### 1AC – Advantage

#### Advantage (1) is Instability

#### Status quo reforms are slow and contradictory – they fail inevitably

**Ratheborne 1/17/14** (“Raul Castro’s Unhurried Reforms of Cuba economy falter” http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/27ee4c6a-7dee-11e3-b409-00144feabdc0.html#axzz2rHElg2UP) –Neal Emory

The car sale is the latest in a series of reforms introduced by President Raúl Castro that are supposed to improve the country’s economic lot and bolster the government’s popularity but which, in this case, has made the authorities a laughing stock among Cubans who earn an average state wage of $18 a month.¶ It also illustrates the hesitancy and contradictions at the heart of the economic transition begun by Mr Castro and that Latin American heads of state will see when they visit Havana for a regional summit on January 28.¶ “I call it Raúl’s mambo – two steps forward, one step back,” says Ted Henken, a Cuba specialist at City University of New York. “Every measure Raúl announces has great potential, but there is always a dark cloud.”¶ Since he became president in 2008, Mr Castro has stressed the need to reduce the state’s role in Cuba’s sagging economy and boost growth forecasts of just 2.2 per cent this year. Foreign debts have been restructured and a unification of Cuba’s multiple exchange rates even mooted.¶ Yet even as he introduces reforms, such as allowing small businesses and co-ops to set up, the ruling Communist party’s blocking habits of command and control remain.¶ This was vividly illustrated in a video leaked on to the internet that showed Juan Triana, a prominent local economist, lecturing a sour-looking group of interior ministry officials on the merits of liberalisation – all within the constructs of socialism and a one party state, of course.¶ “Raúl is going as fast as he can, or he understands,” says Roberto Veiga, editor of Espacio Laical, an independent Cuban magazine funded by the church. “There is a tension between how slow things need to go given the government’s desire to retain control, and how fast they need to given the precariousness of the economy.”¶ Near the colonial era cathedral in old Havana, a privately owned restaurant appropriately named the Moneda Cubana, the Cuban coin, shows the outer limits of what Mr Castro’s reforms have achieved so far.¶ Miguel Ángel opened his bustling establishment three years ago, and by 2013 his business had grown enough that he paid 660,000 pesos (US$26,400) in taxes to the state – a revolution in a country where citizens have never paid taxes before. Estimates suggest taxes paid by Cuba’s almost 500,000 self-employed are equivalent to 2 per cent of the national budget.¶ But, despite his success, Mr Ángel chafes at the government’s record on reform. “It needs to be more direct, to present its reforms all in one go rather than changing the rules all the time,” he says¶ Other entrepreneurs say they know what he means. Across town, Michael Franco has just closed his business reselling imported cell phones and clothes after the government banned the trade in a move that showed who is top dog. “I will have to find something else to do,” he ruminates.¶ “Without hurry, but without pause,” has been Mr Castro’s reform mantra. To emphasise this deliberate if leisurely approach, in December he even told the National Assembly he is making development plans up to 2030.¶ Yet time is not on Cuba’s side. Castro has said he will retire by 2018 and, by then, the economy needs to have recovered sufficiently to meet a demographic transition that by 2021 will see more people leaving the workforce than entering it

#### The plan is key – Cuban transition will inevitably result in regime collapse – prior knowledge is key to maintain stability

**Maybarduk 9** (Gary H., Gary Harold Maybarduk is currently a adjunct professor at George Washington University and writes on issues of US policy towards Cuba. Professor Maybarduk was a professor of national security studies at the US Army War College from 2002-2004. He also taught economics at the Foreign Service Institute, the University of Minnesota and the Universidad Del Salvador in Argentina. He has a PhD in economics from the University of Minnesota, a MS in national security studies from the National War College, a MA in international relations from the Fletcher School of Law & Diplomacy and a BS in economics from MIT. Professor Maybarduk served 32 years in the US Foreign Service with postings in Caracas, Havana, Freetown, Managua, Mexico City and Port Moresby. In Washington, he served as Director of Central American Affairs, Deputy Director for Economic Policy and Summit Coordination in Western Hemispheric Affairs, Deputy Director of the Policy Analysis Staff of the Bureau of Economic Affairs, Senior Economic Advisor for the Bureau of African Affairs and Senior Advisor to the Office of Reconstruction and Stabilization. He also served as a legislative advisor for international and military affairs for Senator John Danforth and as a congressional liaison officer for the Bureau of African Affairs., The US Strategy for Transition in Cuba, 2009, <http://web.gc.cuny.edu/dept/bildn/publications/documents/Maybarduk12_000.pdf>)//moxley

Collapse could follow from a military coup or, in a more likely scenario, from a series of public protests that turned violent. The government has a wide variety of tools it uses to contain demonstrations when they occur. Violence is seldom necessary. Punishment of demonstrators usually comes after the demonstrations are over. Over time, perhaps not until Raúl departs, there is likely to be a weakening of unity among the leadership. Disagreements over policy and personal ambitions will eventually leak to the public**.** The weaker the government appears or the more hesitant it is to react decisively against public protests, the more likely the size and number of demonstrations will grow. If a collective government falters in its decision making and/or if the security forces make an uncharacteristic mistake in crowd control, the potential for violence is great. If the government loses control, generalized violence—political, criminal, and score settling—is likely. This will be a critical period for US policy. We may want to support a new government promising a return to democracy. Such a government could come under severe financial pressure. Other governments, with their own agendas, may want to fill an economic and political void. **We might wish to provide fast disbursing economic assistance**. This is when knowledge of personalities, institutions, and regional differences will be important. This is when I would hope the American government would call on our Cuban scholars to fill our gaps in knowledge.

#### Cuban instability results in Caribbean instability, terrorism, democratic backsliding, and distracts the US from critical hotspots including Africa, the Caucus, and North Korea

Gorrell 5 (Tim, Lieutenant Colonel, “CUBA: THE NEXT UNANTICIPATED ANTICIPATED STRATEGIC CRISIS?” 3/18, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA433074)

Regardless of the succession, under the current U.S. policy, Cuba’s problems of a post Castro transformation only worsen. In addition to Cubans on the island, there will be those in exile who will return claiming authority. And there are remnants of the dissident community within Cuba who will attempt to exercise similar authority. A power vacuum or absence of order will create the conditions for instability and civil war. Whether Raul or another successor from within the current government can hold power is debatable. However, that individual will nonetheless extend the current policies for an indefinite period, which will only compound the Cuban situation. When Cuba finally collapses anarchy is a strong possibility if the U.S. maintains the “wait and see” approach. The U.S. then must deal with an unstable country 90 miles off its coast. In the midst of this chaos, thousands will flee the island. During the Mariel boatlift in 1980 125,000 fled the island.26 Many were criminals; this time the number could be several hundred thousand fleeing to the U.S., creating a refugee crisis.¶ Equally important, by adhering to a negative containment policy, the U.S. may be creating its next series of transnational criminal problems. Cuba is along the axis of the drug-trafficking flow into the U.S. from Columbia. The Castro government as a matter of policy does not support the drug trade. In fact, Cuba’s actions have shown that its stance on drugs is more than hollow rhetoric as indicated by its increasing seizure of drugs – 7.5 tons in 1995, 8.8 tons in 1999, and 13 tons in 2000.27 While there may be individuals within the government and outside who engage in drug trafficking and a percentage of drugs entering the U.S. may pass through Cuba, the Cuban government is not the path of least resistance for the flow of drugs. If there were no Cuban restraints, the flow of drugs to the U.S. could be greatly facilitated by a Cuba base of operation and accelerate considerably.¶ In the midst of an unstable Cuba, the opportunity for radical fundamentalist groups to operate in the region increases. If these groups can export terrorist activity from Cuba to the U.S. or throughout the hemisphere then the war against this extremism gets more complicated. Such activity could increase direct attacks and disrupt the economies, threatening the stability of the fragile democracies that are budding throughout the region. In light of a failed state in the region, the U.S. may be forced to deploy military forces to Cuba, creating the conditions for another insurgency. The ramifications of this action could very well fuel greater anti-American sentiment throughout the Americas. A proactive policy now can mitigate these potential future problems.¶ U.S. domestic political support is also turning against the current negative policy. The Cuban American population in the U.S. totals 1,241,685 or 3.5% of the population.28 Most of these exiles reside in Florida; their influence has been a factor in determining the margin of victory in the past two presidential elections. But this election strategy may be flawed, because recent polls of Cuban Americans reflect a decline for President Bush based on his policy crackdown. There is a clear softening in the Cuban-American community with regard to sanctions. Younger Cuban Americans do not necessarily subscribe to the hard-line approach. These changes signal an opportunity for a new approach to U.S.-Cuban relations. (Table 1)¶ The time has come to look realistically at the Cuban issue. Castro will rule until he dies. The only issue is what happens then? The U.S. can little afford to be distracted by a failed state 90 miles off its coast. The administration, given the present state of world affairs, does not have the luxury or the resources to pursue the traditional American model of crisis management. The President and other government and military leaders have warned that the GWOT will be long and protracted. These warnings were sounded when the administration did not anticipate operations in Iraq consuming so many military, diplomatic and economic resources. There is justifiable concern that Africa and the Caucasus region are potential hot spots for terrorist activity, so these areas should be secure. North Korea will continue to be an unpredictable crisis in waiting. We also cannot ignore China. What if China resorts to aggression to resolve the Taiwan situation? Will the U.S. go to war over Taiwan? Additionally, Iran could conceivably be the next target for U.S. pre-emptive action. These are known and potential situations that could easily require all or many of the elements of national power to resolve. In view of such global issues, can the U.S. afford to sustain the status quo and simply let the Cuban situation play out? The U.S. is at a crossroads: should the policies of the past 40 years remain in effect with vigor? Or should the U.S. pursue a new approach to Cuba in an effort to facilitate a manageable transition to post-Castro Cuba?

#### LNG tanker explosions cause catastrophic damage – outweighs nuclear war

Lovin 1 (Amory B., Chief Scientist of the [Rocky Mountain Institute](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rocky_Mountain_Institute), and L. Hunter Lovin, President – National Capitalism and Co-Founder – Rocky Mountain Institute, “Brittle Power: Energy Strategy for National Security”, http://verdilivorno.it/doc\_gnl/198204\_Brittle\_Power\_intro\_GNL\_note.pdf)

About nine percent of such a tankerload of LNG will probably, if spilled onto water, boil to gas in about five minutes. 3 (It does not matter how cold the water is; it will be at least two hundred twenty-eight Fahrenheit degrees hot- ter than the LNG, which it will therefore cause to boil violently.) The result- ing gas, however, will be so cold that it will still be denser than air. It will therefore flow in a cloud or plume along the surface until it reaches an ignition source. Such a plume might extend at least three miles downwind from a large tanker spill within ten to twenty minutes. 4 It might ultimately reach much farther—perhaps six to twelve miles. 5 If not ignited, the gas is asphyxiating. If ignited, it will burn to completion with a turbulent diffusion flame reminiscent of the 1937 Hindenberg disaster but about a hundred times as big. Such a fireball would burn everything within it, and by its radiant heat would cause third-degree burns and start fires a mile or two away. 6 An LNG fireball can blow through a city, creating “a very large number of ignitions and explosions across a wide area. No present or foreseeable equipment can put out a very large [LNG]... fire.” 7 The energy content of a single standard LNG tanker (one hundred twenty-five thousand cubic meters) is equivalent to seven-tenths of a megaton of TNT, or about fifty-five Hiroshima bombs.

#### Bioterror causes extinction

Mhyrvold ‘13 Nathan, Began college at age 14, BS and Masters from UCLA, Masters and PhD, Princeton “Strategic Terrorism: A Call to Action,” Working Draft, The Lawfare Research Paper Series Research paper NO . 2 – 2013

As horrible as this would be, such a pandemic is by no means the worst attack one can imagine, for several reasons. First, most of the classic bioweapons are based on 1960s and 1970s technology because the 1972 treaty halted bioweapons development efforts in the United States and most other Western countries. Second, the Russians, although solidly committed to biological weapons long after the treaty deadline, were never on the cutting edge of biological research. Third and most important, the science and technology of molecular biology have made enormous advances, utterly transforming the field in the last few decades. High school biology students routinely perform molecular-biology manipulations that would have been impossible even for the best superpower-funded program back in the heyday of biological-weapons research. The biowarfare methods of the 1960s and 1970s are now as antiquated as the lumbering mainframe computers of that era. Tomorrow’s terrorists will have vastly more deadly bugs to choose from. Consider this sobering development: in 2001, Australian researchers working on mousepox, a nonlethal virus that infects mice (as chickenpox does in humans), accidentally discovered that a simple genetic modification transformed the virus.10, 11 Instead of producing mild symptoms, the new virus killed 60% of even those mice already immune to the naturally occurring strains of mousepox. The new virus, moreover, was unaffected by any existing vaccine or antiviral drug. A team of researchers at Saint Louis University led by Mark Buller picked up on that work and, by late 2003, found a way to improve on it: Buller’s variation on mousepox was 100% lethal, although his team of investigators also devised combination vaccine and antiviral therapies that were partially effective in protecting animals from the engineered strain.12, 13 Another saving grace is that the genetically altered virus is no longer contagious. Of course, it is quite possible that future tinkering with the virus will change that property, too. Strong reasons exist to believe that the genetic modifications Buller made to mousepox would work for other poxviruses and possibly for other classes of viruses as well. Might the same techniques allow chickenpox or another poxvirus that infects humans to be turned into a 100% lethal bioweapon, perhaps one that is resistant to any known antiviral therapy? I’ve asked this question of experts many times, and no one has yet replied that such a manipulation couldn’t be done. This case is just one example. Many more are pouring out of scientific journals and conferences every year. Just last year, the journal Nature published a controversial study done at the University of Wisconsin–Madison in which virologists enumerated the changes one would need to make to a highly lethal strain of bird flu to make it easily transmitted from one mammal to another.14 Biotechnology is advancing so rapidly that it is hard to keep track of all the new potential threats. Nor is it clear that anyone is even trying. In addition to lethality and drug resistance, many other parameters can be played with, given that the infectious power of an epidemic depends on many properties, including the length of the latency period during which a person is contagious but asymptomatic. Delaying the onset of serious symptoms allows each new case to spread to more people and thus makes the virus harder to stop. This dynamic is perhaps best illustrated by HIV , which is very difficult to transmit compared with smallpox and many other viruses. Intimate contact is needed, and even then, the infection rate is low. The balancing factor is that HIV can take years to progress to AIDS , which can then take many more years to kill the victim. What makes HIV so dangerous is that infected people have lots of opportunities to infect others. This property has allowed HIV to claim more than 30 million lives so far, and approximately 34 million people are now living with this virus and facing a highly uncertain future.15 A virus genetically engineered to infect its host quickly, to generate symptoms slowly—say, only after weeks or months—and to spread easily through the air or by casual contact would be vastly more devastating than HIV . It could silently penetrate the population to unleash its deadly effects suddenly. This type of epidemic would be almost impossible to combat because most of the infections would occur before the epidemic became obvious. A technologically sophisticated terrorist group could develop such a virus and kill a large part of humanity with it. Indeed, terrorists may not have to develop it themselves: some scientist may do so first and publish the details. Given the rate at which biologists are making discoveries about viruses and the immune system, at some point in the near future, someone may create artificial pathogens that could drive the human race to extinction. Indeed, a detailed species-elimination plan of this nature was openly proposed in a scientific journal. The ostensible purpose of that particular research was to suggest a way to extirpate the malaria mosquito, but similar techniques could be directed toward humans.16 When I’ve talked to molecular biologists about this method, they are quick to point out that it is slow and easily detectable and could be fought with biotech remedies. If you challenge them to come up with improvements to the suggested attack plan, however, they have plenty of ideas. Modern biotechnology will soon be capable, if it is not already, of bringing about the demise of the human race— or at least of killing a sufficient number of people to end high-tech civilization and set humanity back 1,000 years or more. That terrorist groups could achieve this level of technological sophistication may seem far-fetched, but keep in mind that it takes only a handful of individuals to accomplish these tasks. Never has lethal power of this potency been accessible to so few, so easily. Even more dramatically than nuclear proliferation, modern biological science has frighteningly undermined the correlation between the lethality of a weapon and its cost, a fundamentally stabilizing mechanism throughout history. Access to extremely lethal agents—lethal enough to exterminate Homo sapiens—will be available to anybody with a solid background in biology, terrorists included.

#### The plan is key to ensure successful reforms

**Maybarduk 9** (Gary H., Gary Harold Maybarduk is currently a adjunct professor at George Washington University and writes on issues of US policy towards Cuba. Professor Maybarduk was a professor of national security studies at the US Army War College from 2002-2004. He also taught economics at the Foreign Service Institute, the University of Minnesota and the Universidad Del Salvador in Argentina. He has a PhD in economics from the University of Minnesota, a MS in national security studies from the National War College, a MA in international relations from the Fletcher School of Law & Diplomacy and a BS in economics from MIT. Professor Maybarduk served 32 years in the US Foreign Service with postings in Caracas, Havana, Freetown, Managua, Mexico City and Port Moresby. In Washington, he served as Director of Central American Affairs, Deputy Director for Economic Policy and Summit Coordination in Western Hemispheric Affairs, Deputy Director of the Policy Analysis Staff of the Bureau of Economic Affairs, Senior Economic Advisor for the Bureau of African Affairs and Senior Advisor to the Office of Reconstruction and Stabilization. He also served as a legislative advisor for international and military affairs for Senator John Danforth and as a congressional liaison officer for the Bureau of African Affairs., The US Strategy for Transition in Cuba, 2009, <http://web.gc.cuny.edu/dept/bildn/publications/documents/Maybarduk12_000.pdf>)//moxley

America needs a new strategy for the Cuban Transition. Our preoccupation with the overthrow of the current Cuban Government continues to fail to achieve its goal, while obscuring threats to our national security interests. A collapse of the current regime, as envisioned by current US policy, would lead to mass migration. It would turn Cuba into a major trafficking point for the drug trade. It would not ensure the establishment of a stable democracy. The US is ill prepared for these challenges. Some principles of US policy, such as the demand for the abolishment of Cuban State Security, which includes the Cuban Coast Guard and most police organizations, will only make matters worse. Limitations on our assistance to a transition government will limit our ability to influence the transition. The Cuban Government, **led by Raúl Castro or his designated successor**, will likely follow a path that is some variation of the "Chinese solution". It will move forward on some economic reforms, but keep tight control of political power. Such a scenario is anathema to our national values for a free and democratic Cuba. **The rigidity of current US policy**, as defined by the Helms-Burton Act, is too inflexible to allow us to deal with either the governmental collapse or Chinese scenarios. Nor will it allow the US to negotiate through the intricacies of the more likely and messier combination of the two. To improve our ability to respond to the unpredictable nature of a Cuba transition, we should repeal the Helms-Burton Act and return foreign policy making to the Executive Branch and the Congressional appropriation process where it belongs. To provide the knowledge necessary to promote a successful transition, we need to allow Cuban diplomats the ability to move freely around the United States if the Cuban Government agrees to give the same freedom to our diplomats in Havana. To help the President deal with another mass exodus from Cuba, we should give him the power to suspend the Cuban Adjustment Act. These changes should not be perceived as concessions to the current Cuban Government, but rather as actions needed for our own national interests.

### 1AC – Advantage

#### Advantage (2 ) is Ag

#### Cuban agriculture is collapsing—now is key

M. Dawn King, Professor of Environmental Studies at Brown, 3/21/12

(Cuban Sustainability: The Effects of Economic Isolation on Agriculture and Energy, wpsa.research.pdx.edu/meet/2012/kingmdawn.pdf)

Cuba needed an alternative agricultural model when foreign oil imports were cut off significantly at the end of the 1980s, and the partial opening of the Cuban economy, focused on creating more autonomous agricultural cooperatives, in the 1990s helped diversify food crops and set Cuba along a path of increased food security. The Cuban model was initiated out of necessity, not because of any sort of Cuban environmental consciousness, yet better environmental conditions went hand in hand with the new development strategy. Cuba learned the limits of their agricultural model under their socialist economic system and it is in need of further transformation in both the agriculture and energy sectors. A further opening of the economy to joint ventures could help with updating the power grid and providing more sources of renewable energy – potentially expanding Cuba’s potential for a more sustainable means of energy security. Further, Cuba needs foreign investment to update agriculture facilities and take maximum advantage of cogeneration and biofuel potential with sugarcane waste. The strong state control of farming practices, used to successfully jumpstart the alternative model, has hit its limit. The Cuban government must begin loosening its grips on the domestic economy to allow for more competition in the farming sector. Despite the potential to become more sustainable with a purposive and focused opening of the economy, the recent surge in joint venture investment on expanding domestic oil extraction, petrochemical facilities, and oil refinery infrastructure reveals a trend toward decreasing environmental sustainability. Once heralded as the world’s most sustainable country by coupling environmental performance indicators with their human development scores, Cuba is slipping further away from this goal. Perhaps the most distressing part of this current trend is that it took Cuba decades to create a national identity that embraced sustainable environmental practices in both the energy and agricultural sector, and it seemingly took only a couple of years to derail these efforts. Undoubtedly, conservation efforts and sustainable education programs can only satiate citizen’s energy desires to a certain point. In order to further the quality of life in the country, electric production must increase to rural areas with little energy infrastructure and to Havana in order to spur foreign investment and domestic small business growth. Cuba’s trade agreement with Venezuela is bringing in much-needed petroleum for electricity production, but their dependence on a relatively unstable country for crude is trapping them into the same relationship that crippled their economy in 1990 – impairing their original goal of self-sufficiency. Cuba is at a turning point in their path toward environmental sustainability, and the current need for immediate foreign capital and increased energy production seem to be trumping its desire to achieve development sustainably. Cuba still has enough centralized control to leap-frog dirty electric production for cleaner renewable forms of energy and the potential to guide development strategies that emphasize investments in and research on renewable energy. It can utilize its expertise on organic farming strategies to increase sugar production in a much more ecologically friendly manner than their monoculture approach in the 1970s and 80s. Decisions made in the next five years will demonstrate whether Cuba embraces their newly created national identity as a society striving for sustainable development or rejects the goal of sustainable development to increase short-term capital and energy needs.

#### The plans dialogue is key – failure to expand communication collapses the Cuban agricultural model

**Thompson and Stephens 12** (Charles D. Thompson, Jr., Ph.D. Curriculum and Education Director, Center for Documentary Studies at Duke University Lecturer in Cultural Anthropology, North Carolina A&T State University M.S. in Agricultural Education, Alexander Stephens is an associate director at the Marian Cheek Jackson Center for Saving and Making History, completed a semester of study in Havana, Cuba, before graduating with a degree in Latin American Studies from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, “Visions for Sustainable Agriculture in Cuba and the United States: Changing Minds and Models through Exchange”, November 2012, http://www.southernspaces.org/2012/visions-sustainable-agriculture-cuba-and-united-states-changing-minds-and-models-through-exchan#sthash.GowEptZk.dpuf)//moxley

Views like Menendez’s reflect an inconsistency in U.S. foreign policy when it comes to our closest Caribbean neighbor. The United States is willing to cultivate relationships with countries with human rights conditions that the State Department deems similarly flawed to Cuba’s in the interest of exchanging ideas and advancing trade.[4](http://www.southernspaces.org/2012/visions-sustainable-agriculture-cuba-and-united-states-changing-minds-and-models-through-exchan#footnote4_j3lc9jp) Rather than cutting off contact, the U.S. maintains relationships while attempting to promote progress toward civil and human rights. If the goal is to advance the rights of Cuban citizens, an open line of communication is essential. If U.S. policy is founded on a notion that Cuba has nothing to teach, it is profoundly near-sighted. The U.S., and particularly agricultural areas of the U.S. South, shares with Cuba the challenge of sustainably growing food and fiber without despoiling water and soils, and harming the people doing the work. These challenges transcend national borders. Between the fanciful extremes of Eden and evil empire lies a third way: understanding Cuba as a potential interlocutor regarding sustainable agriculture. New voices call for dialogue between U.S. and Cuban citizens engaged in a burgeoning organic farm and garden movement in both countries. Dialogue between Cuban agriculturalists and their counterparts in the U.S. can further collective knowledge and improve environmental conditions. To understand sustainable agricultural initiatives in Cuba and to envision future exchanges, I organized a research team and obtained an academic visa for travel in December 2010 and January 2011. With help from U.S. and Canadian organizations, we arranged visits to experimental sites and meetings with some of Cuba’s foremost agricultural innovators. Most memorably, during our two week trip we got to know some farmers and gardeners. I came back to the U.S. convinced that those of us working on building a sustainable and just agricultural economy must be engaged with what is happening in Cuba.

#### The plan is a pre-requisite to lifting the embargo – normalization destroys agricultural practices and recreates industrial ag

**Thompson and Stephens 12** (Charles D. Thompson, Jr., Ph.D. Curriculum and Education Director, Center for Documentary Studies at Duke University Lecturer in Cultural Anthropology, North Carolina A&T State University M.S. in Agricultural Education, Alexander Stephens is an associate director at the Marian Cheek Jackson Center for Saving and Making History, completed a semester of study in Havana, Cuba, before graduating with a degree in Latin American Studies from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, “Visions for Sustainable Agriculture in Cuba and the United States: Changing Minds and Models through Exchange”, November 2012, http://www.southernspaces.org/2012/visions-sustainable-agriculture-cuba-and-united-states-changing-minds-and-models-through-exchan#sthash.GowEptZk.dpuf)//moxley

**Individuals and small groups can begin to heal historic wounds between two countries**—**through** common experiences, work, and dialogue. I came back to the U.S. enriched beyond measure, not by internalizing the policies of agriculture over the last century or even what might make an organopónico movement run better, but by human exchanges and in-person meetings. We should invent ways to enable visitors who are prepared to listen and learn to go to Cuba, as well as ways to bring farmers and technicians from Cuba to work in the U.S. South. The dialogue of resistance to imperialism in Cuba can help inform the politics of the U.S. sustainable agriculture movement. And with political and economic changes imminent in Cuba, there are lessons to be learned from U.S. organizations confronting corporate agriculture. It would be tragic if loosened commercial restrictions in Cuba resulted in planting an agribusiness model there that we are desperately trying to get away from in our own country. As Fernando Funes put it, the inclusion of small farmers through redistribution of resources "makes them critical actors in the new reconfigured economy."20 Cuban people, particularly rural people, are the true wealth of the island. Most are literate, savvy about change, and have developed opinions about workable solutions. The potential for exchange between Cuba and the U.S. South offers a collective possibility for agricultural sustainability, an exchange that must overcome boundaries between nations.

#### Industrial agriculture is the root cause of warming, Amazon deforestation and wetland destruction – only a shift now solves

**Cummins 10** (Ronnie, founder and Director of the Organic Consumers Association (OCA), a non-profit, U.S. based network of 850,000 consumers, dedicated to safeguarding organic standards and promoting a healthy, just, and sustainable system of agriculture and commerce. The OCA’s primary strategy is to work on national and global campaigns promoting health, justice, and sustainability that integrate public education, marketplace pressure, media work, litigation, and grassroots lobbying. Cummins is also editor of OCA’s website www.organicconsumers.org (30,000 visitors a day) and newsletters, Organic Bytes (270,000 subscribers), and Organic View, he has served as director of US and international efforts such as the Pure Food Campaign, and the Global Days of Action Against GMOs. From 1992-98 Cummins served as a campaign director for the Foundation on Economic Trends in Washington, D.C, October 10th, 2010, “Industrial Agriculture and Human Survival: The Road Beyond 10/10/10”, <http://www.commondreams.org/view/2010/10/07-9>)//moxley

Industrial Food and Farming: A Deadly Root of Global Warming Although transportation, industry, and energy producers are obviously major fossil fuel users and greenhouse gas polluters, not enough people understand that the worst U.S. and global greenhouse gas emitter is “Food Incorporated,” transnational industrial food and farming, of which Monsanto and GMOs constitute a major part. Industrial farming, including 173 million acres of GE soybeans, corn, cotton, canola, and sugar beets, accounts for at least 35% of U.S. greenhouse gas emissions (EPA’s ridiculously low estimates range from 7% to 12%, while some climate scientists feel the figure could be as high as 50% or more). Industrial agriculture, biofuels, and non-sustainable cattle grazing - including cutting down the last remaining tropical rainforests in Latin America and Asia for GMO and chemical-intensive animal feed and biofuels **- are also the main driving forces in global deforestation and wetlands destruction, which generate an additional 20% of all climate destabilizing GHGs.** In other words the direct (food, fiber, and biofuels production, food processing, food distribution) and indirect damage (deforestation and destruction of wetlands) of industrial agriculture, GMOs, and the food industry are the major cause of global warming. Unless we take down Monsanto and Food Inc. and make the Great Transition to a relocalized system of organic food and farming, we and our children are doomed to reside in Climate Hell. Overall 78% of climate destabilizing greenhouse gases come from CO2, while the remainder come from methane, nitrous oxide, and black carbon or soot. To stabilize the climate we will need to drastically reduce all of these greenhouse gas emissions, not just CO2, and sequester twice as much carbon matter in the soil (through organic farming and ranching, and forest and wetlands restoration) as we are doing presently. Currently GMO and industrial/factory farms (energy and chemical-intensive) farms emit at least 25% of the carbon dioxide (mostly from tractors, trucks, combines, transportation, cooling, freezing, and heating); 40% of the methane (mostly from massive herds of animals belching and farting, and manure ponds); and 96% of nitrous oxide (mostly from synthetic fertilizer manufacture and use, the millions of tons of animal manure from factory-farmed cattle herds, pig and poultry flocks, and millions of tons of sewage sludge spread on farms). Black carbon or soot comes primarily from older diesel engines, slash and burn agriculture, and wood cook stoves. Per ton, methane is 21 times more damaging, and nitrous oxide 310 times more damaging,as a greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide, when measured over a one hundred year period. **Damage is even worse if you look at the impact on global warming** over the next crucial 20-year period**.** **Many** climate scientists **admit that they have previously drastically underestimated the dangers of the non-CO2 GHGs, including methane, soot, and nitrous oxide, which are responsible for at least 22% of global warming. Almost all U.S. food and farm-derived methane comes from factory farms, huge herds of confined cows, hogs, and poultry operations**, in turn made possible by heavily subsidized ($15 billion per year) GMO soybeans, corn, cottonseed, and canola; as well as rotting food waste thrown into landfills instead of being separated out of the solid waste stream and properly composted. To drastically reduce C02, methane, and nitrous oxide releases we need an immediate consumer boycott, followed by a government ban on factory farms, dairies, and feedlots. To reduce black carbon or soot emissions we will need to upgrade old diesel engines, and provide farmers and rural villagers in the developing world with alternatives to slash and burn agriculture (compost, compost tea, biochar) and non-polluting cook stoves and home heating. We also need to implement mandatory separation and recycling of food wastes and “green garbage” (yard waste, tree branches, etc.) at the municipal level, so that that we can reduce methane emissions from landfills. Mandatory composting will also enable us to produce large quantities of high quality organic compost to replace the billions of pounds of chemical fertilizer and sewage sludge, which are releasing GHGs, destroying soil fertility, polluting our waters, and undermining public health. Nearly all nitrous oxide pollution comes from dumping billions of pounds of synthetic nitrogen fertilizer and sewage sludge on farmland (chemical fertilizers and sludge are banned on organic farms and ranches), mainly to grow GMO crops and animal feed. Since about 80% of U.S. agriculture is devoted to producing non-organic, non-grass fed meat, dairy, and animal products, reducing agriculture GHGs means eliminating the overproduction and over-consumption of GMO crops, factory-farmed meat, and animal products. It also means creating massive consumer demand for organic foods, including pasture-raised, grass-fed animal products. **The fact that climate change is now metastasizing into climate chaos is indisputable**: massive flooding in Pakistan, unprecedented forest fires in Russia and the Amazon, melting of the glaciers that supply water for crops and drinking water of a billion people in Asia and South America, crop failures in regions all over the globe, record heat waves in the U.S. and Europe, methane leaking from the Arctic tundra and coastlines, killer hurricanes in the Gulf of Mexico and Central America, and steadily spreading pestilence, crop failures, and disease. The realization that every time we eat non-organic processed food, we are ingesting unlabeled, hazardous GMO foods and pesticides is indeed alarming. **But the impending threat of industrial food and farming detonating runaway climate change (i.e. moving from our current .8 degree Centigrade average global rise in temperature to 2-6 degrees) is terrifying**. Either we rein in industrial food and farming and GMOs, out-of-control politicians and corporations, and make the transition to an organic and green economy or we will perish.

#### Warming is real, anthropogenic, and threatens extinction --- prefer new evidence that represents consensus

Richard Schiffman 9/27/13, environmental writer @ The Atlantic citing the Fifth Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, “What Leading Scientists Want You to Know About Today's Frightening Climate Report,” The Atlantic, http://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2013/09/leading-scientists-weigh-in-on-the-mother-of-all-climate-reports/280045/

The polar icecaps are melting faster than we thought they would; seas are rising faster than we thought they would; extreme weather events are increasing. Have a nice day! That’s a less than scientifically rigorous summary of the findings of the Fifth Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report released this morning in Stockholm.¶ Appearing exhausted after a nearly two sleepless days fine-tuning the language of the report, co-chair Thomas Stocker called climate change “the greatest challenge of our time," adding that “each of the last three decades has been successively warmer than the past,” and that this trend is likely to continue into the foreseeable future.¶ Pledging further action to cut carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions, U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry said, "This isn’t a run of the mill report to be dumped in a filing cabinet. This isn’t a political document produced by politicians... It’s science."¶ And that science needs to be communicated to the public, loudly and clearly. I canvassed leading climate researchers for their take on the findings of the vastly influential IPCC report. What headline would they put on the news? What do they hope people hear about this report?¶ When I asked him for his headline, Michael Mann, the Director of the Earth Systems Science Center at Penn State (a former IPCC author himself) suggested: "Jury In: Climate Change Real, Caused by Us, and a Threat We Must Deal With."¶ Ted Scambos, a glaciologist and head scientist of the National Snow and Ice Data Center (NSIDC) based in Boulder would lead with: "IPCC 2013, Similar Forecasts, Better Certainty." While the report, which is issued every six to seven years, offers no radically new or alarming news, Scambos told me, it puts an exclamation point on what we already know, and refines our evolving understanding of global warming.¶ The IPCC, the indisputable rock star of UN documents, serves as the basis for global climate negotiations, like the ones that took place in Kyoto, Rio, and, more recently, Copenhagen. (The next big international climate meeting is scheduled for 2015 in Paris.) It is also arguably the most elaborately vetted and exhaustively researched scientific paper in existence. Founded in 1988 by the United Nations and the World Meteorological Organization, the IPCC represents the distilled wisdom of over 600 climate researchers in 32 countries on changes in the Earth’s atmosphere, ice and seas. It endeavors to answer the late New York mayor Ed Koch’s famous question “How am I doing?” for all of us. The answer, which won’t surprise anyone who has been following the climate change story, is not very well at all. ¶ It is now 95 percent likely that human spewed heat-trapping gases — rather than natural variability — are the main cause of climate change, according to today’s report. In 2007 the IPCC’s confidence level was 90 percent, and in 2001 it was 66 percent, and just over 50 percent in 1995. ¶ What’s more, things are getting worse more quickly than almost anyone thought would happen a few years back.¶ “If you look at the early IPCC predictions back from 1990 and what has taken place since, climate change is proceeding faster than we expected,” Mann told me by email. Mann helped develop the famous hockey-stick graph, which Al Gore used in his film “An Inconvenient Truth” to dramatize the sharp rise in temperatures in recent times. ¶ Mann cites the decline of Arctic sea ice to explain : “Given the current trajectory, we're on track for ice-free summer conditions in the Arctic in a matter of a decade or two... There is a similar story with the continental ice sheets, which are losing ice — and contributing to sea level rise — at a faster rate than the [earlier IPCC] models had predicted.”¶ But there is a lot that we still don’t understand. Reuters noted in a sneak preview of IPCC draft which was leaked in August that, while the broad global trends are clear, climate scientists were “finding it harder than expected to predict the impact in specific regions in coming decades.”¶ From year to year, the world’s hotspots are not consistent, but move erratically around the globe. The same has been true of heat waves, mega-storms and catastrophic floods, like the recent ones that ravaged the Colorado Front Range. There is broad agreement that climate change is increasing the severity of extreme weather events, but we’re not yet able to predict where and when these will show up. ¶ “It is like watching a pot boil,” Danish astrophysicist and climate scientist Peter Thejll told me. “We understand why it boils but cannot predict where the next bubble will be.”¶ There is also uncertainty about an apparent slowdown over the last decade in the rate of air temperature increase. While some critics claim that global warming has “stalled,” others point out that, when rising ocean temperatures are factored in, the Earth is actually gaining heat faster than previously anticipated.¶ “Temperatures measured over the short term are just one parameter,” said Dr Tim Barnett of the Scripps Institute of Oceanography in an interview. “There are far more critical things going on; the acidification of the ocean is happening a lot faster than anybody thought that it would, it’s sucking up more CO2, plankton, the basic food chain of the planet, are dying, it’s such a hugely important signal. Why aren’t people using that as a measure of what is going on?”¶ Barnett thinks that recent increases in volcanic activity, which spews smog-forming aerosols into the air that deflect solar radiation and cool the atmosphere, might help account for the temporary slowing of global temperature rise. But he says we shouldn’t let short term fluctuations cause us to lose sight of the big picture.¶ The dispute over temperatures underscores just how formidable the IPCC’s task of modeling the complexity of climate change is. Issued in three parts (the next two installments are due out in the spring), the full version of the IPCC will end up several times the length of Leo Tolstoy’s epic War and Peace. Yet every last word of the U.N. document needs to be signed off on by all of the nations on earth. ¶ “I do not know of any other area of any complexity and importance at all where there is unanimous agreement... and the statements so strong,” Mike MacCracken, Chief Scientist for Climate Change Programs, Climate Institute in Washington, D.C. told me in an email. “What IPCC has achieved is remarkable (and why it merited the Nobel Peace Prize granted in 2007).”¶ Not surprisingly, the IPCC’s conclusions tend to be “conservative by design,” Ken Caldeira, an atmospheric scientist with the Carnegie Institution’s Department of Global Ecology told me: “The IPCC is not supposed to represent the controversial forefront of climate science. It is supposed to represents what nearly all scientists agree on, and it does that quite effectively.”¶ Nevertheless, even these understated findings are inevitably controversial. Roger Pielke Jr., the Director of the Center for Science and Technology Policy Research at the University of Colorado, Boulder suggested a headline that focuses on the cat fight that today’s report is sure to revive: "Fresh Red Meat Offered Up in the Climate Debate, Activists and Skeptics Continue Fighting Over It." Pielke should know. A critic of Al Gore, who has called his own detractors "climate McCarthyists," Pielke has been a lightning rod for the political controversy which continues to swirl around the question of global warming, and what, if anything, we should do about it. ¶ The public’s skepticism of climate change took a dive after Hurricane Sandy. Fifty-four percent of Americans are now saying that the effects of global warming have already begun. But 41 percent surveyed in the same Gallup poll believe news about global warming is generally exaggerated, and there is a smaller but highly passionate minority that continues to believe the whole thing is a hoax. ¶ For most climate experts, however, the battle is long over — at least when it comes to the science. What remains in dispute is not whether climate change is happening, but how fast things are going to get worse.¶ There are some possibilities that are deliberately left out of the IPCC projections, because we simply don’t have enough data yet to model them. Jason Box, a visiting scholar at the Byrd Polar Research Center told me in an email interview that: “The scary elephant in the closet is terrestrial and oceanic methane release triggered by warming.” The IPCC projections don’t include the possibility — some scientists say likelihood — that huge quantities of methane (a greenhouse gas thirty times as potent as CO2) will eventually be released from thawing permafrost and undersea methane hydrate reserves. Box said that the threshhold “when humans lose control of potential management of the problem, may be sooner than expected.”¶ Box, whose work has been instrumental in documenting the rapid deterioration of the Greenland ice sheet, also believes that the latest IPCC predictions (of a maximum just under three foot ocean rise by the end of the century) may turn out to be wildly optimistic, if the Greenland ice sheet breaks up. “We are heading into uncharted territory” he said. “We are creating a different climate than the Earth has ever seen.” ¶ The head of the IPCC, Rajendra Pachauri, speaks for the scientific consensus when he says that time is fast running out to avoid the catastrophic collapse of the natural systems on which human life depends. What he recently told a group of climate scientist could be the most chilling headline of all for the U.N. report: ¶ "We have five minutes before midnight."

#### Not too late – every reduction key

Nuccitelli 12

[Dana, is an environmental scientist at a private environmental consulting firm in the Sacramento, California area. He has a Bachelor's Degree in astrophysics from the University of California at Berkeley, and a Master's Degree in physics from the University of California at Davis. He has been researching climate science, economics, and solutions as a hobby since 2006, and has contributed to Skeptical Science since September, 2010, <http://www.skepticalscience.com/realistically-what-might-future-climate-look-like.html>, HM]

We're not yet committed to surpassing 2°C global warming, but as Watson noted, we are quickly running out of time to realistically give ourselves a chance to stay below that 'danger limit'. However, 2°C is not a do-or-die threshold. Every bit of CO2 emissions we can reduce means that much avoided future warming, which means that much avoided climate change impacts. As Lonnie Thompson noted, the more global warming we manage to mitigate, the less adaption and suffering we will be forced to cope with in the future. Realistically, based on the current political climate (which we will explore in another post next week), limiting global warming to 2°C is probably the best we can do. However, there is a big difference between 2°C and 3°C, between 3°C and 4°C, and anything greater than 4°C can probably accurately be described as catastrophic, since various tipping points are expected to be triggered at this level. Right now, we are on track for the catastrophic consequences (widespread coral mortality, mass extinctions, hundreds of millions of people adversely impacted by droughts, floods, heat waves, etc.). But we're not stuck on that track just yet, and we need to move ourselves as far off of it as possible by reducing our greenhouse gas emissions as soon and as much as possible. There are of course many people who believe that the planet will not warm as much, or that the impacts of the associated climate change will be as bad as the body of scientific evidence suggests. That is certainly a possiblity, and we very much hope that their optimistic view is correct. However, what we have presented here is the best summary of scientific evidence available, and it paints a very bleak picture if we fail to rapidly reduce our greenhouse gas emissions. If we continue forward on our current path, catastrophe is not just a possible outcome, it is the most probable outcome. And an intelligent risk management approach would involve taking steps to prevent a catastrophic scenario if it were a mere possibility, let alone the most probable outcome. This is especially true since the most important component of the solution - carbon pricing - can be implemented at a relatively low cost, and a far lower cost than trying to adapt to the climate change consequences we have discussed here (Figure 4).

### 1AC – MULTILAT

#### Advantage 2 is Multilateralism

#### Anti-Americanism and unilateralism kill U.S. legitimacy – that causes interventions and escalation

\*unilateralism fails –

a. power dilution – arms trade has fallen to NGOs, international organizations are too cumbersome and beaten by small regional alliances, GONGOs are resulting in proxy soft-power competition

b. small state backlash – international norms created by unipolarity cause diffusion of power to smaller states with vetoes that they can use to control us in international institutions

c. economic multipolarity – strong economic globalization means other countries have enough influence to American goals

\*unilateralism causes great power wars via aggressive intervention – military power creates the temptation of policymakers to use it—hegemons are inevitably more aggressive and that leads to adventurism – policymakers have incentives to engage in threat construction and greatly exaggerate threats that allow intervention – Iraq proves

**Kupchan 12** – Ph.D. in international relations from Oxford, Associate Professor of International Relations @gtown, Senior Fellow and Director of Europe Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations (Charles Kupchan, “Sorry, Mitt: It Won't Be an American Century”, FEBRUARY 6, 2012, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/02/06/it\_won\_t\_be\_an\_american\_century?page=0,2)

In an election season, such talk rolls easily off the tongue. But Romney's hackneyed rhetoric is woefully out of step -- both with an American electorate hungry for a less costly brand of foreign policy and with a world in the midst of tectonic change. A sharp **economic downturn** and **expensive, inconclusive conflicts** in Iraq and Afghanistan have left Americans ready for a focus on the home front. Abroad, the charge for the next U.S. president can hardly be to stick his head in the sand and deny that the global distribution of power is fast changing. On the contrary, it is to react soberly and steadily to the implications of such change and ensure that the United States remains secure and prosperous even as economic and military strength spreads to new quarters. President Barack Obama is on the correct path. Leaving Iraq and overseeing a paced withdrawal from Afghanistan will bring U.S. commitments back into line with U.S. interests. Special operations and drone strikes have proved far more effective in fighting al Qaeda than has occupying countries in the Middle East and South Asia, and an offshore posture in the Persian Gulf is the best way to deal with Iran. Amid **China's rise** and the **economic dynamism** building in its neighborhood, Obama is right to downsize the U.S. presence in Europe and orchestrate a strategic "pivot" to East Asia. The move constitutes a necessary hedge against Chinese ambition and ensures that American workers will benefit from expanding markets in the Pacific Rim. These policies will enable the United States to simultaneously adjust to a shifting global landscape, husband its resources, and grow its economy -- facilitating the president's pledge to focus on "nation-building here at home." Romney has already denigrated Obama's pragmatism, charging that "our president thinks America is in decline." Obama shot back in his State of the Union address on Jan. 24 that "anyone who tells you that America is in decline … doesn't know what they're talking about." Obama decidedly has the upper hand in this back-and-forth. He recognizes that, the country's strengths notwithstanding, U.S. strategy must adjust to a world in which power will be more broadly distributed. And his focus on rebuilding the American economy speaks directly to an electorate yearning for more equity and prosperity at home. According to a recent Pew Research Center survey, **46 percent of Americans** want the United States to "mind its own business," and 76 percent think the country should "concentrate more on our own national problems" than on foreign challenges. These are high numbers by historical standards -- a clear indication that the **electorate** is hurting economically and wary of **strategic overreach**. Romney should take note. His chest-thumping talk of a new American century still plays well in some quarters. But Obama's commitment to nation-building at home will play even better. Even if Romney's rhetoric were to get more domestic traction, it would still bear no resemblance to the new global landscape that is fast emerging. The United States is indeed an exceptional nation -- in its prized geographic location, commitment to freedom and democracy, and brand of international leadership. But the country's exceptionalism should not be used as an excuse to hide from global realities. China's GDP will catch up with America's over the course of the next decade. The World Bank predicts that the dollar, euro, and China's renminbi will become co-equals in a "multi-currency" monetary system by 2025. Goldman Sachs expects the collective GDP of the top four developing countries -- Brazil, China, India, and Russia -- to match that of the G-7 countries by 2032. The United States will no doubt exit the current slump and bounce back economically in the years ahead. Nonetheless, a more level global playing field is inevitable. To be sure, America's military superiority will remain second to none for decades to come. As the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan have made amply clear, though, military primacy hardly ensures effective influence. And with the **U.S. defense budget poised to shrink** in the service of restoring the country's fiscal health, the United States will have to pick its fights carefully. Shrewd and judicious statecraft will be at least as important as raw power in ensuring the country's security. To acknowledge the need for the United States to adjust to prospective shifts in the global distribution of power is not, as Duke University professor Bruce Jentleson recently pointed out in Democracy, to be a declinist or a pessimist. It is to be a realist. And safely guiding the United States through this coming transition requires seeing the world as it is rather than retreating toward the illusory comfort of denial. Adjusting to the rise of the rest requires, for starters, making more room at the table for newcomers. That process is already well under way. The G-20 has supplanted the G-8, widening the circle for global consultations. In the aftermath of reforms adopted in 2010, developing countries now have enhanced weight at the World Bank and IMF. The enlargement of the U.N. Security Council, though currently bogged down in wrangling, is also in the offing. But making international institutions more representative is the easy part. More challenging will be managing the ideological diversity that will accompany the coming realignment in global power. Precisely because the United States is an exceptional nation, its version of liberal democracy may well prove to be the exception, not the rule. In China, Russia, and the sheikhdoms of the Persian Gulf, state-led brands of capitalism are holding their own -- and may well do so for the foreseeable future. The Arab Spring could finally bring democratic rule to at least some countries in the Middle East, but it is also breeding political Islam; democratization should not be mistaken for Westernization. Even emerging powers that are already democracies, such as India, Brazil, and Turkey, are charting their own paths. They regularly break with the United States and Europe on trade, Middle East diplomacy, military intervention, the environment, and other issues, preferring to side with other ascending states, whether democratic or not. Romney's paeans to American power are no excuse for his silence on how he plans to manage these complexities. Promoting international stability will grow more demanding as rising powers bring to the table their differing conceptions of order and governance. The United States has a key role to play in managing such diversity and channeling it toward cooperative ends. Overheated proclamations of American preeminence, however, will do more harm than good. If a new, consensual international order is to emerge, rising powers must be treated as stakeholders in that order, not merely as objects of American power. Shepherding the transition to this more pluralistic world is arguably the defining challenge facing U.S. statecraft in the years ahead. Romney appears ready to pave over this challenge by denying that such change is afoot and attempting to portray Obama's policies as "an eloquently justified surrender of world leadership." Obama should welcome this debate and refuse to let his opponents hide behind the veil of American exceptionalism. Democrats no longer need to feel vulnerable on national security; Obama has demonstrated smarts and strength on many issues, including the degradation of al Qaeda, the pivot to Asia, and the isolation of Iran. He understands that agile, firm diplomacy backed by American power will do much more for the United States than congratulatory talk of American primacy. A smarter, more selective, and less costly U.S. role in the world would not only help the United States get its own house in order, but also give rising powers the wider berth they seek. And good policy would also be good politics; Americans are keen to share with others the burdens and responsibilities of international engagement. The world desperately needs a brand of U.S. leadership that focuses not on ruling the roost, but on guiding a more diverse and unwieldy globe to consensus and cooperation.

#### Multilat is the alternative – it leads to global coop and power sharing—it creates shared framework of interaction changes the way states interpret global politics

\*multilateralism solves global problems –

a. fosters great power sharing – increased multilateral dialogue devises similar analytics lenses that make policies more readily adopted on a large scale

b. increases international cooperation – lends legitimacy to policies by virtue of debate and increases efficient implementation of joint programs because actors feel invested in solutions – creates a self-reinforcing dynamic which creates new focal points for strategic interaction

**Pouliot, 11** — Professor of Political Science at McGill University (Vincent, “Multilateralism as an End in Itself”, International Studies Perspectives (2011) 12, 18–26) NG

Because it rests on open, nondiscriminatory debate, and the routine exchange of viewpoints, the multilateral procedure introduces three key advantages that are gained, regardless of the specific policies adopted, and tend to diffuse across all participants. Contrary to the standard viewpoint, according to which a rational preference or functional imperative lead to multilateral cooperation, here it is the systematic practice of multilateralism that creates the **drive to cooperate**. At the theoretical level, the premise is that it is not only what people think that explains what they do, but also what they do that determines what they think (Pouliot 2010). Everyday multilateralism is a self-fulfilling practice for at least three reasons. First, the joint practice of multilateralism creates mutually recognizable [and] patterns of action among global actors. This process owes to the fact that practices structure social interaction (Adler and Pouliot forthcoming).2 Because they are meaningful, organized, and repeated, practices generally convey a degree of mutual intelligibility that allows people to develop social relations over time. In the field of international security, for example, the practice of deterrence is premised on a limited number of gestures, signals, and linguistic devices that are meant, as Schelling (1966:113) put it, to ‘‘getting the right signal across.’’ The same goes with the practice of multilateralism, which rests on a set of political and social patterns that establish the boundaries of action in a mutually intelligible fashion. These structuring effects, in turn, allow for the development of **common frameworks** for appraising global events. Multilateral dialog serves not only to find joint solutions; it also makes it possible for various actors to zoom in on the definition of the issue at hand—a particularly important step on the global stage. The point is certainly not that the multilateral procedure leads everybody to agree on everything—that would be as impossible as counterproductive. Theoretically speaking, there is room for skepticism that multilateralism may ever allow communicative rationality at the global level (see Risse 2000; Diez and Steans 2005). With such a diverse and uneven playing field, one can doubt that discursive engagement, in and of itself, can lead to common lifeworlds. Instead, what the practice of multilateralism fosters is the emergence of a shared framework of interaction—for example, a common linguistic repertoire—that allows global actors to make sense of world politics in mutually recognizable ways. Of course, they may not agree on the specific actions to be taken, but at least they can build on an established pattern of political interaction to deal with the problem at hand—sometimes even before it emerges in acute form. In today’s pluralistic world, that would already be a considerable achievement. In that sense, multilateralism may well be a constitutive practice of what Lu (2009) calls ‘‘political friendship among peoples.’’ The axiomatic practice of principled and inclusive dialog is quite apparent in the way she describes this social structure: ‘‘While conflicts, especially over the distribution of goods and burdens, will inevitably arise, under conditions of political friendship among peoples, they will be negotiated within a global background context of norms and institutions based on mutual recognition, equity in the distribution of burdens and benefits of global **cooperation, and power-sharing** in the institutions of global governance rather than domination by any group’’ (2009:54–55). In a world where multilateralism becomes an end in itself, this ideal pattern emerges out of the structuring effects of axiomatic practice: take the case of NATO, for instance, which has recently had to manage, through the multilateral practice, fairly strong internal dissent (Pouliot 2006). While clashing views and interests will never go away in our particularly diverse world, as pessimists are quick to emphasize (for example, Dahl 1999), the management of discord is certainly made easier by shared patterns of dialog based on mutually recognizable frameworks. Second, the multilateral procedure typically ensures a remarkable level of **moderation** in the global policies adopted. In fact, a quick historical tour d’horizon suggests that actors engaged in multilateralism tend to **avoid radical solutions** in their joint decision making. Of course, the very process of uniting disparate voices helps explain why multilateralism tends to produce median consensus. This is not to say that the multilateral practice inevitably leads to lowest common denominators. To repeat, because it entails complex and often painstaking debate before any actions are taken, the multilateral procedure forces involved actors to devise and potentially share **similar analytical lenses** that, in hindsight, make the policies adopted seem inherently, and seemingly ‘‘naturally,’’ moderate. This is because the debate about what a given policy means takes place before its implementation, which makes for a much smoother ride when decisions hit the ground. This joint interpretive work, which constitutes a crucial aspect of multilateralism, creates outcomes that are generally perceived as inherently reasonable. Participation brings inherent benefits to politics, as Bachrach (1975) argued in the context of democratic theory. Going after the conventional liberal view according to which actors enter politics with an already fixed set of preferences, Bachrach observes that most of the time people define their interests in the very process of participation. The argument is not that interests formed in the course of social interaction are in any sense more altruistic. It rather is that the nature and process of political practices, in this case multilateralism, matter a great deal in shaping participants’ preferences (Wendt 1999). In this sense, not only does the multilateral practice have structuring effects on global governance, but it is also constitutive of what actors say, want, and do (Adler and Pouliot forthcoming). Third and related, multilateralism lends **legitimacy** to the policies that it generates by virtue of the debate that the process necessarily entails. There is no need here to explain at length how deliberative processes that are inclusive of all stakeholders tend to produce outcomes that are generally considered more socially and politically acceptable. In the long run, the large ownership also leads to more **efficient implementation**, because actors feel **invested** in the enactment of solutions on the ground. Even episodes of political failure, such as the lack of UN reaction to the Rwandan genocide, can generate useful lessons when re-appropriated multilaterally—think of the Responsibility to Protect, for instance.3 From this outlook, there is no contradiction between efficiency and the axiomatic practice of multilateralism, quite the contrary. The more multilateralism becomes the normal or self-evident practice of global governance, the more benefits it yields for the many stakeholders of global governance. In fact, multilateralism as an end in and of itself could generate even more diffuse reciprocity than Ruggie had originally envisioned. Not only do its distributional consequences tend to even out, multilateralism as a global governance routine also creates **self-reinforcing dynamics** and new focal points for strategic interaction. The axiomatic practice of multilateralism helps define problems in commensurable ways and craft moderate solutions with wide-ranging ownership—three processual benefits that further strengthen the impetus for multilateral dialog. Pg. 21-23

#### It’s reverse casual —weak regulations risk extinction.

Masciulli 11—Professor of Political Science @ St Thomas University [Joseph Masciulli, “The Governance Challenge for Global Political and Technoscientific Leaders in an Era of Globalization and Globalizing Technologies,” Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society February 2011 vol. 31 no. 1 pg. 3-5]

What is most to be feared is enhanced global disorder resulting from the combination of weak global regulations; the unforeseen destructive consequences of converging technologies and economic globalization; military competition among the great powers; and the prevalent biases of short-term thinking held by most leaders and elites. But no practical person would wish that such a disorder scenario come true, given all the weapons of mass destruction (WMDs) available now or which will surely become available in the foreseeable future. As converging technologies united by IT, cognitive science, nanotechnology, and robotics advance synergistically in monitored and unmonitored laboratories, we may be blindsided by these future developments brought about by technoscientists with a variety of good or destructive or mercenary motives. The current laudable but problematic openness about publishing scientific results on the Internet would contribute greatly to such negative outcomes.

To be sure, if the global disorder-emergency scenario occurred because of postmodern terrorism or rogue states using biological, chemical, or nuclear WMDs, or a regional war with nuclear weapons in the Middle East or South Asia, there might well be a positive result for global governance. Such a global emergency might unite the global great and major powers in the conviction that a global concert was necessary for their survival and planetary survival as well. In such a global great power concert, basic rules of economic, security, and legal order would be uncompromisingly enforced both globally and in the particular regions where they held hegemonic status. That concert scenario, however, is flawed by the limited legitimacy of its structure based on the members having the greatest hard and soft power on planet Earth.

At the base of our concerns, I would argue, are human proclivities for narrow, short-term thinking tied to individual self-interest or corporate and national interests in decision making. For globalization, though propelled by technologies of various kinds, “remains an essentially human phenomenon . . . and the main drivers for the establishment and uses of disseminative systems are hardy perennials: profit, convenience, greed, relative advantage, curiosity, demonstrations of prowess, ideological fervor, malign destructiveness.” These human drives and capacities will not disappear. Their “manifestations now extend considerably beyond more familiarly empowered governmental, technoscientific and corporate actors to include even individuals: terrorists, computer hackers and rogue market traders” (Whitman, 2005, p. 104).

In this dangerous world, if people are to have their human dignity recognized and enjoy their human rights, above all, to life, security, a healthy environment, and freedom, we need new forms of comprehensive global regulation and control. Such **effective global leadership** **and governance** with robust enforcement powers **alone can adequately respond to destructive current global problems, and prevent new ones**. However, successful human adaptation and innovation to our current complex environment through the social construction of effective global governance will be a daunting collective task for global political and technoscientific leaders and citizens. For our global society is caught in “the whirlpool of an accelerating process of modernization” that has for the most part “been left to its own devices” (Habermas, 2001, p. 112). We need to progress in human adaptation to and innovation for our complex and problematical global social and natural planetary environments through global governance. I suggest we need to begin by ending the prevalent biases of short-termism in thinking and acting and the false values attached to the narrow self-interest of individuals, corporations, and states.

I agree with Stephen Hawking that the long-term future of the human race must be in space. It will be difficult enough to avoid disaster on planet Earth in the next hundred years, let alone the next thousand, or million. . . . There have been a number of times in the past when its survival has been a question of touch and go. The Cuban missile crisis in 1962 was one of these. The frequency of such occasions is likely to increase in the future. We shall need great care and judgment to negotiate them all successfully. But I’m an optimist. If we can avoid disaster for the next two centuries, our species should be safe, as we spread into space. . . . But we are entering an increasingly dangerous period of our history. Our population and our use of the finite resources of planet Earth, are growing exponentially, along with our technical ability to change the environment for good or ill. But our genetic code still carries the selfish and aggressive instincts that were of survival advantage in the past. . . . Our only chance of long term survival is not to remain inward looking on planet Earth, but to spread out into space. We have made remarkable progress in the last hundred years. But if we want to continue beyond the next hundred years, our future is in space.” (Hawking, 2010)

Nonetheless, to reinvent humanity pluralistically in outer space and beyond will require securing our one and only global society and planet Earth through effective global governance in the foreseeable future. And **our dilemma is that** the enforcement powers of multilateral institutions **are not likely to be strengthened because** of the competition for greater (relative, not absolute) hard and soft power by the **great** and major **powers**. They **seek** their **national** or alliance **superiority**, or at least, parity, for the sake of their state’s survival and security now. Unless the global disorder-emergency scenario was to occur soon—God forbid—the great powers will most likely, recklessly and tragically, leave global survival and security to their longer term agendas. Pg. 4-5

#### Multilat promotes band-wagoning and international coalitions among allies, strengthening the US-led system

\*only multilateralism solves global problems, unilateralism fails for several reasons –

a. technology – the internet and instant communications makes small states and non-state actors immune to hard power – even rogue states can shape public opinion against America through state-run news agencies

b. threats – terrorism, disease and the private arms trade cannot be addressed via unilateralism – they are global problems that demand local solutions which only multilateralism resolves

c. facilitates state-sponsored backlash – creates bloated international institutions that delay successful solutions – the failures of Kyoto, Copenhagen and every global trade treaty for the past 20 years prove that hard power doesn’t result in global cooperation – multilateralism results in joint-info sharing that solves

**Ikenberry and Kupchan 04 –** (John Ikenberry and Charles Kupchan, “Liberal Realism: The Foundations of a Democratic Foreign Policy,” National Interest (Fall 2004))

It is misguided, however, to assume that America's preponderant power, when combined with an assertive unilateralism, promotes stability as a matter of course. As the record of the past four years makes clear, the unfettered exercise of U.S. primacy has not led to deference and bandwagoning, but to resentment and incipient balancing. The problem is not unipolarity per se, but changes in the exercise of U.S. power that have in turn changed foreign perceptions of U.S. intentions and how the United States will use its preponderant strength. A dominant America that reassures others and deploys its power to secure public goods induces systemic stability; unfettered primacy deployed in the exclusive pursuit of national self-interest does the opposite.¶ The Bush Administration's grand strategy rests on a second geopolitical misconception: that U.S. primacy is durable. To be sure, America's economic and military might ensures that it will remain the world's leading nation for decades to come. But current power asymmetries will inevitably diminish in the years ahead. The European Union's wealth already rivals that of the United States, and it may well forge a more independent and unified security policy as this decade proceeds. Over the course of the next decade, Japan may tire of always following America's lead, China will emerge as a major power, and Russia, India and Brazil are poised to become stronger and more assertive players. It will be impossible for the United States to sustain current power, asymmetries. Indeed, if America seeks to preserve unipolarity and its attendant sway over global affairs, it will only ensure that other centers of power, as they rise, array their strength against the United States.¶ Finally, the Bush Administration has overestimated the advantages of military superiority and mistaken brute strength for influence, producing adverse consequences on a number of fronts. In Iraq, Washington was correct that Saddam Hussein's regime would crumble under the U.S. onslaught, but it failed to appreciate that the invasion would spawn a dangerous mix of nationalism and religious extremism, leaving the United States struggling against a guerrilla insurgency that effectively neutralized America's military might. In similar fashion, the Bush Administration is aware that its unilateralist bent has provoked **anti-American sentiment** in many quarters, but it has discounted the discontent because countries opposed to U.S. policy do not have the military wherewithal to stand in America's way.¶ Although it is correct that other countries are not forming alliances against the United States, Washington is overlooking the more subtle forms of balancing that are occurring--with potent geopolitical consequence. The broad coalition that blocked UN authorization of the Iraq War denied the United States the legitimacy of international approval, substantially raising the economic and political costs of the war. Allies bore **90 percent of the costs** of the Gulf War, but the American taxpayer has financed most of the current operation, and Washington has been unable to convince key allies to send troops to Iraq. If the United States continues on its current course, it will enjoy military supremacy, but little else.¶ FROM THE perspective of liberal realism, management of the global balance of power would be based on three propositions. First, the United States must wield its superior strength in concert with others to ensure that it forestalls rather than invites balancing behavior. Re-establishing America's bona tides as a benign hegemon necessitates resuscitating the alliances, institutions and consultations that have eroded under Bush's watch. The United States should of course reserve the fight to act alone as a last resort, hut Washington must rediscover that the costs of unilateral action usually far exceed the costs of seeking consensus.¶ Second, liberal realism entails moving with--rather than against--the secular diffusion of global power. The scope of American primacy will wane as this century progresses; the ultimate objective should be to channel rising centers of strength into cooperative partnerships with the United States. Furthermore, strength elsewhere, even if it comes at the expense of America's relative power, need not come at the expense of its influence and security. If rising centers of power are integrated into a rule-based order, they promise to be net contributors to international stability. Americans would benefit substantially from a Europe that is capable of projecting power outside its neighborhood and sharing risks and responsibilities with the United States. China is emerging as one of Asia's dominant states; what is in question is not whether its power will rise, but the ends to which it will use its growing strength.¶ Third, liberal realism rests on a multidimensional understanding of power, sensitive to the fact that America's military supremacy, although a vital element of national strength, is not sufficient to safeguard American security. The United States should continue to invest in its armed forces and maintain its pronounced military advantage, but absent respect for U.S. leadership abroad, U.S. primacy does more to divide the world than to unite it. Washington needs to renew the non-military dimensions of its global influence, working to reclaim its moral authority abroad and to make disaffected allies again feel like stakeholders in the international system.

#### The plan solves–

#### Only a special envoy solves – the plan restores US credibility internationally

**Piccone 1-23-14** (Ted Piccone is the acting vice president and director for the Foreign Policy program. Piccone specializes in global democracy and human rights policies; U.S.-Latin American relations; and multilateral affairs. Piccone serves as an advisor to the Club of Madrid and has served on the National Security Council, “Reach Out to Cuba”, January 23rd, 2014, http://www.brookings.edu/research/papers/2014/01/reach-out-cuba-piccone)//moxley

Such a move would ease onerous financial strictures associated with being on the list (penalties in the Cuba case that are way beyond proportion and directly interfere with our goals to open Cuba’s economy). Moreover, it would incentivize Cuba’s cooperation to resolve the case of USAID contractor Alan Gross expeditiously. Other sweeteners we could bring to the table include authorizing payments for exports to Cuba through financing issued by U.S. banks and lifting the six-month wait that any vessel that enters Cuban ports must endure before docking at a U.S port. This latter step is of increasing value to our own trade interests as we get closer to the opening of the enlarged Panama Canal in 2015. We can also continue to take unilateral steps to improve humanitarian treatment of the four Cubans still serving time in U.S. prisons on spying charges in 1998. Your special envoy would also be charged with ensuring that both the spirit and the letter of these and previous presidential orders are appropriately respected throughout the government. These relatively modest measures would go a long way toward restoring our credibility in the region as we approach next year’s Summit of the Americas, which may otherwise ride off the rails. Conclusion To move forward, we need to overcome two stumbling blocks that have held us back: the detention of Alan Gross and the hardline views of a small faction of Congress. At least two important developments are coming together to give us confidence that we can tackle these issues successfully. First, the anti-Cuba lobby is increasingly out of sync, not only with their Cuban-American constituents but also with a growing number of Cuban dissidents and religious leaders who want the embargo lifted. Second, the Cubans are under pressure from their increasingly unstable benefactor Venezuela and may be more receptive than before to artful diplomacy that allows both sides to navigate these shoals. Nonetheless, we will need to be prepared for some unhelpful noise from a small but committed pro-embargo group of Republicans and Democrats. This can best be handled through personal outreach by your senior envoy and by early signs from Havana that they are ready to deal. If successful, we can trigger a new dynamic in the long and troubled history of U.S.-Cuban affairs, avert negative consequences for us of a potentially hard landing for the Cuban people, **and further our goals of a free and prosperous Latin American and Caribbean neighborhood.**

### Plan

#### The United States federal government should substantially increase its economic engagement toward the Republic of Cuba through direct trade talks.

### Solvency

#### Only the plan solves information sharing and confidence building – dialogue is a pre-requisite

**Havana Journal 9** (Havana Journal, Direct text of Richard Lugar – is the President of the Lugar Center, a non-profit organization focusing on nuclear non-proliferation, food security, and other critical issues.  Lugar also recently announced the creation of the Lugar Academy at the University of Indianapolis, including a Washington semester internship program for Uindy students and other student leaders.  Lugar was also recently named a Professor of Practice and Distinguished Scholar at the new School of Global and International Studies at Indiana University, April 2009, http://havanajournal.com/politics/entry/senator-lugar-letter-to-obama-requests-special-envoy-to-cuba/)//moxley

Given Cuba’s symbolic importance to Latin America, in particular, a **U.S. initiative to engage Cuba on issues relevant to U.S. security would increase our diplomatic influence as your Administration seeks regional cooperation on a wide range of pressing issues, from energy security, immigration and narcotics, to trade and poverty alleviation**. Because Latin America’s posture toward Cuba favors dialogue, I am concerned that our current approach could serve as an impediment to gaining support for larger goals in a region in which historical resentments color our interactions. In reforming our approach to Cuba, **you have an opportunity to significantly advance our interests and standing in the hemisphere.**¶ At the Summit of the Americas you will be confronted with growing momentum within the region in favor or of reincorporating Cuba as a member of the Organization of American States (OAS). Cuban inclusion in the OAS presents challenges to the integrity of the organization and its commitment to promote and defend democracy and human rights, as codified in the Inter-American Democratic Charter and the American Convention on Human Rights. While it is too early to allow Cuba back into the OAS outright, announcing during the April 17 meeting, a lifting of U.S. opposition to discussion on how the OAS should engage with Cuba would signal a preference for consultation, partnership, and pragmatism. This would lay the groundwork for such a discussion to take place during the Organization of American States’ General Assembly (OASGA) in Honduras, starting June 1, 2009.¶ As your Administration reviews options in the run-up to the Summit**, I ask that you also consider the designation of a Special Envoy for Cuba,** who would report directly to Secretary of State Clinton. **This would help ensure that our ongoing relations with the rest of the region and the duties of the Assistant Secretary of State for Western Hemisphere are not shortchanged as a result of the attention that such a complex untangling will demand**. The Special Envoy’s responsibilities would begin with the initiation of direct talks with the Cuban government on migration and drug interdiction in order to serve vital U.S. security interests in the Straits of Florida, among other issues. Such dialogue on matters of shared concern has significant confidence-building potential and could ultimately create the conditions for meaningful discussion of more contentious subjects, particularly human rights and greater freedoms. Proposals such as the ones **I suggest would be an important demonstration that you are serious in wanting a renewed relationship with Latin America.**¶ I encourage you to capitalize on the current bipartisan support for reforming our policy toward Cuba in the U.S. Congress and from countries in Latin America such as Brazil and the European Union (Spain, particularly), as well. The stance of these actors provides you with propitious circumstances to take meaningful action within the framework of the embargo. U.S. policy should be driven by our own interests and from Washington, not by events in Cuba**.** **Reform of our approach towards Cuba is a means to an end: the advancement of U.S. security and foreign policy interests in the Western Hemisphere**

#### Talks are happening now but need to be expanded

**Piccone 2-10-14** (Ted Piccone is the acting vice president and director for the Foreign Policy program. Piccone specializes in global democracy and human rights policies; U.S.-Latin American relations; and multilateral affairs. Piccone serves as an advisor to the Club of Madrid and has served on the National Security Council, “Next Steps: How President Obama Should Advance U.S.-Cuba Relations”, February 10th, 2014, http://www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/2014/02/10-next-steps-us-cuba-relations-piccone)//moxley

Expand ongoing cooperation on issues of mutual concern

Last month, U.S. and Cuban officials met in Havana to continue discussions on migration, an important building block toward future normalization of relations. The President should build on this success by appointing a special envoy to lead similar dialogues on travel**, counterterrorism and counternarcotics, the environment, and trade and investment.** Normalizing relations with Cuba along these lines would give American and Cuban citizens the freedom to engage in direct diplomacy and support the Cuban people in their desire to participate in and benefit from the updating of the Cuban model.

#### Lifting of the embargo is inevitable – triggers your disads

**Ediger 9/19/12** – (Don, “Cuba Post-Castro Future” Masters from the University of Southern California and a writer for Consortium News with background at the Sacramento Master Club, Consortium News is a peer-reviewed and edited News service with reviewers from the Associated Press and Newsweek, Available online @ http://consortiumnews.com/2012/09/19/cubas-post-castro-future/)

With Fidel Castro now 86 and his brother Raul at 81, big changes appear inevitable in Cuba over the next few years. Cuban-Americans are ramping up investment plans, assuming the U.S. government will finally lift the embargo. But the future may not be all that’s expected, reports Don Ediger.¶ By Don Ediger¶ For more than 50 years, Cuban-Americans have been looking for ways to end the Castro regime. Today their plans are being re-shaped in ways that would have been all but unthinkable only a few years ago – and these plans will be affected by the outcome of U.S. presidential elections.¶ Most Cuban-Americans now believe that a transition to democracy may require a period of many years. In the meantime, a growing number of them are exploring ways to profit from a country that has been off limits for most American companies.¶ Cuban leader Fidel Castro speaking at the Jose Marti Monument in 2003. (Photo credit: Ricardo Stuckert/ABr.)¶ The key to this new strategy is an option that until recently wasn’t even open to discussion – ending the U.S. embargo. That is more likely to happen, Cuba experts say, if Barack Obama is reelected, because Democrats are traditionally more open to options regarding the embargo. There’s also growing doubt about whether outlawing Cuban imports actually hurts the regime.¶ “Personally, I think that the embargo is a completely failed policy,” says Miami attorney Antonio Zamora, referring to the 50-year-old law that was imposed after the Castro regime expropriated private property. In all those years, Zamora points out, only a few property owners have ever been compensated.¶ Though largely overlooked by the media, major shifts in Florida demographics make repeal of the embargo much more likely. Numbering more than one million, Cuban-Americans have been the largest Hispanic group in Florida, and for many years they overwhelmingly favored keeping the embargo in place. To win elections in Florida – the country’s largest swing state – politicians of both parties have traditionally promised to uphold the embargo for fear of alienating Cuban voters.¶ Now that’s changing. Hispanics from Puerto Rico, the Dominican Republic, Venezuela, Mexico and other Latin American countries are growing faster in numbers than those from Cuba. And while Cuban-Americans are mostly Republicans, others in Florida are heavily Democratic.¶ Moreover, Cuban-Americans themselves are changing their mind about the embargo. According to a recent study by the Cuban Research Institute at Florida International University (FIU), most Cuban-Americans in Miami would agree with Zamora that the embargo hasn’t worked well. In fact, 47 percent would like to see the embargo lifted.¶ “This is probably the first presidential election in which Cuba is not a top issue for the Cuban-American community,” says Andy Gomez, senior fellow at the University of Miami’s Institute for Cuban and Cuban-American Studies. A member of Mitt Romney’s staff phoned Gomez last year to get his advice on the topics that Romney should address when he visits Miami. Gomez’s answer wasn’t Cuba but jobs and the economy.¶ It’s not that Cuban-Americans are no longer interested in Cuba, Gomez says, but that they are “tired of the same thing over and over again.”¶ There’s a growing consensus among Cuban-Americans that lifting the embargo won’t help the Castros retain power – as some once thought – because the regime has been thoroughly entrenched for more than five decades. When Fidel Castro became ill six years ago, some experts thought the end was near, but today they discuss a variety of scenarios.¶ As Jose Gabilondo of FIU’s Cuban Research Institute explains it: “The logic of the U.S. embargo is ‘Let’s create conditions of civil unrest in Cuba by creating conditions of economic hardship such that there will be a popular uprising that will lead to a revolution.’ I reject that approach. I don’t think it makes sense.”¶ The other approach, Gabilondo says, “is to realize that transition is already happening in Cuba – slowly, and one deal at a time.”¶ A Vietnam-Style Scenario¶ The most likely scenario, many experts believe, is for Cuba to follow a path similar to Vietnam’s – continuing as an authoritarian socialist state but also opening up trade with the United States.¶ Several Cuban-American groups are already gearing up for this possibility, which comes with the prospect of huge profits for American companies once the embargo is lifted. There’s also a sentiment in the community that opening up trade might also provide the Cuban government with an incentive to be less repressive.¶

#### Talks now non-unique your disads

**CT 12-3-13** (Coshocton Tribune, “Obama thaws relations between U.S. and Cuba”, December 3rd, 2013, http://www.coshoctontribune.com/article/20131203/OPINION04/312030009/Obama-thaws-relations-between-U-S-Cuba)//moxley

And it appears the Obama administration has done just that. It is quietly employing a “new think” diplomacy to end this nation’s Cold War standoff with Cuba. In January, Cuba ended a decades-old requirement that its citizens needed to obtain a government-issued exit permit before they could travel abroad. In July, the Obama administration increased from six months to five years the duration of visas granted to Cuban visitors to the U.S. These new visas allow Cubans to travel back and forth between the two countries, which haven’t had formal diplomatic ties since 1961. Also this year, talks between the U.S. and Cuba to restore normal mail service have resumed. The talks were halted in 2009 after Cuba arrested Alan Gross, a State Department contractor who brought communications equipment to Cuba and was accused of spying. In August, Cuba allowed U.S. doctors to visit Gross, whose health is said to be failing, for the first time. That concession came just a few months after a U.S. judge agreed to let a Cuban spy, Rene Gonzalez, serve the remaining three years of his probation in Cuba. Gonzalez is one of five Cubans convicted in 2001 of spying on the U.S. military and Cuban exile groups in south Florida. In 2011, he was the first of the group to be released from prison, but was still on probation when he was allowed to stay in Cuba after having been given permission to go there to attend his father’s funeral. This is how diplomacy is supposed to work. The Obama administration’s subtle engagement of Cuba also might account for keeping Edward Snowden out of Cuba. According to a Russian newspaper report, the rogue U.S. intelligence analyst now languishes in Russia because of Cuba’s refusal in August to allow him to fly from Moscow to Havana, where he was expected to take a connecting flight to an exile in Venezuela, Nicaragua or Bolivia. It’s this diplomatic push and pull that Obama hopes will produce the meaningful change that the chest-beating policies of a long succession of U.S. presidents have failed to bring about in Cuba. Increased travel between the USA and Cuba is the cornerstone of the president’s détente with the communist state. Obama wisely believes that increased contact between Americans and Cubans will do more to improve life for people on that Caribbean island than the longstanding U.S. economic blockade. And it is this increased contact that Obama hopes will give him the leverage he needs to solve the gnawing problems that ideologues on both sides of the Florida Straits use to keep the U.S. and Cuba locked in a Cold War battle that should have ended long ago.

#### Talks now non-unique EVERY DA

**Frank 9-16-13** (Marc, Reuters, “U.S. and Cuba talk about resuming direct mail service”, September 16th, 2013, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/09/17/us-cuba-usa-idUSBRE98G00F20130917>)//moxley

The United States and Cuba concluded on Monday their second round of talks aimed at re-establishing direct mail service between the two countries after a 50-year ban, but left for later the most sensitive issue - Cuban planes landing on U.S. soil. The Cuban Foreign Ministry said both sides had agreed to continue the talks in the near future and that it had emphasized, "working out the transportation of mail by regular direct routes in both directions," was key to their successful conclusion. The State Department said something very similar in a statement: "The goal of the talks is for the United States and Cuba to work out the details for a pilot program to directly transport mail between the two countries." Cuba said talks between the postal services of the two countries took place "in a respectful manner," and the U.S. Interests Section said U.S. officials "described the discussions as fruitful." The U.S. delegation, led by U.S. postal service executive director for international postal services, Lea Emerson, was to tour Cuban mail facilities on Tuesday, the U.S. Interests Section said. The two countries do not have diplomatic relations, but maintain lower-level missions in each other's capitals. Direct mail service between the United States and Cuba has been suspended since 1963. Despite the ban, letters and other mail still flow between the United States and the island nation 90 miles away through other countries, such as Canada, Mexico and Panama. Relations between the two countries have been frozen since soon after Cuba's 1959 revolution led by Fidel Castro, and Washington has maintained economic sanctions on Cuba for more than half a century. Monday's talks took place amid a few signs the Obama administration and President Raul Castro have not completely given up on some improvement in the two countries' hostile standoff. Former British ambassador to Cuba, Paul Webster Hare, who lectures on international relations at Boston University, said Cuba's decision not to allow fugitive former U.S. intelligence analyst Edward Snowden to fly from Russia to Cuba on the way to exile in Latin America, was significant. "The Cubans recognized that for any prospect of better relations they needed to avoid more long-term irritants," he said.

#### US-Cuba talks are happening now but are at a critical junction – lack of commitment derails the process

**Galeono 6/22/13** (Javier, Associated Press, “Analysis: Cuba, U.S. Take Steps Toward Rapprochement but Complicated Road Lies Ahead”, June 22nd, 2013, <http://cubaconfidential.wordpress.com/tag/john-kerry/>)//moxley

HAVANA, Cuba — They’ve hardly become allies, but Cuba and the U.S. have taken some baby steps toward rapprochement in recent weeks that have people on this island and in Washington wondering if a breakthrough in relations could be just over the horizon. Skeptics caution the Cold War enemies have been here many times before, only to fall back into old recriminations but there are signs that views might be shifting on both sides of the Florida Straits.¶ The countries have held talks in the past week on resuming direct mail service, and announced a July 17 meeting on migration issues. A U.S. federal judge in May allowed a convicted Cuban intelligence agent to return to the island. Cuba informed the family of jailed U.S. government subcontractor Alan Gross this month it would let an American doctor examine him, although the visit has apparently not yet happened. Cuban President Raul Castro has also ushered in a series of economic and social changes, including making it easier for Cubans to travel off the island.¶ Under the radar, diplomats on both sides describe a sea change in the tone of their dealings. Only last year, Cuban state television was broadcasting grainy footage of American diplomats meeting with dissidents on Havana streets and publicly accusing them of being CIA frontmen. **Today, U.S. diplomats in Havana and Cuban Foreign Ministry officials have easy contact,** even sharing home phone numbers.¶ Josefina Vidal, Cuba’s top diplomat for North American affairs, recently travelled to Washington and met twice with State Department officials, a visit that came right before the announcements of resumptions in the two sets of bilateral talks that had been suspended for more than two years. Washington has also granted visas to prominent Cuban officials, including the daughter of Cuba’s president.¶ “**These recent steps indicate a desire on both sides to try to move forward,** but also a recognition on both sides of just how difficult it is to make real progress,” said Robert Pastor, a professor of international relations at American University and former national security adviser on Latin America during the Carter administration. “These are tiny, incremental gains, and the prospects of going backwards are equally high.”

#### The US is key to global ag policy

WFP 10 [World Food Prize, “Chicago Council Wins Grant to Expand Global Agricultural Development Initiative,” Dec 23, 2010, pg. http://www.worldfoodprize.org/index.cfm?nodeID=24667&action=display&newsID=11003]

A number of policy developments indicate that the United States is beginning to recognize the transformational role agriculture can play in addressing the challenge of global poverty: President Obama called for a doubling of U.S. support for agricultural development in 2010 at the G-20 summit in April 2009; the U.S. Administration rolled out its initial strategic and implementation thinking on the Feed the Future initiative in May 2010; and both the House and Senate have considered legislation to enhance support for agricultural development. However, to ensure these advances are realized in a way that can have a tangible impact on global poverty during a time of economic uncertainty, further policy innovation, sustained political and financial support, and accountability of U.S. policy for agricultural development and food security is needed. “U.S. leadership is key to ensuring agricultural development receives the long-term policy attention and resources needed to reduce global poverty and hunger over the long term,” said Glickman. “The next three years will be critical in determining whether the new U.S. impetus for leadership in agricultural development and food security will become a prominent, effective, and lasting feature of U.S. development policy.” Over the last two years, food security has risen to the top of the agenda of global issues that need urgent national and international attention. Prompted by the food price crisis of 2008, the increase in the number of people living in abject poverty rose to over 1 billion in 2009, and the need to nearly double food production to meet global demand by 2050, world leaders are giving new attention to agricultural development in poor regions and the sufficiency and sustainability of the world’s food supply. “Agricultural development is the essential first step to alleviate extreme poverty and hunger in developing nations,” said Bertini. “We have the knowledge, tools and resources necessary to solve global hunger, but what is needed is sustained momentum in U.S. policy toward supporting agriculture as a poverty alleviation tool.”

#### Dialogue is the only solution – effective engagement requires reliable information

**Maybarduk 9** (Gary H., Gary Harold Maybarduk is currently a adjunct professor at George Washington University and writes on issues of US policy towards Cuba. Professor Maybarduk was a professor of national security studies at the US Army War College from 2002-2004. He also taught economics at the Foreign Service Institute, the University of Minnesota and the Universidad Del Salvador in Argentina. He has a PhD in economics from the University of Minnesota, a MS in national security studies from the National War College, a MA in international relations from the Fletcher School of Law & Diplomacy and a BS in economics from MIT. Professor Maybarduk served 32 years in the US Foreign Service with postings in Caracas, Havana, Freetown, Managua, Mexico City and Port Moresby. In Washington, he served as Director of Central American Affairs, Deputy Director for Economic Policy and Summit Coordination in Western Hemispheric Affairs, Deputy Director of the Policy Analysis Staff of the Bureau of Economic Affairs, Senior Economic Advisor for the Bureau of African Affairs and Senior Advisor to the Office of Reconstruction and Stabilization. He also served as a legislative advisor for international and military affairs for Senator John Danforth and as a congressional liaison officer for the Bureau of African Affairs., The US Strategy for Transition in Cuba, 2009, <http://web.gc.cuny.edu/dept/bildn/publications/documents/Maybarduk12_000.pdf>)//moxley

To maintain our vision of a free Cuba while protecting our national interests will require an informed and flexible strategy that will be able to respond to the changing situation in Cuba. When the Cuban Government is ready, we need to develop a policy of engagement, much as we did with the former Soviet Union and its satellite states. **It should not be a policy of unilateral concessions, but it should allow us to act in our own national interest**. As a first step, we should reestablish full diplomatic relations with Havana**. This would demonstrate our willingness to respond in measured steps to positive events in Cuba**. Raúl Castro has toned down the rhetoric against the US Government. Cuba recently signed two Human Rights treaties. We could use these actions to justify the establishment of full relations. However, we do not really need this type of justification. **US interests also require this step.** Any coherent strategy requires good information. Today, we have far too little of the information needed to respond to events in Cuba. We need to give our diplomats in Havana the space to do their normal job of reporting on personalities, conditions, institutions, and attitudes in Cuba. This will require reducing restrictions on Cuban diplomats in the United States. Cuba has retaliated to those restrictions by preventing US diplomats from going outside of Havana or talking to any government employee other than those in the Ministry of Foreign relations. Cuban diplomats can of course learn almost anything they need to know about us by reading our newspapers and watching our television. Our diplomats do not have that luxury. We should lift our restrictions if the Cubans do the same, and then get on with the job of understanding the reality ahead.

#### Now is key – commitment to diplomacy is a necessary starting point in engagement

**Galeono 6/22/13** (Javier, Associated Press, “Analysis: Cuba, U.S. Take Steps Toward Rapprochement but Complicated Road Lies Ahead”, June 22nd, 2013, <http://cubaconfidential.wordpress.com/tag/john-kerry/>)//moxley

Ted Henken, a professor of Latin American studies at Baruch College in New York who helped organize a recent U.S. tour by Cuban dissident blogger Yoani Sanchez, said the Obama administration is too concerned with upsetting Cuban-American politicians and has missed opportunities to engage with Cuba at a crucial time in its history.¶ **“I think that** a lot more would need to happen for this to amount to momentum leading to any kind of major diplomatic breakthrough,” he said. “Obama should be bolder and more audacious.”¶ Even these limited moves have sparked fierce criticism by those long opposed to engagement. Cuban-American congressman Mario Diaz Balart, a Florida Republican, called the recent overtures “disturbing.”¶ “Rather than attempting to legitimize the Cuban people’s oppressors, the administration should demand that the regime stop harbouring fugitives from U.S. justice, release all political prisoners and American humanitarian aid worker Alan Gross, end the brutal, escalating repression against the Cuban people, and respect basic human rights,” he said.¶ Another Cuban-American politician from Florida, Rep. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, scolded Obama for seeking “dialogue with the dictatorship.”¶ Despite that rhetoric, many experts think Obama would face less political fallout at home if he chose engagement because younger Cuban-Americans seem more open to improved ties than those who fled immediately after the 1959 revolution.¶ Of 10 Cuban-Americans interview recently at the popular Miami restaurant Versailles, a de facto headquarters of the exile community, only two said they were opposed to the U.S. holding migration talks. Several said they hoped for much more movement.¶ Jose Gonzalez, 55, a shipping-industry supervisor who was born in Cuba and came to the U.S. at age 12, said he now favours an end to the embargo and the resumption of formal diplomatic ties. “There was a reason that existed but it doesn’t any more,” he said.¶ Santiago Portal, 65, an engineer who moved to the U.S. 45 years ago, said more dialogue would be good. “The more exchange of all types the closer Cuba will be to democracy,” he said.¶ Those opinions dove-tail with a 2011 poll by Florida International University of 648 randomly selected Cuban-Americans in Miami-Dade County that showed 58 per cent favoured re-establishing diplomatic relations with Cuba. That was a considerable increase from a survey in 1993, when 80 per cent of people polled said they did not support trade or diplomatic relations with Cuba.¶ “In general, there is an open attitude, certainly toward re-establishing diplomatic relations,” said Jorge Duany, director of the Cuban Research Institute at Florida International University. “Short of perhaps lifting the embargo**, there seems to be increasing support for some sort of understanding with the Cuban government.”**

#### That’s key – establishing contacts and information sharing solves – repealing the embargo fails – the plan is a necessary pre-requisite

**Maybarduk 9** (Gary H., Gary Harold Maybarduk is currently a adjunct professor at George Washington University and writes on issues of US policy towards Cuba. Professor Maybarduk was a professor of national security studies at the US Army War College from 2002-2004. He also taught economics at the Foreign Service Institute, the University of Minnesota and the Universidad Del Salvador in Argentina. He has a PhD in economics from the University of Minnesota, a MS in national security studies from the National War College, a MA in international relations from the Fletcher School of Law & Diplomacy and a BS in economics from MIT. Professor Maybarduk served 32 years in the US Foreign Service with postings in Caracas, Havana, Freetown, Managua, Mexico City and Port Moresby. In Washington, he served as Director of Central American Affairs, Deputy Director for Economic Policy and Summit Coordination in Western Hemispheric Affairs, Deputy Director of the Policy Analysis Staff of the Bureau of Economic Affairs, Senior Economic Advisor for the Bureau of African Affairs and Senior Advisor to the Office of Reconstruction and Stabilization. He also served as a legislative advisor for international and military affairs for Senator John Danforth and as a congressional liaison officer for the Bureau of African Affairs., The US Strategy for Transition in Cuba, 2009, <http://web.gc.cuny.edu/dept/bildn/publications/documents/Maybarduk12_000.pdf>)//moxley

We should not tie ourselves in knots trying to define what would constitute a hypothetical transitional Cuban government and putting prior restrictions on the type of assistance we could provide. Under current US policy, very little economic assistance can be given to a transitional government before a democratic government is elected. Yet during this transitional period many problems will arise that could derail the evolving democratic process. We will need to be able to make judgment calls during this period, to assist the transition process, **to strengthen Cuba’s ability to fight narcotics trafficking, and perhaps boost the economy**. This would not require that we assist a government unwilling to implement political reforms, but would return the decision to the discretion of the Executive branch and the Congressional appropriations process where it belongs. We should also amend the requirement that we provide no assistance until the transitional Cuban Government abolishes State Security. The President’s Commission did its best to avoid, but not repudiate the Helms-Burton language, and proposed language that would serve us well for discussions with any Cuban government. It proposed that we: . . . assemble and maintain a current list of criminal justice system personnel implicated in abuse or corruption that will be available to all U.S. Government personnel discussing conditions for potential U.S. assistance with a Cuban Transition Government.2 We can refuse to give support to a government full of thugs, but we cannot afford to demand the abolishment of the entire system of law enforcement. We, the American people, should also give serious thought to what guidance should be given to the President regarding implementation of the Cuban Adjustment Act once Cuba begins to move towards democratic elections. There is no right answer to that issue, but it deserves more public debate. **Finally,** we should not unilaterally lift the embargo. That should wait until the process of political and economic liberalization is well underway. Lifting the embargo would be a big boost to the Cuban economy but, contrary to the claims by those anxious to do business in Cuba, its value to the economic welfare of the American people would be minimal.3 For humanitarian reasons, however, we should lift the restrictions on family visits and remittances.

#### The model of sustainability is threatened – other countries trigger your impacts but the US ensures a transition to sustainable ag practices

**Thompson and Stephens 12** (Charles D. Thompson, Jr., Ph.D. Curriculum and Education Director, Center for Documentary Studies at Duke University Lecturer in Cultural Anthropology, North Carolina A&T State University M.S. in Agricultural Education, Alexander Stephens is an associate director at the Marian Cheek Jackson Center for Saving and Making History, completed a semester of study in Havana, Cuba, before graduating with a degree in Latin American Studies from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, “Visions for Sustainable Agriculture in Cuba and the United States: Changing Minds and Models through Exchange”, November 2012, http://www.southernspaces.org/2012/visions-sustainable-agriculture-cuba-and-united-states-changing-minds-and-models-through-exchan#sthash.GowEptZk.dpuf)//moxley

With Cuba developing closer ties to the U.S. agriculture industry, increasing its trade with China, and, with Venezuela’s help, poised to explore oil fields off its northern coast, we cannot assume that the island nation will adopt a model of ecological sustainability.9 Resistance to the onslaught of ecologically destructive development that looms on Cuba’s horizon will come through cooperation and exchange, not isolation. What we do know about Cuba’s agricultural innovations is that domestic shortages brought on by the end of Soviet subsidies and the U.S. embargo forced the Cuban government to seek alternative solutions. This entailed ceding some degree of power to its innovative citizen farmers and gardeners who have, in turn, helped create an alternative to industrial agriculture through the formation of organic garden cooperatives known as "organopónicos," local distribution channels, information exchanges, and the like.10 Urban dwellers, many of them university trained, some of them scientists, have joined cooperative gardens in the cities. Working toward sustainability, Cuba’s rural farmers have received new freedoms to produce for more open markets. Such policy changes, along with newly revamped farms and numerous urban gardens, have contributed to a much-needed increase in the country’s food supply since the early 1990s.11 While overall food production in Cuba in 2010 was lower than in 2005, the organic movement coupled with local sales and farmers’ pocketing some of the profit, is one area of progress.