”, Pg. 3-4. Peter Lang. 2004. Google Books. http://books.google.com/books?id=wzXbv13XucUC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs\_ge\_summary\_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false)//JuneC//

Early stages of colonial discourse in a broad sense are usually documentary accounts of cultural contacts, Satisfying one’s curiosity on other exotic lands and their people. The idea of the “Noble Savage" is an example of white men’s psychological and romantic projection of their cultural dissatisfaction onto the Other. And yet, implied is the notion of progress, that is, civilized versus primitive. Nevertheless early (self-centered) accounts of the west about the Other were relatively based on mutual respect. Montaigne’s essay “On Cannibals," for example, has deep sentiments of respect and wonder towards “primitive” cultures. Despite the numerous descriptions of savage (barbaric) customs and primitive dwelling conditions he had heard from other, Montaigne’s wise reflexivity places emphasis ultimately on the Other's cultural merits found in the metaphysical realm not in the material world. He used the Other and their positive Othemess to warn demoralization of his own civilization. By the end of the nineteenth century, the remoteness of the Other in the early colonial discourse had been replaced by realistic necessities of economic and political interests, which brought the massive and systematic exploitation of non-whites along with strong racial biases. The romantic projection to the Other found in the eighteenth and early nineteenth century literature was replaced by wide-spread debasement and dehumanization of non-white races. Thus, racial consciousness or curiosity of earlier contact with the Other changed into serious “racism." Colonial discourse reflects not only contemporary ideology but also sociopolitical situations. The narrative voice in literary works about the Other usually carries a negative judgment about them, and it perpetuates the West’s superiority complex and the Other’s inferiority complex. The ideology of imperialism or colonialism is actually cultural discourse, which rationalizes inequality as it systematically distorts and devalues the Other and the Other’s culture. In creating a false conception of the Other, colonial discourse reveals the truth about power structures. The West has been the voice of the powerful. The political dominance all over the globe might be a kind of infallible evidence for supremacy of the western civilization during the period of imperialism. Imperialist rhetoric of the time served as an important tool to exploit and manipulate the Other through psychological dominance as well as political and military dominance. Literary works contributed to the perpetuation of such colonial or imperial attitudes.

#### Language shapes reality – evaluating the meanings behind the words of an action is a priori to the action

**Edelman 85** (Murray Edelman. American political scientist in University of Wisconsin. “Political Language and Political Reality”. American Political Science Association. Winter 1985. JSTOR. http://www.jstor.org/stable/418800?seq=1&uid=3739560&uid=2&uid=4&uid=3739256&sid=21102185169611)//JuneC//

The most incisive twentieth century students of language converge from different premises on the conclusion that language is the key creator of the social worlds people experience, and they agree as well that language cannot usefully be understood as a tool for describing an objective reality. For the later Wittgenstein there are no essences, only language games. Chomsky analyzes the sense in which grammar is generative. For Derrida all language is performative, a form of action that undermines its own presuppositions. Foucault sees language as antedating and constructing subjectivity. The "linguistic turn" in twentieth century philosophy, social psychology, and literary theory entails an intellectual ferment that raises fundamental questions about a great deal of mainstream political science, and especially about its logical positivist premises. While the writersjust mentioned analyze various senses in which language use is an aspect of creativity, those who focus upon specifically political language are chiefly concerned with its capacity to reflect ideology, mystify, and distort. The more perspicacious of them deny that an undistorting language is possible in a social world marked by inequalities in resources and status, though the notion of an undistorted language can be useful as an evocation of an ideal benchmark. The emphasis upon political language as distorting or mystifying is a key theme in Lasswell and Orwell, as it is in Habermas, Osgood, Ellul, Vygotsky, Enzensberger, Bennett, and Shapiro. The critical element in political maneuver for advantage is the creation of meaning: the construction of beliefs about the significance of events, of problems, of crises of policy changes, and of leaders. The strategic need is to immobilize opposition and mobilize support. While coercion and intimidation help to check resistance in all political systems, the key tactic must always be the evocation of meanings that legitimize favored courses of action and threaten or reassure people so as to encourage them to be supportive or to remain quiescent. Allocations of benefits must themselves be infused with meanings. Whose well being does a policy threaten and whose does it enhance? lt is language about political events and developments that people experience; even events that are close by take their meaning from the language used to depict them. So political language is political reality; there is no other so far as the meaning of events to actor and spectators is concerned.

## Case

**Do not evaluate their value system without first assessing the consequences of its actual implementation. Viewing ethics in isolation is irresponsible & complicit with the evil they criticize.**

**Issac** **2002**.,( Jeffery C. Professor of political science at Indiana-Bloomington & Director of the Center for the Study of Democracy and Public Life. PhD Yale University. From “Ends, Means, and Politics.” Dissent Magazine. Volume 49. Issue # 2. Available online @ subscribing institutions using Proquest. Herm

As a result, the most important political questions are simply not asked. It is assumed that U.S. military intervention is an act of "aggression," but no consideration is given to the aggression to which intervention is a response. The status quo ante in Afghanistan is not, as peace activists would have it, peace, but rather terrorist violence abetted by a regime--the Taliban--that rose to power through brutality and repression. This requires us to ask a question that most "peace" activists would prefer not to ask: What should be done to respond to the violence of a Saddam Hussein, or a Milosevic, or a Taliban regime? What means are likely to stop violence and bring criminals to justice? Calls for diplomacy and international law are well intended and important; they implicate a decent and civilized ethic of global order. But they are also vague and empty, because they are not accompanied by any account of how diplomacy or international law can work effectively to address the problem at hand. The campus left offers no such account. To do so would require it to contemplate tragic choices in which moral goodness is of limited utility. Here what matters is not purity of intention but the intelligent exercise of power. Power is not a dirty word or an unfortunate feature of the world. It is the core of politics. Power is the ability to effect outcomes in the world. Politics, in large part, involves contests over the distribution and use of power. To accomplish anything in the political world, one must attend to the means that are necessary to bring it about. And to develop such means is to develop, and to exercise, power. To say this is not to say that power is beyond morality. It is to say that power is not reducible to morality. As writers such as Niccolo Machiavelli, Max Weber, Reinhold Niebuhr, and Hannah Arendt have taught, an unyielding concern with moral goodness undercuts political responsibility. The concern may be morally laudable, reflecting a kind of personal integrity, but it suffers from three fatal flaws: (1) It fails to see that the purity of one's intention does not ensure the achievement of what one intends. Abjuring violence or refusing to make common cause with morally compromised parties may seem like the right thing; but if such tactics entail impotence, then it is hard to view them as serving any moral good beyond the clean conscience of their supporters; (2) it fails to see that in a world of real violence and injustice, moral purity is not simply a form of powerlessness; it is often a form of complicity in injustice. This is why, from the standpoint of politics--as opposed to religion--pacifism is always a potentially immoral stand. In categorically repudiating violence, it refuses in principle to oppose certain violent injustices with any effect; and (3) it fails to see that politics is as much about unintended consequences as it is about intentions; it is the effects of action, rather than the motives of action, that is most significant. Just as the alignment with "good" may engender impotence, it is often the pursuit of "good" that generates evil. This is the lesson of communism in the twentieth century: it is not enough that one's goals be sincere or idealistic; it is equally important, always, to ask about the effects of pursuing these goals and to judge these effects in pragmatic and historically contextualized ways. Moral absolutism inhibits this judgment. It alienates those who are not true believers. It promotes arrogance. And it undermines political effectiveness.

#### Realism’s inevitable – interdisciplinary research proves

**Wohlforth 09** - William Wohlforth (professor of government at Dartmouth College) 2009 “ Unipolarity, Status Competition, and Great Power War”Project Muse

Mainstream theories generally posit that states come to blows over an international status quo only when it has implications for their security or material well-being. The guiding assumption is that a state’s satisfaction [End Page 34] with its place in the existing order is a function of the material costs and benefits implied by that status.24 By that assumption, once a state’s status in an international order ceases to affect its material wellbeing, its relative standing will have no bearing on decisions for war or peace. But the assumption is undermined by cumulative research in disciplines ranging from neuroscience and evolutionary biology to economics, anthropology, sociology, and psychology that human beings are powerfully motivated by the desire for favorable social status comparisons. This research suggests that the preference for status is a basic disposition rather than merely a strategy for attaining other goals.25 People often seek tangibles not so much because of the welfare or security they bring but because of the social status they confer. Under certain conditions, the search for status will cause people to behave in ways that directly contradict their material interest in security and/or prosperity.

#### Proximate causes o/w – no root causes

**Thompson 3**

William, Professor of Political Science and Director of the Center for the Study of International Relations at Indiana University, “A Streetcar Named Sarajevo: Catalysts, Multiple Causation Chains, and Rivalry Structures,” International Studies Quarterly, 47(3), AD: 7-10-9

Richard Ned Lebow (2000–2001) has recently invoked what might be called a streetcar interpretation of systemic war and change. According to him, all our structural theories in world politics both overdetermine and underdetermine the explanation of the most important events such as World War I, World War II, or the end of the Cold War. Not only do structural theories tend to fixate on one cause or stream of causation, they are inherently incomplete because the influence of structural causes cannot be known without also identifying the necessary role of catalysts. As long as we ignore the precipitants that actually encourage actors to act, we cannot make accurate generalizations about the relationships between more remote causation and the outcomes that we are trying to explain. Nor can we test the accuracy of such generalizations without accompanying data on the presence or absence of catalysts. In the absence of an appropriate catalyst (or a ‘‘streetcar’’ that failed to arrive), wars might never have happened. Concrete information on their presence (‘‘streetcars’’ that did arrive) might alter our understanding of the explanatory significance of other variables. But since catalysts and contingencies are so difficult to handle theoretically and empirically, perhaps we should focus instead on probing the theoretical role of contingencies via the development of ‘‘what if ’’ scenarios.

**Multiple alt causes—embargo is only a small part of the problem**

**PSL, 12** (PSL, 8/30/12, “U.S. imperialism tries to rebound in Latin America

Democrats working hard to reverse the region’s left-wing turn”, [http://www.pslweb.org/liberationnews/newspaper/vol-6-no-11/us-imperialism-tries-to.html)//EM](http://www.pslweb.org/liberationnews/newspaper/vol-6-no-11/us-imperialism-tries-to.html%29//EM)

While Washington’s political and military tactics have varied, its objectives in the region today are essentially unchanged: economic domination. In the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s, Washington installed and armed military dictatorships and regimes in Guatemala, Chile, Argentina, Bolivia, Paraguay, Brazil, Uruguay and Haiti. It fueled genocidal proxy wars to crush insurgent popular movements in Central America, as well as Nicaragua’s Sandinista government in the 1980s. The U.S. military directly intervened in Panama and Grenada, and Cuba continues to be punished with a severe blockade and the occupation of part of its national territory, Guantánamo Bay. The military and fascist repression of previous decades eventually gave way to elections and civilian governments, but only the form of domination changed. Under a more “democratic” façade of government, the new leaders signed onto free-trade programs, allowing U.S. capital to dictate terms and dominate national economies like Mexico and Argentina. With rising overproduction of U.S. commodities and the never-ending drive for expansion, U.S. multinational corporations and banks used Latin America as an outlet for their “surplus” production and capital. Neither Democrat nor Republican will give Latin America a moment of peace. For Mexico, the 1994 North American Free Trade Agreement was the major turning point. Mexican farmers, in mostly small-scale production, could not compete with highly subsidized and mechanized U.S. agribusiness. Mexican agriculture collapsed and over 6 million workers and farmers were forced for their survival to leave their country for the United States. A historic rejection of Washington’s rule An inspiring new development—the Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of Our America (or ALBA)—arose in Latin America in the mid-2000s. Unprecedented in the continent’s history, a successful alliance of Latin American and Caribbean countries started to deliver real advances for their people through cooperation and solidarity. It began with Cuba and Venezuela signing a pact known as the Bolivarian Alternative for the Americas in 2004. In the following years, Bolivia joined ALBA in 2006 after Evo Morales’ election the previous year, Nicaragua joined in 2007 after Daniel Ortega became president and Ecuador joined under Rafael Correa’s presidency in 2009. Caribbean members have also joined: Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines. Hugo Chávez ‘buries’ free trade In a famous episode in Mar del Plata, Argentina, in November 2005, Hugo Chávez spoke to tens of thousands of Latin American activists in an outdoor stadium at the conclusion of a massive “People’s Summit.” The People’s Summit was organized to protest the U.S.-led “Summit of the Americas” in the same city. There, George W. Bush headed the U.S. delegation and tried to pressure other member states to accept the Free Trade Area of the Americas. It was clear the FTAA would fail. Too many countries had been ravaged by already-existing free trade, and growing movements had re-awakened in resistance, inspired by Venezuela’s Bolivarian revolutionary process and by Cuba’s determined survival. At the People’s rally, Chávez waved a shovel above his head and the crowd cheered as he said, “We have come here to bury the FTAA!” He announced a groundbreaking economic pact with Argentina, beginning with the very first oil shipments ever delivered to Buenos Aires by Venezuela. Chávez then spoke of ALBA’s Petro-Caribe accord with 14 Caribbean nations, essentially offering oil for barter. In Mar del Plata, George W. Bush refused to back Argentine President Nestor Kirchner’s request for support in that country's impending debt renegotiation with the World Bank. This was punishment for Argentina for openly rejecting the FTAA and improving relations with Cuba, a reversal of the open hostility displayed by previous administrations. As a harbinger of what ALBA could mean for the peoples of the continent, Venezuela stepped in and helped eliminate Argentina’s billion-dollar debt. Today, U.S. imperialism is less able to impose its will on a growing number of countries, in particular those states in the ALBA alliance. U.S. role evident in Latin America reversals On May 20, 2008, then-candidate Barack Obama gave a major “Latin America speech” that included a veiled threat to Venezuela and ALBA. Having chosen to give the speech in Miami, he strongly condemned Cuba and promised to maintain the blockade. Obama then warned of “demagogues like Chávez” who had “stepped into this vacuum” left by the discredited Latin American establishment, cautioning that this new trend had “made inroads from Bolivia to Nicaragua.” The speech denied the social advances of these countries, calling them mere “false promises.” Only six months into Obama’s presidency, in June 2009, the Honduran military seized democratically elected President Manuel Zelaya and expelled him from the country. Honduras had just joined ALBA, and Zelaya, who came from a moderate ruling-class party, began to adopt a more progressive stance. In a sharp shift from his past politics, for instance, he supported a popular drive for a constitutional assembly. New constitutions had already been adopted under the administrations of Chávez, Morales and Correa; while not socialist, these offered more opportunities for the government and the people to challenge the rule of the oligarchy and foreign capital. Both Obama and Secretary of State Hillary Clinton refused to condemn or even characterize the military coup as such. Later, the U.S. government offered recognition to the 2010 sham election of Porfirio Lobo. Honduras is now solidly back in the U.S. sphere of influence and is no longer part of ALBA. There has been a dramatic rise in political repression and murders of opposition leaders, women, journalists and LGBT activists. Then, in June of this year, Paraguay’s democratically elected President Fernando Lugo was deposed without due process in a lightning-speed impeachment. His illegal removal means that the huge agribusiness operations of Monsanto and Cargill, which own enormous tracts of land for gigantic transgenic soy and corn production, can go on unimpeded. In 2008, the Pentagon, with no notice to or consultation with any Latin American governments, reactivated the Fourth Fleet, which had been deactivated 58 years earlier. They claimed the purpose of the Fourth Fleet was to promote peace, but the real aim was clear: to bully and threaten a Latin America breaking free of their control. Whether the president is a Democrat or Republican, U.S. imperialism will not give the peoples of Latin America and the Caribbean a moment of peace. A vast array of diplomats, generals, think tanks and corporations are working day and night, in coordination with their ruling-class friends across the region, to undermine and reverse the left-wing tide. Inside the belly of the beast, the Party for Socialism and Liberation is working to expose these efforts, and stands in solidarity with the people’s resistance and unfolding revolutions of the new Latin America.

**The aff will devolve into policing the women involved in sex trafficking subjecting them to state control**

**Sharma, 5** (Nandita Sharma, Assistant Professor in the School of Social Sciences,

Atkinson at York University in Toronto, Autumn 2005, NWSA Journal,

Vol. 17, No. 3, “Anti-Trafficking Rhetoric and the Making of a Global Apartheid”, http://www.jstor.org/stable/4317159)//EM

This anti-sex work bias was evident in the work done by some feminist organizations advocating for women migrants from China arriving in 1999. A minority of women in this group (5 out of 24) either had been sex workers in China and/or planned to be in the United States believing that this would allow them to earn the highest possible income. In my interviews with them, they emphasized that working in the sex industry was a key part of their migration strategy. However, many feminists advocating for these migrants were wholly unable to accept that sex work could be a legitimate aspect of a woman's migratory project. Instead, as in many antitrafficking frames, it was imagined that the only reason women migrants would work in the sex industry was out of fear of the traffickers.12 **The "solution" that emerges out of such imaginations is to further criminalize prostitution**. In this there is again much historical continuity with past anti-White Slave Trade efforts. As Brock et al. note, the ways in which a 'traffic in women' discourse was first deployed by social reformers during the late nineteenth century in Canada, the United States and Britain was through the mobilization for an expansion of criminal code legislation, particularly the procuring and bawdy house provisions, allegedly for the protection of women and girls. (2000, 88) Legislative protections for victims of trafficking were won. Yet feminist **scholarship has shown that these protections were a victory for those interested in policing the sexual practices of women and girls rather than for the sex workers themselves** (Valverde 1992).

# 2NC

## Case

#### Its the only falsifiable theory

**Thayer 4** – Thayer has been a Fellow at the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University and has taught at Dartmouth College and the University of Minnesota [Darwin and International Relations: On the Evolutionary Origins of War and Ethnic Conflict, University of Kentucky Press, 2004, pg. 68 //]

Evolution provides a better ultimate causal foundation according to the D-N model because it tightly fits this model on two levels. First, it explains how life evolves through the evolutionary processes (natural selection, gene mutation, etc.) described in chapter 1 that provide the general laws of evolution and specific antecedent conditions affecting these laws. This theory of how nature evolves may be applied and tested against specific evidence, for example, about how early primates and humans lived and continue to do so, which may confirm evolutionary processes. Second, proximate causes of human (or other animal) behavior may be deduced from it. That is, if the evolutionary process is valid, then much of human behavior must have evolved because the behavior contributed to fitness in past environments. Accordingly, **evolutionary theory provides an adequate causal explanation for realism** because if the antecedent conditions arc provided **the ultimate cause logically produces the proximate causes** (egoism and domination) of realism. Measured by Poppers method of falsification, evolutionary theory is also superior to the ultimate causes of Niebuhr and Morgenthau because **it is falsifiable**.41 That is, scholars know what evidence would not verify the theory. Popper argued that if a theory is scientific, then we may conceive of observations that would show the theory to be false. His intent was to make precise the idea that scientific theories should be subject to empirical test. In contrast to good scientific theories that can be falsified, Popper suggested that no pattern of human behavior could falsify Marxism or Freudian psychoanalytic theory. More formally, Poppers criterion of falsifiability requires that a theory contain "observation sentences," that is, "proposition P is falsifiable if and only if P deductively implies at least one observation sentence O"2 Falsifiable theories contain predictions that may be checked against empirical evidence. So according to Popper, **scientists should accept a theory\* only if it is falsifiable** and no observation sentence has falsified it.

#### Falsifiability is a trump card – rejection causes extinction

**Coyne, 06** – Author and Writer for the Times (Jerry A., “A plea for empiricism”, FOLLIES OF THE WISE, Dissenting essays, 405pp. Emeryville, CA: Shoemaker and Hoard, 1 59376 101 5)

Supernatural forces and events, essential aspects of most religions, play no role in science, not because we exclude them deliberately, but because they have never been a useful way to understand nature. Scientific “truths” are empirically supported observations agreed on by different observers. Religious “truths,” on the other hand, are personal, unverifiable and contested by those of different faiths. Science is nonsectarian: those who disagree on scientific issues do not blow each other up. Science encourages doubt; most religions quash it. But religion is not completely separable from science. Virtually all religions make improbable claims that are in principle empirically testable, and thus within the domain of science: Mary, in Catholic teaching, was bodily taken to heaven, while Muhammad rode up on a white horse; and Jesus (born of a virgin) came back from the dead. None of these claims has been corroborated, and while science would never accept them as true without evidence, religion does. A mind that accepts both science and religion is thus a mind in conflict. Yet scientists, especially beleaguered American evolutionists, need the support of the many faithful who respect science. It is not politically or tactically useful to point out the fundamental and unbreachable gaps between science and theology. Indeed, scientists and philosophers have written many books (equivalents of Leibnizian theodicy) desperately trying to show how these areas can happily cohabit. In his essay, “Darwin goes to Sunday School”, Crews reviews several of these works, pointing out with brio the intellectual contortions and dishonesties involved in harmonizing religion and science. Assessing work by the evolutionist Stephen Jay Gould, the philosopher Michael Ruse, the theologian John Haught and others, Crews concludes, “When coldly examined . . . these productions invariably prove to have adulterated scientific doctrine or to have emptied religious dogma of its commonly accepted meaning”. Rather than suggesting any solution (indeed, there is none save adopting a form of “religion” that makes no untenable empirical claims), Crews points out the dangers to the survival of our planet arising from a rejection of Darwinism. Such rejection promotes apathy towards overpopulation, pollution, deforestation and other environmental crimes: “So long as we regard ourselves as creatures apart who need only repent of our personal sins to retain heaven’s blessing, we won’t take the full measure of our species-wise responsibility for these calamities”. Crews includes three final essays on deconstruction and other misguided movements in literary theory. These also show “follies of the wise” in that they involve interpretations of texts that are unanchored by evidence. Fortunately, the harm inflicted by Lacan and his epigones is limited to the good judgement of professors of literature. Follies of the Wise is one of the most refreshing and edifying collections of essays in recent years. Much like Christopher Hitchens in the UK, Crews serves a vital function as National Sceptic. He ends on a ringing note: “The human race has produced only one successfully validated epistemology, characterizing all scrupulous inquiry into the real world, from quarks to poems. It is, simply, empiricism, or the submitting of propositions to the arbitration of evidence that is acknowledged to be such by all of the contending parties. Ideas that claim immunity from such review, whether because of mystical faith or privileged “clinical insight” or the say-so of eminent authorities, are not to be countenanced until they can pass the same skeptical ordeal to which all other contenders are subjected.” As science in America becomes ever more harried and debased by politics and religion, we desperately need to heed Crews’s plea for empiricism.

## El Bloqueo

#### You must reject every instance of racism – the impact is distinct

**Memmi, 97** – Professor Emeritus of Sociology, University of Paris (Albert, RACISM, 1997, p. 163. (DRGCL/B1048)

The struggle against racism will be long, difficult, without intermission, without remission, probably never achieved. Yet for this very reason, it is a struggle to be undertaken without surcease and without concessions. One cannot be indulgent toward racism; one must not even let the monster in the house, especially not in a mask. To give it merely a foothold means to augment the bestial part in us and in other people, which is to diminish what is human. To accept the racist universe to the slightest degree is to endorse fear, injustice and violence. It is to accept the persistence of the dark history in which we still largely live. It is to agree that the outsider will always be a possible victim (and which [person] man is not [themself] himself an outsider relative to someone else?). Racism illustrates in sum, the inevitable negativity of the condition of the dominated; that is, it illuminates in a certain sense the entire human condition. The anti-racist struggle, difficult though it is, and always in question, is nevertheless one of the prologues to the ultimate passage from animality to humanity. In that sense, we cannot fail to rise to the racist challenge

#### Perception link - the language shift is significant to Cubans – plan triggers our impacts

**Penn 8** (Sean Penn. Penn was named Ambassador at Large for Haiti and was also been honored with The Commander's Award for Service. “Mountain of Snakes (Part II)”. Huffington Post. 30 November 2008. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/sean-penn/mountain-of-snakes-part-i\_b\_147239.html)//JuneC//

I return to the subject of elections in the U.S. by repeating the question Brinkley had asked Chavez. Would Castro accept an invitation to Washington to meet with a President Obama? Castro becomes reflective. "This is an interesting question," he says, followed by a rather long, awkward silence. Until, "The U.S. has the most complicated election process in the world. There are practiced election stealers in the Cuban-American lobby in Florida..." I chime in, "I think that lobby is fracturing," I tell him. And then, with the certainty of a die-hard optimist, I say, "Obama will be our next president." He smiles, seemingly at my naivete, but the smile disappears as he says, "If he is not murdered before November 4th, he'll be your next president." I note that he had still not answered my question about meeting in Washington. "You know," he says, "I have read the statements Obama has made, that he would preserve the blockade." I interject, "His term was embargo." "Yes," Castro says, "blockade is an act of war, so Americans prefer the term embargo, a word that is used in legal proceedings...but in either case, we know that this is pre-election talk, and that he has also said he was open to discussion with anyone." Recognizing his own jag, he interrupts himself, "You are probably thinking, Oh, the brother talks as much as Fidel!" We laugh. "It is not usually so, but...you know, Fidel once, he had a delegation here, in this room, from China. Several diplomats and a young translator. I think it was the translator's first time with a Head of State. They'd all had a very long flight and were jet-lagged. Fidel, of course, knew this, but still he talked for hours. Soon, one, near the end of the table, just there (pointing to a nearby chair), his eyes begin to get heavy, then another, then another. But Fidel, he continued to talk. Soon, all, including the highest ranking of them, to whom Fidel had been directly addressing his words, fell sound asleep in their chairs. So, Fidel, he turns his eyes to the only one awake, the young translator, and kept him in conversation till dawn." By this time in the story, both Raul and I were in stitches. I'd only had the one meeting with Fidel, whose astonishing mind and passion bleeds words. But it was enough to get the picture. Only our translator was not laughing, as Castro returns to the point.

#### We should reject and be skeptical of imperialist rhetoric

**Kumar 9** (Deepa Kumar. Associate Professor of Media Studies and Middle Eastern Studies at the Rutgers University. Obama’s Cairo Speech: A Rhetorical Shift in US Imperialism. DissidentVoice. 13 June 2009. http://dissidentvoice.org/2009/06/obama’s-cairo-speech-a-rhetorical-shift-in-us-imperialism/)//JuneC//

We in the U.S. need to develop a similar skepticism of imperial rhetoric. Liberal imperialism has a long history in the U.S. Starting with the Spanish-American War, political elites have argued that U.S. interventions in various countries were for humanitarian goals. The U.S. claimed to be liberating the Cubans from Spain, yet they simply took over the reigns of power from the latter. Woodrow Wilson championed the right of nations to self-determination, but conveniently applied it only to the break-up of the Ottoman and Austro-Hungarian empires in his “fourteen points” program. FDR claimed to be championing democracy during the Second World War, yet African Americans did not have the right to vote under Jim Crow laws. JFK claimed to want to “help” Third World countries to develop economically and to foster democracy, and created the Peace Corps for this purpose. Yet he sent more troops into Vietnam, and attempted to overthrow Castro through the “Bay of Pigs” invasion. In short, the U.S., like all empires, has always sought to disguise its real aims behind fine-sounding phrases and goals. While Obama’s speech is a step forward in that it eschews the hate-filled Islamophobic rhetoric of the Bush regime, it does little for the real Muslims and Arabs who continue to face discrimination, harassment, rendition, torture, war and occupation. To address these problems, a reinvigorated antiwar movement should use Obama’s rhetoric to build a struggle that can champion the rights of Arabs and Muslims around the world, and hold Obama accountable to his own words.
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#### Growth prevents conflict escalation – solves the case impacts

Griswold 7

Daniel, Trade Policy Studies @ Cato, 4/20/’7, Trade, Democracy and Peace, http://www.freetrade.org/node/681

A second and even more potent way that trade has promoted peace is by promoting more economic integration. As national economies become more intertwined with each other, those nations have more to lose should war break out. War in a globalized world not only means human casualties and bigger government, but also ruptured trade and investment ties that impose lasting damage on the economy. In short, globalization has dramatically raised the economic cost of war.

**We have a moral obligation to support comprehensive reform –solves exploitation and takes a stand against unethical practices – this is the politics of invisibility – we refuse to contemplate those that are affected by our decisions**
**Noorani 10** (Ali, Executive Director of the Reform Immigration FOR America campaign and National Immigration Forum, Why We Must Continue Pushing for Comprehensive Immigration Reform, <http://immigration.change.org/blog/view/why_we_must_continue_pushing_for_comprehensive_immigration_reform>)
There are 11 million undocumented immigrants living in the United States today. And there are 279 Congressional votes standing between those people and the American dream. The fight for those 279 votes that 11 million people need has been long and tough, but now, more than ever, is the time for our courage and leadership.  In April, Arizona enshrined racial profiling into law — and awakened millions to the current civil rights crisis the immigrant community is facing in our country. Arizona changed the game and brought the urgency of our fight to a fever pitch.  Since then, at least 18 states have considered legislation similar to the Arizona law. The lack of political courage from both the White House and members of Congress to tackle immigration reform has left a vacuum that states like Arizona are rushing to fill with their own measures — and these measures mostly focus only on enforcement with no thought given to families and workers.  Immigration is no longer a policy debate; it is a political battle with clear choices: Legalization or criminalization. Justice for all or racial profiling. Family unity or family separation.  We, as advocates, also have a clear choice. We can negotiate with ourselves and entice our opponents to the table by proposing piecemeal options. But, an effort to push anything short of a comprehensive overhaul of our broken system would both give our opponents a reprieve from working on a bi-partisan solution to one of our nation’s most pressing problems and give our allies the choice of checking off the “immigration” box on their to-do list without having fully addressed the issue.  Anything less than full legalization of the 11 million undocumented immigrants is unacceptable, and we should not demand anything less.  We have a moral obligation to push for real reform that brings justice to all of our communities. We won’t allow the inaction of Congress to force us into negotiating away our power. The courage of those 11 million people is our power. If we back off from organizing the entire community, we will fail to create — much less take advantage of — the opportunities that lie ahead.  The American public has shown that they are in favor of immigration reform with a pathway to legalization. Our communities have stood up and made their voices heard. Arizona has ignited the 21st century fight for civil rights.  Now is the time for our lawmakers to step up and stop putting politics above what is right and just.  We must continue increasing our pressure. There are no lack of options in front of the President and Congress to legalize the undocumented, keep families together and reform our immigration system in the interests of our nation. There is only a lack conviction. And it’s up to us, as immigration rights advocates, to force them to do the right thing, and bring real, comprehensive reform to all 11 million undocumented immigrants, leaving no one behind.

**This supports a system of power of domination – causes war and destruction**

**LaBalme 02** (Fen, *Activism.net,* “Activism: Pease: NVCD: Discrimination,” 2002, http://www.activism.net/peace/nvcdh/discrimination.shtml, accessed July 2, 2009).

In this action, our struggle is not only against missiles and bombs, but against the system of power they defend: a system based on domination, on the belief that some people have more value than others, and therefore have the right to control others, to exploit them so that they can lead better lives than those they oppress. We say that all people have value. No person, no group, has the right to wield power over the decisions and resources of others. The structure of our organizations and the processes we use among ourselves are our best attempt to live our belief in self-determination. Besides working against discrimination of all kinds among ourselves, we must try to understand how such discrimination supports the system which produces nuclear weapons. For some people who come to this action, the overriding issue is the struggle to prevent nuclear destruction. For others, that struggle is not separate from the struggles against racism, sexism, classism, and the oppression of groups of people because of their sexual orientation, religion, age, physical (dis)ability, appearance, or life history. Understood this way, it is clear that nuclear weapons are already killing people, forcing them to lead lives of difficulty and struggle. Nuclear war has already begun, and it claims its victims disproportionately from native peoples, the Third World, women, and those who are economically vulnerable because of the history of oppression. All oppressions are interlocking. We separate racism, classism, etc. in order to discuss them, not to imply that any form of oppression works in isolation. We know that to work against any one of these is not just to try to stop something negative, but to build a positive vision. Many in the movement call this larger goal feminism. Calling our process "feminist process" does not mean that women dominate or exclude men; on the contrary, it challenges all systems of domination. The term recognizes the historical importance of the feminist movement in insisting that nonviolence begins at home, in the ways we treat each other.

**It will culminate in extinction – we control the scale of violence**

**Scheper-Hughes and Bourgois 04** (Prof of Anthropology @ Cal-Berkely; Prof of Anthropology @ UPenn)(Nancy and Philippe, Introduction: Making Sense of Violence, in Violence in War and Peace, pg. 19-22)

This large and at first sight “messy” Part VII is central to this anthology’s thesis. It encompasses everything from the routinized, bureaucratized, and utterly banal violence of children dying of hunger and maternal despair in Northeast Brazil (Scheper-Hughes, Chapter 33) to elderly African Americans dying of heat stroke in Mayor Daly’s version of US apartheid in Chicago’s South Side (Klinenberg, Chapter 38) to the racialized class hatred expressed by British Victorians in their olfactory disgust of the “smelly” working classes (Orwell, Chapter 36). In these readings violence is located in the symbolic and social structures that overdetermine and allow the criminalized drug addictions, interpersonal bloodshed, and racially patterned incarcerations that characterize the US “inner city” to be normalized (Bourgois, Chapter 37 and Wacquant, Chapter 39). Violence also takes the form of class, racial, political self-hatred and adolescent self-destruction (Quesada, Chapter 35), as well as of useless (i.e. preventable), rawly embodied physical suffering, and death (Farmer, Chapter 34). Absolutely central to our approach is a blurring of categories and distinctions between wartime and peacetime violence. Close attention to the “little” violences produced in the structures, habituses, and mentalites of everyday life shifts our attention to pathologies of class, race, and gender inequalities. More important, it interrupts the voyeuristic tendencies of “violence studies” that risk publicly humiliating the powerless who are often forced into complicity with social and individual pathologies of power because suffering is often a solvent of human integrity and dignity. Thus, in this anthology we are positing a violence continuum comprised of a multitude of “small wars and invisible genocides” (see also Scheper- Hughes 1996; 1997; 2000b) conducted in the normative social spaces of public schools, clinics, emergency rooms, hospital wards, nursing homes, courtrooms, public registry offices, prisons, detention centers, and public morgues. The violence continuum also refers to the ease with which humans are capable of reducing the socially vulnerable into expendable nonpersons and assuming the license - even the duty - to kill, maim, or soul-murder. We realize that in referring to a violence and a genocide continuum we are flying in the face of a tradition of genocide studies that argues for the absolute uniqueness of the Jewish Holocaust and for vigilance with respect to restricted purist use of the term genocide itself (see Kuper 1985; Chaulk 1999; Fein 1990; Chorbajian 1999). But we hold an opposing and alternative view that, to the contrary, it is absolutely necessary to make just such existential leaps in purposefully linking violent acts in normal times to those of abnormal times. Hence the title of our volume: Violence in War and in Peace. If (as we concede) there is a moral risk in overextending the concept of “genocide” into spaces and corners of everyday life where we might not ordinarily think to find it (and there is), an even greater risk lies in failing to sensitize ourselves, in misrecognizing protogenocidal practices and sentiments daily enacted as normative behavior by “ordinary” good-enough citizens. Peacetime crimes, such as prison construction sold as economic development to impoverished communities in the mountains and deserts of California, or the evolution of the criminal industrial complex into the latest peculiar institution for managing race relations in the United States (Waquant, Chapter 39), constitute the “small wars and invisible genocides” to which we refer. This applies to African American and Latino youth mortality statistics in Oakland, California, Baltimore, Washington DC, and New York City. **These are “invisible” genocides not because they are secreted away or hidden from view, but quite the opposite**. As Wittgenstein observed, the things that are hardest to perceive are those which are right before our eyes and therefore taken for granted. In this regard, Bourdieu’s partial and unfinished theory of violence (see Chapters 32 and 42) as well as his concept of misrecognition is crucial to our task. By including the normative everyday forms of violence hidden in the minutiae of “normal” social practices - in the architecture of homes, in gender relations, in communal work, in the exchange of gifts, and so forth - Bourdieu forces us to reconsider the broader meanings and status of violence, especially the links between the violence of everyday life and explicit political terror and state repression, Similarly, Basaglia’s notion of “peacetime crimes” - crimini di pace - imagines a direct relationship between wartime and peacetime violence. Peacetime crimes suggests the possibility that war crimes are merely ordinary, everyday crimes of public consent applied systematically and dramatically in the extreme context of war. Consider the parallel uses of rape during peacetime and wartime, or the family resemblances between the legalized violence of US immigration and naturalization border raids on “illegal aliens” versus the US government- engineered genocide in 1938, known as the Cherokee “Trail of Tears.” Peacetime crimes suggests that everyday forms of state violence make a certain kind of domestic peace possible. Internal “stability” is purchased with the currency of peacetime crimes, many of which take the form of professionally applied “strangle-holds.” Everyday forms of state violence during peacetime make a certain kind of domestic “peace” possible. It is an easy-to-identify peacetime crime that is usually maintained as a public secret by the government and by a scared or apathetic populace. Most subtly, but no less politically or structurally, the phenomenal growth in the United States of a new military, postindustrial prison industrial complex has taken place in the absence of broad-based opposition, let alone collective acts of civil disobedience. The public consensus is based primarily on a new mobilization of an old fear of the mob, the mugger, the rapist, the Black man, the undeserving poor. How many public executions of mentally deficient prisoners in the United States are needed to make life feel more secure for the affluent? What can it possibly mean when incarceration becomes the “normative” socializing experience for ethnic minority youth in a society, i.e., over 33 percent of young African American men (Prison Watch 2002). In the end it is essential that we recognize the existence of a genocidal capacity among otherwise good-enough humans and that we need to exercise a defensive hypervigilance to the less dramatic, permitted, and even rewarded everyday acts of violence that render participation in genocidal acts and policies possible (under adverse political or economic conditions), perhaps more easily than we would like to recognize. Under the violence continuum we include, therefore, all expressions of radical social exclusion, dehumanization, depersonal- ization, pseudospeciation, and reification which normalize atrocious behavior and violence toward others. A constant self-mobilization for alarm, a state of constant hyperarousal is, perhaps, a reasonable response to Benjamin’s view of late modern history as a chronic “state of emergency” (Taussig, Chapter 31). We are trying to recover here the classic anagogic thinking that enabled Erving Goffman, Jules Henry, C. Wright Mills, and Franco Basaglia among other mid-twentieth-century radically critical thinkers, to perceive the symbolic and structural relations, i.e., between inmates and patients, between concentration camps, prisons, mental hospitals, nursing homes, and other “total institutions.” Making that decisive move to recognize the continuum of violence allows us to see the capacity and the willingness - if not enthusiasm - of ordinary people, the practical technicians of the social consensus, to enforce genocidal-like crimes against categories of rubbish people. There is no primary impulse out of which mass violence and genocide are born, it is ingrained in the common sense of everyday social life. The mad, the differently abled, the mentally vulnerable have often fallen into this category of the unworthy living, as have the very old and infirm, the sick-poor, and, of course, the despised racial, religious, sexual, and ethnic groups of the moment. Erik Erikson referred to “pseudo- speciation” as the human tendency to classify some individuals or social groups as less than fully human - a prerequisite to genocide and one that is carefully honed during the unremark- able peacetimes that precede the sudden, “seemingly unintelligible” outbreaks of mass violence. Collective denial and misrecognition are prerequisites for mass violence and genocide. But so are formal bureaucratic structures and professional roles. The practical technicians of everyday violence in the backlands of Northeast Brazil (Scheper-Hughes, Chapter 33), for example, include the clinic doctors who prescribe powerful tranquilizers to fretful and frightfully hungry babies, the Catholic priests who celebrate the death of “angel-babies,” and the municipal bureaucrats who dispense free baby coffins but no food to hungry families. Everyday violence encompasses the implicit, legitimate, and routinized forms of violence inherent in particular social, economic, and political formations. It is close to what Bourdieu (1977, 1996) means by “symbolic violence,” the violence that is often “nus-recognized” for something else, usually something good. Everyday violence is similar to what Taussig (1989) calls “terror as usual.” All these terms are meant to reveal a public secret - the hidden links between violence in war and violence in peace, and between war crimes and “peace-time crimes.” Bourdieu (1977) finds domination and violence in the least likely places - in courtship and marriage, in the exchange of gifts, in systems of classification, in style, art, and culinary taste- the various uses of culture. Violence, Bourdieu insists, is everywhere in social practice. It is misrecognized because its very everydayness and its familiarity render it invisible. Lacan identifies “rneconnaissance” as the prerequisite of the social. The exploitation of bachelor sons, robbing them of autonomy, independence, and progeny, within the structures of family farming in the European countryside that Bourdieu escaped is a case in point (Bourdieu, Chapter 42; see also Scheper-Hughes, 2000b; Favret-Saada, 1989). Following Gramsci, Foucault, Sartre, Arendt, and other modern theorists of power-vio- lence, Bourdieu treats direct aggression and physical violence as a crude, uneconomical mode of domination; it is less efficient and, according to Arendt (1969), it is certainly less legitimate. While power and symbolic domination are not to be equated with violence - and Arendt argues persuasively that violence is to be understood as a failure of power - violence, as we are presenting it here, is more than simply the expression of illegitimate physical force against a person or group of persons. Rather, we need to understand violence as encompassing all forms of “controlling processes” (Nader 1997b) that assault basic human freedoms and individual or collective survival. Our task is to recognize these gray zones of violence which are, by definition, not obvious. Once again, the point of bringing into the discourses on genocide everyday, normative experiences of reification, depersonalization, institutional confinement, and acceptable death is to help answer the question: What makes mass violence and genocide possible? In this volume we are suggesting that mass violence is part of a continuum, and that it is socially incremental and often experienced by perpetrators, collaborators, bystanders - and even by victims themselves - as expected, routine, even justified. The preparations for mass killing can be found in social sentiments and institutions from the family, to schools, churches, hospitals, and the military. They harbor the early “warning signs” (Charney 1991), the “priming” (as Hinton, ed., 2002 calls it), or the “genocidal continuum” (as we call it) that push social consensus toward devaluing certain forms of human life and lifeways from the refusal of social support and humane care to vulnerable “social parasites” (the nursing home elderly, “welfare queens,” undocumented immigrants, drug addicts) to the militarization of everyday life (super-maximum-security prisons, capital punishment; the technologies of heightened personal security, including the house gun and gated communities; and reversed feelings of victimization).

#### 1) Time and will to pass it is there – it’s a question of PC

Foley 10/17

Elise, Huffington Post, Obama To House On Immigration: If You Have Ideas, 'Let's Hear Them', 10/17/13, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/10/17/obama-house-immigration\_n\_4115818.html

President Barack Obama vowed Thursday to restart his push for comprehensive immigration reform this year after a bruising fight on government spending that only increased bad blood between the two parties.¶ "The majority of Americans think this is the right thing to do, and it's sitting there waiting for the House to pass it," he said during remarks from the White House. "Now if the House has ideas on how to improve the Senate bill, let's hear them. Let's start the negotiations. But let's not leave this problem to keep festering for another year, or two years, or three years."¶ "This can and should get done by the end of this year," he added.¶ Obama and immigration reform advocates have insisted there's still time and the will to pass reform, even though House Republicans are showing little interest in doing so. After the Senate passed a comprehensive immigration bill in June, reform stalled in the house when House Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) vowed not to pick it up, regardless of likely support from most Democrats and some Republicans. Instead, the House GOP vowed to pass piecemeal measures -- with no talk of a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants -- that have now faded from attention.

#### 2) House will cave

Talev and Dorning 10/17

Margaret and Mike, Bloomberg, Obama’s Fiscal Fight Win Won’t Secure Success for Agenda, 10/17/13, http://www.businessweek.com/news/2013-10-17/obama-s-fiscal-fight-win-won-t-secure-success-for-agenda

David Plouffe, a former senior adviser to Obama, said the president is likely to emerge with a stronger hand in any case. The Tea Party faction in the House overplayed its hand, he said, and that probably enhances the position of the Senate, where Democrats have a majority, and of House Republicans who are willing to compromise with the administration.¶ The outcome of this standoff makes future confrontations over the debt limit less likely, Plouffe said.¶ “Hopefully, we have broken forever using the debt ceiling as a political weapon,” Plouffe said. “I’m not naïve but I think it’s unlikely the Republicans in Congress want to go through this anytime again soon.”¶ Next Round¶ The biggest victory for the president was in cutting off the Republican attempt to scuttle the health-care law, Plouffe said. By the time the next round of fiscal negotiations occurs in January, coverage will have begun for Americans who signed up through the health-insurance exchanges. That means Republicans who attack the law in the next budget fight would have to try to take away existing coverage from constituents.¶ Whether Obama gets from Congress a new immigration law or changes he’s seeking in taxes and entitlement programs depends on how Republicans read the outcome of this fight, Plouffe said.¶ He recalled that following their political loss in the 1996 shutdown, House Republicans under Gingrich reached deals with Clinton on welfare reform and the minimum wage.¶ “There was a strategic necessity for them post-shutdown to show they could govern,” Plouffe said. Immigration law “would be the natural place” for Republicans to act, he said.

**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.