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#### Unemployment benefits will be restored, but continued pressure on the GOP is key

Jamelle Bouie 12-28, The Daily Beast, Republicans’ Unemployment Shame, <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2013/12/28/republicans-unemployment-shame.html>

The prospects for fixing the lapse are mixed. Most Republicans are opposed to extending benefits, and argue that the program increases dependency, despite research that the opposite is true; with some form of support guaranteed, unemployed workers are more likely to stay in the workforce and continue their search for a job. With that said, there are Republicans in the Senate—like Dean Heller of Nevada—who support a short-term extension of three months. And House Speaker John Boehner has signaled his willingness to consider an extension, provided it’s offset with further cuts to spending.

The problem is that Congress has just passed an agreement that maintains most sequester cuts, and congressional Democrats are unlikely to sign on to another round of deficit reduction, just as Republicans are loath to consider new spending.

If the long-term unemployed have anything on their side, it’s that extending benefits is popular with the public, with 55 percent in favor and 33 percent opposed, according to a recent survey (PDF) commissioned by the National Employment Law Project. Likewise, Public Policy Polling—a Democratic firm—found that in four GOP swing districts, large bipartisan majorities supported an extension. In some areas, in fact, local news outlets are hitting Republicans hard for their resistance to renewing emergency unemployment insurance.

There’s a chance that this pressure will work to move a few GOP lawmakers to the “yes” camp, providing votes to help the unemployed. But, as we saw throughout 2013, you’re almost certain to lose if you bet on Republicans to do the right thing.

#### Plan drains capital—anti-Cuba lobby means any policy draws a fight

Birns and Mills 13 (Larry, Director of the Council on Hemispheric Affairs, Frederick B., COHA Senior Research Fellow, 01/30, “Best Time for U.S.–Cuba Rapprochement Is Now,” http://www.coha.org/best-time-for-u-s-cuba-rapprochement-is-now/)

Despite the basic intransigence of US policy towards Cuba, in recent years, important changes have been introduced by Havana: state control over the economy has been diminished; most travel restrictions affecting both Americans and Cubans on the island have been lifted; and the “group of 75” Cuban dissidents detained in 2003 have been freed. Washington has all but ignored these positive changes by Havana, but when it comes to interacting with old foes such as those of Myanmar, North Korea, and Somalia, somehow constructive dialogue is the order of the day. One reason for this inconsistency is the continued opposition by the anti-Castro lobby to a change of course by Washington. The anti-Castro lobby and their allies in the US Congress argue that the reforms coming out of Havana are too little too late and that political repression continues unabated. They continue to see the embargo as a tool for coercing either more dramatic reforms or regime change. It is true that the reformist tendency in Cuba does not include a qualitative move from a one party system to political pluralism. Lamentably, Cuba reportedly continues to use temporary detentions and the occasional jailing of non-violent dissidents to limit the parameters of political debate and total freedom of association. The authors agree that no non-violent Cuban dissident should be intimidated, detained or jailed. But continuing to maliciously turn the screws on Havana has never provided an incentive for more democracy in any sense of the word nor has it created a political opening into which Cuba, with confidence, could enter. The easing of tensions between Washington and Havana is more likely to contribute to the evolution of a more democratic form of socialism on the island, the early stages of which we may presently be witnessing. In any case the precise form of such change inevitably should and will be decided in Cuba, not in Washington or Miami. To further moves towards rapprochement with Cuba, the U.S. State Department should remove the country from the list of state sponsors of terrorism. It is an invention to depict Havana as a state sponsor of terrorism, a charge only levied by the State Department under pressure from Hill hardliners. As researcher Kevin Edmunds, quite properly points out: “This position is highly problematic, as the United States has actively engaged in over 50 years of economic and covert destabilization in Cuba, going so far as blindly protecting wanted terrorists such as Luis Posada Carilles and Orlando Bosch, both former CIA agents accused of dozens of terrorist attacks in Cuba and the United States ” (Nov. 15, 2012, Kevin Edmonds blog). It was precisely the propensity of some anti-Castro extremists to plan terrorist attacks against Cuba that urgently motivated the infiltration of such groups by the Cuban five as well as the close monitoring of these organizations by the FBI. Another gesture of good will would be for the White House to grant clemency to the Cuban five: Gerardo Hernandez, Ramón Labañino, Fernando Gonzalez, Antonio Guerrero and René Gonzalez. They are Cuban nationals who were convicted in a Miami court in 2001 and subsequently sentenced to terms ranging from 15 years to double life, mostly on charges of conspiracy to commit espionage. Despite requests for a change of venue out of Miami, which at first was granted and later denied, the trial took place in a politically charged Miami atmosphere that arguably tainted the proceedings and compromised justice. Supporters maintain that the Cuban five had infiltrated extremist anti-Castro organizations in order to prevent terrorist attacks against Cuba and did not pose any security threat to the United States. It would be an important humanitarian gesture to let them go home. Perhaps such a gesture might facilitate reciprocity on the part of Cuban authorities when it comes to American engineer Alan Gross who is presently being detained in a Cuban jail. There would probably be a political price to pay by the Obama administration for taking steps towards reconciliation with Havana, but if Obama’s election to a second term means that there is to be a progressive dividend, surely such a dividend ought to include a change in US policy towards the island. Mirabile dictu, the Administration can build on the small steps it has already taken. Since 2009, Washington has lifted some of the restrictions on travel between the US and Cuba and now allows Cuban Americans to send remittances to relatives on the island. The Cuba Reconciliation Act (HR 214) introduced by Representative Jose Serrano (D-NY) on January 4, 2013, and sitting in a number of congressional committees, would repeal the harsh terms of the Cuban Democracy Act of 1992 and the Helms-Burton Act of 1996, both of which toughened the embargo during the special period in Cuba. The Cuba Reconciliation Act, however, is unlikely to get much traction, especially with ultra-hardliner Representative Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (R-FL), chairing the House Foreign Relations Committee, and her counterpart, Robert Menendez (D-NJ), who is about to lead the Senate Foreign Relations Body. Some of the anti-Castro Cuban American community would likely view any of the three measures advocated here as a capitulation to the Castro brothers. But as we have argued, a pro-democracy and humanist position is not in any way undermined, but might in fact be advanced by détente. An end to the embargo has been long overdue, and the judgment of history may very well be that it ought never to have been started.

#### Capital is key to passage – prevents economic collapse

AP 12/28 [“1.3 million are losing unemployment benefits Saturday morning,” http://www.columbiatribune.com/news/million-are-losing-unemployment-benefits-saturday-morning/article\_9d1b52ec-6f81-11e3-9033-10604b9f6eda.html?comments=focus]

WASHINGTON — More than 1 million Americans are bracing for a harrowing, post-Christmas jolt as extended federal unemployment benefits come to a sudden halt this weekend, with potentially significant implications for the recovering U.S. economy. A tense political battle likely looms when Congress reconvenes in the new, midterm election year.¶ Nudging Congress along, a vacationing President Barack Obama called two senators proposing an extension to offer his support. From Hawaii, Obama pledged yesterdayto push Congress to move quickly next year to address the "urgent economic priority," the White House said.¶ For families dependent on cash assistance, the end of the federal government's "emergency unemployment compensation" will mean some difficult belt-tightening as enrollees lose their average monthly stipend of $1,166.¶ Jobless rates could drop, but analysts say the economy might suffer with less money for consumers to spend on everything from clothes to cars. Having let the "emergency" program expire as part of a budget deal, it's unclear if Congress has the appetite to start it anew.¶ An estimated 1.3 million people will be cut off when the federally funded unemployment payments end today.¶ Started under President George W. Bush, the benefits were designed as a cushion for the millions of U.S. citizens who lost their jobs in a recession and failed to find new ones while receiving state jobless benefits, which in most states expire after six months. Another 1.9 million people across the country are expected to exhaust their state benefits before the end of June.¶ The Obama administration says those payments have kept 11.4 million people out of poverty and benefited almost 17 million children. The cost of them since 2008 has totaled $225 billion.

#### Nuclear war

Harris and Burrows ‘9

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

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

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

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

#### Violation—the affirmative uses agricultural engagement—that’s distinct

#### Voting issue—

#### Limits—they explode the topic—blurring the lines between economic and other forms of engagement makes any interaction with another country topical—it’s impossible to predict or prepare
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#### Interpretation—economic engagement is a subset of conditional engagement and implies a quid pro quo

Shinn 96 [James Shinn, C.V. Starr Senior Fellow for Asia at the CFR in New York City and director of the council’s multi-year Asia Project, worked on economic affairs in the East Asia Bureau of the US Dept of State, “Weaving the Net: Conditional Engagement with China,” pp. 9 and 11, google books]

In sum, conditional engagement consists of a set of objectives, a strategy for attaining those objectives, and tactics (specific policies) for implementing that strategy.

The objectives of conditional engagement are the ten principles, which were selected to preserve American vital interests in Asia while accommodating China’s emergence as a major power.

The overall strategy of conditional engagement follows two parallel lines: economic engagement, to promote the integration of China into the global trading and financial systems; and security engagement, to encourage compliance with the ten principles by diplomatic and military means when economic incentives do not suffice, in order to hedge against the risk of the emergence of a belligerent China.

The tactics of economic engagement should promote China’s economic integration through negotiations on trade liberalization, institution building, and educational exchanges. While a carrots-and-sticks approach may be appropriate within the economic arena, the use of trade sanction to achieve short-term political goals is discouraged.

The tactics of security engagement should reduce the risks posed by China’s rapid military expansion, its lack of transparency, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and transnational problems such as crime and illegal migration, by engaging in arms control negotiations, multilateral efforts, and a loosely-structured defensive military arrangement in Asia.8

[To footnotes]

8. Conditional engagement’s recommended tactics of tit-for-tat responses are equivalent to using carrots and sticks in response to foreign policy actions by China. Economic engagement calls for what is described as symmetric tit-for-tat and security engagement for asymmetric tit-for-tat. A symmetric response is one that counters a move by China in the same place, time, and manner; an asymmetric response might occur in another place at another time, and perhaps in another manner. A symmetric tit-for-tat would be for Washington to counter a Chinese tariff of 10 percent on imports for the United States with a tariff of 10 percent on imports from China. An asymmetric tit-for-tat would be for the United States to counter a Chines shipment of missiles to Iran with an American shipment of F-16s to Vietnam (John Lewis Gaddis, Strategies of Containment: A critical Appraisal of Postwar American National Security Policy. New York: Oxford University Press, (1982). This is also cited in Fareed Zakaria, “The Reagan Strategy of Containment,” Political Science Quarterly 105, no. 3 (1990), pp. 383-88).

#### Violation—the aff is unilateral action

#### Voter for limits—topic snowballs into countless unilateral affs based on small subsets of engagement in each of the topic countries—literally limitless
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#### Hardline against Cuba now – terror list

Kasperowicz ’13 – Pete, Staff Writer for the Hill, “State keeps Cuba on terror sponsors list”, 5/30, http://thehill.com/blogs/global-affairs/americas/302609-cuba-remains-a-state-sponsor-of-terror-despite-some-improvements

As expected, the State Department on Thursday released a report that keeps Cuba on the list of state sponsors of terrorism, even as it acknowledged that some conditions on the island were improving.

State's Country Reports on Terrorism for 2012 was widely expected to keep Cuba, Iran, Sudan and Syria on the list of countries that sponsor terrorism, despite some reports that incorrectly suggested that it might be used by Secretary of State John Kerry to shift policy on Cuba.

In the case of Cuba, State listed three primary reasons for keeping the island nation on the list. First, it noted that Cuba continued to provide a safe haven for about two dozens members of Basque Fatherland and Liberty (ETA), a group charged with terrorism in Spain.

State's report, though, seemed to give Cuba some credit for hosting peace talks between the government of Colombia and members of the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC). The report notes that Cuba offered aid to FARC members "in past years," and indicates that Havana is no longer supporting the rebel group.

A second major reason for listing Cuba was that the government "continued to harbor fugitives wanted in the United States." That language is unchanged from last year's report.

And thirdly, State said Cuba has deficiencies in the area of anti-money laundering and combating the financing of terrorism, just as it did in last year’s report. This year, however, State also noted that Cuba has become a member of the Financial Action Task Force of South America, which requires Havana to adopt anti-money laundering recommendations.

But still, this improvement and the hosting of peace talks between FARC and Colombia were not enough to remove Cuba from the list.

#### Engagement with Cuba is appeasement

Rubin ‘11 – Jennifer, Labor Law Attorney and Washington Post Journalist, “Obama’s Cuba appeasement”, Washington Post, 8/18, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/right-turn/post/obamas-cuba-appeasement/2011/03/29/gIQAjuL2tL_blog.html>

The chairwoman of the foreign affairs committee, Rep. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen was equally irate: “According to news reports, the Administration attempted to barter for the freedom of wrongly imprisoned U.S. citizen Alan Gross by offering to return Rene Gonzalez, a convicted Cuban spy who was involved in the murder of innocent American citizens. If true, such a swap would demonstrate the outrageous willingness of the Administration to engage with the regime in Havana, which is designated by the U.S. as a state-sponsor of terrorism. Regrettably, this comes as no surprise as this Administration has never met a dictatorship with which it didn’t try to engage. It seems that a rogue regime cannot undertake a deed so dastardly that the Obama Administration would abandon engagement, even while talking tough with reporters. Cuba is a state-sponsor of terrorism. We should not be trying to barter with them. We must demand the unconditional release of Gross, not engage in a quid-pro-quo with tyrants.”

As bad as a prisoner exchange would have been, the administration actions didn’t stop there. The [Associated Press](http://www.usatoday.com/news/washington/story/2011-10-14/cuba-imprisoned-american-swap/50767012/1?csp=34news)reported, “The Gross-Gonzalez swap was raised by former New Mexico Gov. Bill Richardson, as well as by senior U.S. officials in a series of meetings with Cuban officials. Richardson traveled to Cuba last month seeking Gross’ release. He also told Cuban Foreign Minister Bruno Rodriguez that the U.S. would be willing to consider other areas of interest to Cuba. Among them was removing Cuba from the U.S. list of state sponsors of terrorism; reducing spending on Cuban democracy promotion programs like the one that led to the hiring of Gross; authorizing U.S. companies to help Cuba clean up oil spills from planned offshore drilling; improving postal exchanges; ending a program that makes it easier for Cuban medical personnel to move to the United States; and licensing the French company Pernod Ricard to sell Havana Club rum in the United States.”

Former deputy national security adviser [Elliott Abrams explained](http://blogs.cfr.org/abrams/2011/10/14/trading-away-cuba-policy/#more-2032), “It is especially offensive that we were willing to negotiate over support for democracy in Cuba, for that would mean that the unjust imprisonment of Gross had given the Castro dictatorship a significant victory. The implications for those engaged in similar democracy promotion activities elsewhere are clear: local regimes would think that imprisoning an American might be a terrific way to get into a negotiation about ending such activities. Every American administration faces tough choices in these situations, but the Obama administration has made a great mistake here. Our support for democracy should not be a subject of negotiation with the Castro regime.”

The administration’s conduct is all the more galling given the behavior of the Castro regime. Our willingness to relax sanctions was not greeted with goodwill gestures, let alone systemic reforms. To the contrary, this was the setting for Gross’s imprisonment. So naturally the administration orders up more of the same.

Throughout his tenure, President Obama has failed to comprehend the cost-benefit analysis that despotic regimes undertake. He has offered armfuls of goodies and promised quietude on human rights; the despots’ behavior has worsened. There is simply no downside for rogue regimes to take their shots at the United States.

Whether it is Cuba or [Iran,](http://www.nationalreview.com/corner/280214/iran-dangerous-and-diplomacy-has-failed-jamie-m-fly) the administration reverts to “engagement” mode when its engagement efforts are met with aggression and/or domestic oppression. Try to murder a diplomat on U.S. soil? We’ll sit down and chat. Grab an American contractor and try him in a kangaroo court? We’ll trade prisoners and talk about relaxing more sanctions. Invade Georgia, imprison political opponents and interfere with attempts to restart the peace process? We’ll put the screws on our democratic ally to get you into World Trade Organization. The response of these thuggish regimes is entirely predictable and, from their perspective, completely logical. What is inexplicable is the Obama administration’s willingness to throw gifts to tyrants in the expectation they will reciprocate in kind.

#### Appeasement kills credibility – shows other countries the US is weak

Weissberg ’10 – Robert, Professor of Political Science-Emeritus, University of Illinois-Urbana, “President Obama's Compulsive Appeasement Disorder”, 9/27, http://www.americanthinker.com/2010/08/president\_obamas\_compulsive\_ap.html

There's a simple explanation: we are no longer feared. Superpowers of yesteryear, going back to the Greeks and Romans, were feared for a reason -- they leveled a city to make an example. Today, by contrast, Uncle Sam relies on cajoling, bribery (think North Korea), entreating puny leaders of inchoate states (special envoys to the PLO's Mahmoud Abbas) and otherwise playing weak hands. We have gone from resolve to U.N. resolution. We've forgotten Machiavelli's sage advice: since love and fear can hardly exist together, if we must choose between them, it is far safer to be feared than loved.

Being feared does not require bombing Iran into the Stone Age, though that would certainly terrify North Korea and even slow down the Somali pirates. Being feared is when your enemy believes that you are willing to use overwhelming, deadly force, and this need not require nuking anybody. The trick is creating a credible, threatening persona -- convincing your enemy that while you may speak softly, you also carry a big stick and are willing to use it. Israel long ago learned this lesson, regardless of world outrage.

#### That kills US power

APSA ‘9

American Political Science Association, “U.S. Standing in the World: Causes, Consequences, and the Future”, Task Force Report, September 2009

As at the regional level, U.S. standing on the global stage appears susceptible to both vicious and virtuous cycles resulting in valleys and peaks, declines and advances. As credibility and esteem decline, the United States may be less able to lead and accomplish its policy goals. Others will be less willing to follow a U.S. lead or defer to U.S. opinions because they no longer believe the United States will get the job done, honor promises, or offer a desirable model to emulate. This, in turn, may further diminish U.S. standing. We see some evidence of this in the most recent period of diminished U.S. standing in global institutions. Logically, however, the converse ought to be true as well. As the United States is perceived to honor promises and show interest in multilateral leadership, its standing may be expected to increase, which may make expanded leadership, increased authority and cooperation possible. We suspect, however, that is harder to recover standing than to lose it.

#### American power solves nuclear war and dampens all conflict

Barnett ‘11

Thomas, American military geostrategist and Chief Analyst at Wikistrat, “The New Rules: Leadership Fatigue Puts U.S., and Globalization, at Crossroads,” http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/8099/the-new-rules-leadership-fatigue-puts-u-s-and-globalization-at-crossroads

Let me be more blunt: As the guardian of globalization, **the U.S. military has been the greatest force for peace the world has ever known**. Had America been removed from the global dynamics that governed the 20th century, the mass murder never would have ended. Indeed, it's entirely conceivable **there would** now **be no** identifiable **human civilization left**, **once nuclear weapons entered the** killing **equation**. But the world did not keep sliding down that path of perpetual war. Instead, America stepped up and changed everything by ushering in our now-**perpetual great-power peace**. We introduced the international liberal trade order known as globalization and played loyal Leviathan over its spread. What resulted was the collapse of empires, an explosion of democracy, the persistent spread of human rights, the liberation of women, the doubling of life expectancy, a roughly 10-fold increase in adjusted global GDP and a profound and persistent reduction in battle deaths from state-based conflicts. That is what American "hubris" actually delivered. Please remember that the next time some TV pundit sells you the image of "unbridled" American military power as the cause of global disorder instead of its cure. With self-deprecation bordering on self-loathing, we now imagine a post-American world that is anything but. Just watch who scatters and who steps up as the Facebook revolutions erupt across the Arab world. While we might imagine ourselves the status quo power, we remain the world's most vigorously revisionist force. As for the sheer "evil" that is our military-industrial complex, again, let's examine what the world looked like before that establishment reared its ugly head. The last great period of global structural change was the first half of the 20th century, a period that saw a death toll of about 100 million across **two world wars**. That comes to an average of 2 million deaths a year in a world of approximately 2 billion souls. Today, with far more comprehensive worldwide reporting, researchers report an average of less than 100,000 battle deaths annually in a world fast approaching 7 billion people. Though admittedly crude, these calculations suggest a 90 percent absolute drop and a **99 percent** relative drop in deaths due to war. We are clearly headed for a world order characterized by multipolarity, something the American-birthed system was designed to both encourage and accommodate. But given how things turned out the last time we collectively faced such a fluid structure, we would do well to keep U.S. power, in all of its forms, deeply embedded in the geometry to come.
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#### Text: The United States federal government ought to enter into prior, binding consultation with the government of Brazil on whether The United States federal government should normalize sustainable agricultural relations with the Republic of Cuba with the possibility of minor modifications by the Brazilian government.

#### Prior binding consultation key to U.S.-Brazil relations

Einaudi 11—a Distinguished Visiting f ellow in the Center for Strategic r esearch, i nstitute for n ational Strategic Studies, at the n ational Defense University. He is also a Member of the a dvisory Council of the Brazil i nstitute at the Woodrow Wilson i nternational Center for Scholars. (Luigi, “Brazil and the United States: The Need for Strategic Engagement,” March 2011, http://www.ndu.edu/inss/docuploaded/SF%20266%20Einaudi.pdf

A prerequisite for improved mutual engagement will be changes in perspective on both sides. Mutually beneficial engagement requires the United States to welcome Brazil’s emergence as a global power. Brazil is more than a tropical China35; it is culturally and politically close to the United States and Europe. Brazil, in turn, needs to realize that the United States accepts its rise. Brazil also needs to recognize that the United States still matters greatly to Brasilia and that more can be achieved work¬ing with Washington than against it.¶ The United States and Brazil have vast overlapping in-terests, but a formal strategic partnership is probably out of the question for both countries. In the United States, Brazil must compete for policy attention with China, India, Rus-sia, Japan, Mexico, and several European countries. It poses no security threat to the United States. Moreover, despite Brazil’s importance in multilateral organizations, particu¬larly the UN, Brazil can be of limited practical assistance at best to the United States in its two current wars. Brazil’s interests, in turn, may be fairly said to include the need to distinguish itself from the United States. Diplomatically, this means neither country can expect automatic agreement from the other. Interests differ and it may be politically nec¬essary to highlight differences even when interests are simi-lar. But both countries should make every effort to develop a habit of “permanent consultation” in an effort to coordinate policies, work pragmatically together where interests are common, and reduce surprises even while recognizing that specific interests and policies often may differ.¶ A first operational step, therefore, is for both coun-tries to hold regular policy-level consultations, increase exchanges of information, and coordinate carefully on multilateral matters. This is much easier said than done. The list of global issues on which Brazil is becoming a major player includes conflict resolution, all aspects of energy, including nuclear matters, all types of trade, the environment, space, and the development of internation¬al law, including law of the seas and nonproliferation. To share information and ensure effective consultation on so many functional issues will require finding ways to lessen the geographic stovepiping natural to bureaucracy. The U.S. Department of State, for example, has historically organized itself into geographical bureaus responsible for relations with countries in particular regions, leaving functional issues to offices organized globally. This orga¬nization hampers the exchange of information and con¬sultation with countries such as Brazil, whose reach and policies go beyond their particular geographic region. One result is that multilateral affairs are still often an isolated afterthought in the U.S. Government. Are there things the United States and Brazil could do, whether bi¬laterally or in the World Trade Organization, that would offset some of the negative effects of the China trade on manufacturing in both their countries?36 Just posing the question reveals the complexity of the task.

#### Relations solve global prolif

Trinkunas & Bruneau 12 (Harold & Thomas, Ph.D. at Naval Post Graduate School, Center on Contemporary conflict, “US Brazil Workshop on Global and Regional Security,” December 2012, <http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA574567&Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf>)

Brazilian participants also noted the particular alignment of domestic constituencies regarding issues such as MERCOSUR and UNASUR, which they saw as demonstrating that Brazil was a consolidated democracy that had to respond to domestic political and economic interests in much the same way that the United States government did. The United States and Brazil also look very similar in their relationship with the region, one participant said. If we actually look at the interests of United States and Brazil, they are very convergent. One Brazilian participant also added that, like the United States, Brazil is happy to retreat back to unilateralism. Brazilian participants repeatedly emphasized that Brazil is uniquely qualified to play the role of international peacemaker due to their peaceful traditions, the strength of their diplomacy, and their experience in reducing tensions during international crises. Brazilians also stressed that as a consolidated free market democracy, Brazil is inherently a responsible power in the international arena. They disagreed with the characterization of Brazil as a ‘spoiler’, a position held by some U.S. observers of global nonproliferation efforts (albeit not by the U.S. participants in this dialogue). Again and again Brazilian participants emphasized their responsible and mature behavior in important international issues, including nuclear ones. The dialogue participants from outside of the region agreed that Brazil has acquired a good reputation for its skilled diplomacy. One U.S. participant predicted that Brazil would eventually join the expanded UN Security Council as a permanent member. The Brazilians considered the U.S. and Brazil to be natural partners in international nonproliferation efforts, and both sides agreed that the international nonproliferation regime was in crisis. They offered different explanations, however, for the roots of the regime crisis. A participant from within the region added that it is difficult for Brazil and the U.S. to be on the same page or even debate nuclear issues because the two countries comes from very different ends of the nuclear spectrum. Participants observed that the NPT regime is in the midst of a legitimacy crisis. One participant said that from an institutional point of view, the original design of the regime left it unable to adapt to changes that have taken place in the international system since the Cold War. Some U.S. participants expressed optimism that the NPT has been bolstered by the Obama administration’s support for the NPT. A change in both attitude and policy from the administration has fostered a new sense of hope in the NPT’s utility. This participant added that only by fully engaging other members of the NPT can the U.S. and Brazil hope to make the non-proliferation regime stronger.

#### Extinction

Victor AUtgoff**,** Deputy Director of Strategy, Forces, and Resources Institute for Defense Analysis, Summer 2002, Survival,p.87.90

Further, the large number of states that became capable of building nuclear weapons over the years, but chose not to, can be reasonably well explained by the fact that most were formally allied with either the United States or the Soviet Union. Both these superpowers had strong nuclear forces and put great pressure on their allies not to build nuclear weapons. Since the Cold War, the US has retained all its allies. In addition, NATO has extended its protection to some of the previous allies of the Soviet Union and plans on taking in more. Nuclear proliferation by India and Pakistan, and proliferation programmes by North Korea, Iran and Iraq, all involve states in the opposite situation: all judged that they faced serious military opposition and had little prospect of establishing a reliable supporting alliance with a suitably strong, nuclear-armed state. What would await the world if strong protectors, especially the United States, were [was] no longer seen as willing to protect states from nuclear-backed aggression? At least a few additional states would begin to build their own nuclear weapons and the means to deliver them to distant targets, and these initiatives would spur increasing numbers of the world’s capable states to follow suit. Restraint would seem ever less necessary and ever more dangerous. Meanwhile, more states are becoming capable of building nuclear weapons and long-range missiles. Many, perhaps most, of the world’s states are becoming sufficiently wealthy, and the technology for building nuclear forces continues to improve and spread. Finally, it seems highly likely that at some point, halting proliferation will come to be seen as a lost cause and the restraints on it will disappear. Once that happens, the transition to a highly proliferated world would probably be very rapid. While some regions might be able to hold the line for a time, the threats posed by wildfire proliferation in most other areas could create pressures that would finally overcome all restraint. Many readers are probably willing to accept that nuclear proliferation is such a grave threat to world peace that every effort should be made to avoid it. However, every effort has not been made in the past, and we are talking about much more substantial efforts now. For new and substantially more burdensome efforts to be made to slow or stop nuclear proliferation, it needs to be established that the highly proliferated nuclear world that would sooner or later evolve without such efforts is not going to be acceptable. And, for many reasons, it is not. First, the dynamics of getting to a highly proliferated world could be very dangerous. Proliferating states will feel great pressures to obtain nuclear weapons and delivery systems before any potential opponent does. Those who succeed in outracing an opponent may consider preemptive nuclear war before the opponent becomes capable of nuclear retaliation. Those who lag behind might try to preempt their opponent’s nuclear programme or defeat the opponent using conventional forces. And those who feel threatened but are incapable of building nuclear weapons may still be able to join in this arms race by building other types of weapons of mass destruction, such as biological weapons. The war between Iran and Iraq during the 1980s led to the use of chemical weapons on both sides and exchanges of missiles against each other’s cities. And more recently, violence in the Middle East escalated in a few months from rocks and small arms to heavy weapons on one side, and from police actions to air strikes and armoured attacks on the other. Escalation of violence is also basic human nature. Once the violence starts, retaliatory exchanges of violent acts can escalate to levels unimagined by the participants before hand. Intense and blinding anger is a common response to fear or humiliation or abuse. And such anger can lead us to impose on our opponents whatever levels of violence are readily accessible. In sum, widespread proliferation is likely to lead to an occasional shoot-out with nuclear weapons, and that such shoot-outs will have a substantial probability of escalating to the maximum destruction possible with the weapons at hand. Unless nuclear proliferation is stopped, we are headed toward a world that will mirror the American Wild West of the late 1800s. With most, if not all, nations wearing nuclear 'six-shooters' on their hips, the world may even be a more polite place than it is today, but every once in a while we will all gather on a hill to bury the bodies of dead cities or even whole nations.

## off

#### Discourse against conventional agriculture foreclose social responses to structural violence of our farm system – environmental and scientific privileging prevents addressing the root of crisis – the affirmative is a bankrupt sustainability

ALLEN 1993 **–** ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR CENTER AGROECOLOGY UC SANTA CRUZ

*FOOD FOR THE FUTURE*, PAGE 8-10

THE SCIENCE OF SUSTAINABILITY AND THE ROLE OF EPISTEMOLOGY

Located as it has … production of what is).

#### Conventional paradigms of agricultural and global structures of technological rationality make extinction and the case impacts inevitable

AHMED 2008 – EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR INSTITUTE POLICY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

*HIDDEN HOLOCAUST*, 1-7, <http://onlinejournal.com/artman/publish/printer_2803.shtml>

3. Food scarcity The … **global imperial system.**

#### Endorse our criticism as a challenge to agricultural constructions of the social

ALLEN 1993 **–** ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR CENTER AGROECOLOGY UC SANTA CRUZ

*FOOD FOR THE FUTURE*, PAGE

The Production of Society

AND

Society is also … other human beings.

## Case

#### Cuba agriculture sustainable now **because of the Embargo** – plan collapses the industry

Fairweather and Asquith ’10 (Jack Fairweather- former Middle East correspondent who spent four years as the Daily Telegraph’s Baghdad and Gulf correspondent. He was an embedded reporter during the Iraq invasion, and won the British equivalent of the Pulitzer prize for his reporting on Iraq’s civil war. Most recently Jack has been the Washington Post Global’s Islamic world correspondent, where he has created Islam’s Advance, a multi-media Post webpage that’s viewed by 80,000 viewers a month. Jack is also a contributor to Harper’s Magazine, Mother Jones and the Atlantic Monthly and Christina Asquith- Christina Asquith has 12 years experience as a local beat reporter, national correspondent and foreign correspondent for The Philadelphia Inquirer, The New York Times and The Economist. She spent three years in the Middle East covering the Iraq war, and won “Educator of the Year” award by Education News for her coverage of the effects of war on the lives of school system. She also is author of two non-fiction books: “The Emergency Teacher: A Year Inside Philadelphia’s Toughest School” (Skyhorse Press, 2007) and “The Spinsters’ War: A Story of Women, Life and Death in Iraq” (Random House, 2009). Prior to joining Solutions Magazine, she was senior editor at Diverse Magazine in Washington DC; “How Can Cuba’s Sustainable Agriculture Survive the Peace?”; <http://thesolutionsjournal.com/node/554>)

For a country that responded to severe energy crisis by switching to organic, localized agriculture, the fruits of the revolution must be protected from the coming peace.¶ For those trying to imagine life without oil, Cuba has proven the solitary example of a country successfully de-industrializing.¶ Confronted with the collapse of aid from the Soviet Union and ever-tighter U.S. sanctions in the early 1990s, the Castro regime was forced to scupper its centrally-planned, fossil-fuel-driven agriculture and rediscover sustainable and green farming practices.¶ The solutions developed by a young generation of farmers and agronomists – including urban farms in vacant lots in the capital, Havana, and a network of producers across the country – now provide 80% of the country with predominantly local, organic produce and helped turn Cuba into an unintentional leader of the green movement.¶ And yet, scarcely has this revolution been achieved, but it is under threat — not from the imperial machination of America (a popular theme in Communist circles) but **from the promise of Cuba’s re-integration into the world economy**, raised by President Barack Obama at the recent Summit of the Americas.¶ The problem, say the leaders of Cuba’s green movement, is that opening up trade will flood the country with cheap oil and with it a return to an industrialized food supply. Recent subsidized oil imports from Venezuelan president Hugo Chavez have led to an increase in the use of fertilizers.¶ “Industrialized food production in Cuba means centralized planning and control. The government never wanted to give up control, and now with more oil, we may see the independence that localized, sustainable agriculture produces being undermined,” said Fernando Funes Monzote, a leading agronomist at the Indio Hatuey Experimental Station, University of Matanzas.

#### No extinction

Easterbrook 3(Gregg, senior fellow at the New Republic, “We're All Gonna Die!”, <http://www.wired.com/wired/archive/11.07/doomsday.html?pg=1&topic=&topic_set>=)

If we're talking about doomsday - the end of human civilization - many scenarios simply don't measure up. A single nuclear bomb ignited by terrorists, for example, would be awful beyond words, but life would go on. People and machines might converge in ways that you and I would find ghastly, but from the standpoint of the future, they would probably represent an adaptation. Environmental collapse might make parts of the globe unpleasant, but considering that the biosphere has survived ice ages, it wouldn't be the final curtain. Depression, which has become 10 times more prevalent in Western nations in the postwar era, might grow so widespread that vast numbers of people would refuse to get out of bed, a possibility that Petranek suggested in a doomsday talk at the Technology Entertainment Design conference in 2002. But Marcel Proust, as miserable as he was, wrote *Remembrance of Things Past* while lying in bed.

#### Environment is improving - more growth is key

Lomborg 11

Bjorn Lomborg, directs the Copenhagen Consensus Center and is the author of The Skeptical Environmentalist and Cool It, Newsweek, June 12, 2011, "A Roadmap for the Planet", http://www.thedailybeast.com/newsweek/2011/06/12/bjorn-lomborg-explains-how-to-save-the-planet.html#

Climate alarmists and campaigning environmentalists argue that the industrialized countries of the world have made sizable withdrawals on nature’s fixed allowance, and unless we change our ways, and soon, we are doomed to an abrupt end. Take the recent proclamation from the United Nations Environment Program, which argued that governments should dramatically cut back on the use of resources. The mantra has become commonplace: our current way of living is selfish and unsustainable. We are wrecking the world. We are gobbling up the last resources. We are cutting down the rainforest. We are polluting the water. We are polluting the air. We are killing plants and animals, destroying the ozone layer, burning the world through our addiction to fossil fuels, and leaving a devastated planet for future generations. In other words, humanity is doomed. It is a compelling story, no doubt. It is also fundamentally wrong, and the consequences are severe. Tragically, exaggerated environmental worries—and the willingness of so many to believe them—could ultimately prevent us from finding smarter ways to actually help our planet and ensure the health of the environment for future generations. Because, our fears notwithstanding, we actually get smarter. Although Westerners were once reliant on whale oil for lighting, we never actually ran out of whales. Why? High demand and rising prices for whale oil spurred a search for and investment in the 19th-century version of alternative energy. First, kerosene from petroleum replaced whale oil. We didn’t run out of kerosene, either: electricity supplanted it because it was a superior way to light our planet. For generations, we have consistently underestimated our capacity for innovation. There was a time when we worried that all of London would be covered with horse manure because of the increasing use of horse-drawn carriages. Thanks to the invention of the car, London has 7 million inhabitants today. Dung disaster averted. In fact, would-be catastrophes have regularly been pushed aside throughout human history, and so often because of innovation and technological development. We never just continue to do the same old thing. We innovate and avoid the anticipated problems. Think of the whales, and then think of the debate over cutting emissions today. Instead of singlemindedly trying to force people to do without carbon-emitting fuels, we must recognize that we won’t make any real progress in cutting CO2 emissions until we can create affordable, efficient alternatives. We are far from that point today: much-hyped technologies such as wind and solar energy remain very expensive and inefficient compared with cheap fossil fuels. Globally, wind provides just 0.3 percent of our energy, and solar a minuscule 0.1 percent. Current technology is so inefficient that, to take just one example, if we were serious about wind power, we would have to blanket most countries with wind turbines to generate enough energy for everybody, and we would still have the massive problem of storage. We don’t know what to do when the wind doesn’t blow. Making the necessary breakthroughs will require mass improvements across many technologies. The sustainable response to global warming, then, is one that sees us get much more serious about investment into alternative-energy research and development. This has a much greater likelihood of leaving future generations at least the same opportunities as we have today. Because what, exactly, is sustainability? Fourteen years ago, the United Nations World Commission on Environment and Development report “Our Common Future,” chaired by Gro Harlem Brundtland, provided the most-quoted definition. Sustainable development “meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.” The measure of success, then, is whether or not we give future generations the same opportunities that we have had. This prompts the question: have we lived unsustainably in the past? In fact, by almost any measure, humans have left a legacy of increased opportunity for their descendants. And this is true not just for the rich world but also for developing countries. In the last couple of hundred years we have become much richer than in all previous history. Available production per capita—the amount that an average individual can consume—increased eightfold between 1800 and 2000. In the past six decades, poverty has fallen more than in the previous 500 years. This decade alone, China will by itself lift 200 million individuals out of poverty. While one in every two people in the developing world was poor just 25 years ago, today it is one in four. Although much remains to be done, developing countries have become much more affluent, with a fivefold increase in real per capita income between 1950 and today. But it’s not just about money. The world has generally become a much better educated place, too. Illiteracy in the developing world has fallen from about 75 percent for the people born in the early part of the 1900s to about 12 percent among the young of today. More and more people have gained access to clean water and sanitation, improving health and income. And according to the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization, the percentage of undernourished people in the developing world has dropped from more than 50 percent in 1950 to 16 percent today. As humans have become richer and more educated, we have been able to enjoy more leisure time. In most developed countries, where there are available data, yearly working hours have fallen drastically since the end of the 19th century: today we work only about half as much as we did then. Over the last 30 years or so, total free time for men and women has increased, thanks to reductions in workload and housework. Globally, life expectancy today is 69. Compare this with an average life span of 52 in 1960, or of about 30 in 1900. Advances in public health and technological innovation have dramatically lengthened our lives. We have consistently achieved these remarkable developments by focusing on technological innovation and investment designed to create a richer future. And while major challenges remain, the future appears to hold great promise, too. The U.N. estimates that over this century, the planet’s human inhabitants will become 14 times richer and the average person in the developing world a whopping 24 times richer. By the end of the century, the U.N. estimates we will live to be 85 on average, and virtually everyone will read, write, and have access to food, water, and sanitation. That’s not too shabby. Rather than celebrating this amazing progress, many find it distasteful. Instead of acknowledging and learning from it, we bathe ourselves in guilt, fretting about our supposed unsustainable lives. Certainly many argue that while the past may have improved, surely it doesn’t matter for the future, because we are destroying the environment! But not so fast. In recent decades, air quality in wealthy countries has vastly improved. In virtually every developed country, the air is more breathable and the water is more drinkable than they were in 1970. London, renowned for centuries for its infamous smog and severe pollution, today has the cleanest air that it has had since the Middle Ages. Today, some of the most polluted places in the world are the megacities of the developing world, such as Beijing, New Delhi, and Mexico City. But remember what happened in developed countries. Over a period of several hundred years, increasing incomes were matched by increasing pollution. In the 1930s and 1940s, London was more polluted than Beijing, New Delhi, or Mexico City are today. Eventually, with increased affluence, developed countries gradually were better able to afford a cleaner environment. That is happening already today in some of the richest developing countries: air-pollution levels in Mexico City have been dropping precisely because of better technology and more wealth. Though air pollution is by far the most menacing for humans, water quality has similarly been getting better. Forests, too, are regrowing in rich countries, though still being lost in poor places where slash-and-burn is preferable to starvation.

#### Adaptation and migration solve

Ian **Thompson et al. 9**, Canadian Forest Service, Brendan Mackey, The Australian National University, The Fenner School of Environment and Society, College of Medicine, Biology and Environment, Steven McNulty, USDA Forest Service, Alex Mosseler, Canadian Forest Service, 2009, Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity “Forest Resilience, Biodiversity, and Climate Change” Convention on Biological Diversity

 While resilience can be attributed to many levels of organization of biodiversity, the genetic composition of species is the most fundamental. Molecular genet- ic diversity within a species, species diversity within a forested community, and community or ecosystem diversity across a landscape and bioregion represent expressions of biological diversity at different scales. The basis of all expressions of biological diversity is the genotypic variation found in populations. The individuals that comprise populations at each level of ecological organization are subject to natural se- lection and contribute to the adaptive capacity or re- silience of tree species and forest ecosystems (Mull- er-Starck et al. 2005). Diversity at each of these levels has fostered natural (and artificial) regeneration of forest ecosystems and facilitated their adaptation to dramatic climate changes that occurred during the quaternary period (review by: DeHayes et al. 2000); this diversity must be maintained in the face of antici- pated changes from anthropogenic climate warming. Genetic diversity (e.g., additive genetic variance) within a species is important because it is the basis for the natural selection of genotypes within popu- lations and species as they respond or adapt to en- vironmental changes (Fisher 1930, Pitelka 1988, Pease et al. 1989, Burger and Lynch 1995, Burdon and Thrall, 2001, Etterson 2004, Reusch et al. 2005, Schaberg et al. 2008). The potential for evolutionary change has been demonstrated in numerous long- term programmes based on artificial selection (Fal- coner 1989), and genetic strategies for reforestation in the presence of rapid climate change must focus on maintaining species diversity and genetic diversi- ty within species (Ledig and Kitzmiller 1992). In the face of rapid environmental change, it is important to understand that the genetic diversity and adap- tive capacity of forested ecosystems depends largely on in situ genetic variation within each population of a species (Bradshaw 1991). Populations exposed to a rate of environmental change exceeding the rate at which populations can adapt, or disperse, may be doomed to extinction (Lynch and Lande 1993, Burger and Lynch 1995). Genetic diversity deter- mines the range of fundamental eco-physiological tolerances of a species. It governs inter-specific competitive interactions, which, together with dispersal mechanisms, constitute the fundamental de- terminants of potential species responses to change (Pease et al. 1989, Halpin 1997). In the past, plants have responded to dramatic changes in climate both through adaptation and migration (Davis and Shaw 2001). The capacity for long-distance migration of plants by seed dispersal is particularly important in the event of rapid environmental change. Most, and probably all, species are capable of long-distance seed disper- sal, despite morphological dispersal syndromes that would indicate morphological adaptations primarily for short-distance dispersal (Cwyner and MacDon- ald 1986, Higgins et al. 2003). Assessments of mean migration rates found no significant differences be- tween wind and animal dispersed plants (Wilkinson 1997, Higgins et al. 2003). Long-distance migration can also be strongly influenced by habitat suitabil- ity (Higgins and Richardson 1999) suggesting that rapid migration may become more frequent and vis- ible with rapid changes in habitat suitability under scenarios of rapid climate change. The discrepancy between estimated and observed migration rates during re-colonization of northern temperate forests following the retreat of glaciers can be accounted for by the underestimation of long-distance disper- sal rates and events (Brunet and von Oheimb 1998, Clark 1998, Cain et al. 1998, 2000). Nevertheless, concerns persist that potential migration and ad- aptation rates of many tree species may not be able to keep pace with projected global warming (Davis 1989, Huntley 1991, Dyer 1995, Collingham et al. 1996, Malcolm et al. 2002). However, these models refer to fundamental niches and generally ignore the ecological interactions that also govern species dis- tributions.

## Framing

**Maximizing all lives is the only way to affirm equality**

Cummiskey 90– Professor of Philosophy, Bates David, Kantian Consequentialism, Ethics 100.3, p 601-2, p 606, jstor

We must not obscure the issue by characterizing this type of case as the sacrifice of individuals for some abstract "social entity." It is not a question of some persons having to bear the cost for some elusive "overall social good." Instead, the question is whether some persons must bear the inescapable cost for the sake of other persons. Nozick, for example, argues that "to use a person in this way does not sufficiently respect and take account of the fact that he is a separate person, that his is the only life he has."30 Why, however, is this not equally true of all those that we do not save through our failure to act? By emphasizing solely the one who must bear the cost if we act, one fails to sufficiently respect and take account of the many other separate persons, each with only one life, who will bear the cost of our inaction. In such a situation, what would a conscientious Kantian agent, an agent motivated by the unconditional value of rational beings, choose? We have a duty to promote the conditions necessary for the existence of rational beings, but both choosing to act and choosing not to act will cost the life of a rational being. Since the basis of Kant's principle is "rational nature exists as an end-in-itself' (GMM, p. 429), the reasonable solution to such a dilemma involves promoting, insofar as one can, the conditions necessary for rational beings. If I sacrifice some for the sake of other rational beings, I do not use them arbitrarily and I do not deny the unconditional value of rational beings. **Persons** may **have "dignity**, an unconditional and incomparable value" that transcends any market value (GMM, p. 436), **but**, as rational beings, persons **also** have **a fundamental equality which dictates that some must** sometimes **give way for the sake of others.** The formula of the end-in-itself thus does not support the view that we may never force another to bear some cost in order to benefit others. If one focuses on the equal value of all rational beings, then equal consideration dictates that one sacrifice some to save many. [continues] According to Kant, the objective end of moral action is the existence of rational beings. Respect for rational beings requires that, in deciding what to do, one give appropriate practical considerat

ion to the unconditional value of rational beings and to the conditional value of happiness. Since agent-centered constraints require a non-value-based rationale, the most natural interpretation of the demand that one give equal respect to all rational beings lead to a consequentialist normative theory. We have seen that there is no sound Kantian reason for abandoning this natural consequentialist interpretation. In particular, a consequentialist interpretation does not require sacrifices which a Kantian ought to consider unreasonable, and it does not involve doing evil so that good may come of it. It simply requires an uncompromising commitment to the equal value and equal claims of all rational beings and a recognition that, in the moral consideration of conduct, one's own subjective concerns do not have overriding importance.

#### Ethical policymaking requires calculation of consequences

Gvosdev 5 – Rhodes scholar, PhD from St. Antony’s College, executive editor of The National Interest; Nikolas, The Value(s) of Realism, SAIS Review 25.1, pmuse,

As the name implies, realists focus on promoting policies that are achievable and sustainable. In turn, the morality of a foreign policy action is judged by its results, not by the intentions of its framers. A foreign policymaker must weigh the consequences of any course of action and assess the resources at hand to carry out the proposed task. As Lippmann warned, Without the controlling principle that the nation must maintain its objectives and its power in equilibrium, its purposes within its means and its means equal to its purposes, its commitments related to its resources and its resources adequate to its commitments, it is impossible to think at all about foreign affairs.8 Commenting on this maxim, Owen Harries, founding editor of The National Interest, noted, "This is a truth of which Americans—more apt to focus on ends rather than means when it comes to dealing with the rest of the world—need always to be reminded."9 In fact, Morgenthau noted that "there can be no political morality without prudence."10 This virtue of prudence—which Morgenthau identified as the cornerstone of realism—should not be confused with expediency. Rather, it takes as its starting point that it is more moral to fulfill one's commitments than to make "empty" promises, and to seek solutions that minimize harm and produce sustainable results. Morgenthau concluded: [End Page 18] Political realism does not require, nor does it condone, indifference to political ideals and moral principles, but it requires indeed a sharp distinction between the desirable and the possible, between what is desirable everywhere and at all times and what is possible under the concrete circumstances of time and place.11 This is why, prior to the outbreak of fighting in the former Yugoslavia, U.S. and European realists urged that Bosnia be decentralized and partitioned into ethnically based cantons as a way to head off a destructive civil war. Realists felt this would be the best course of action, especially after the country's first free and fair elections had brought nationalist candidates to power at the expense of those calling for inter-ethnic cooperation. They had concluded—correctly, as it turned out—that the United States and Western Europe would be unwilling to invest the blood and treasure that would be required to craft a unitary Bosnian state and give it the wherewithal to function. Indeed, at a diplomatic conference in Lisbon in March 1992, the various factions in Bosnia had, reluctantly, endorsed the broad outlines of such a settlement. For the purveyors of moralpolitik, this was unacceptable. After all, for this plan to work, populations on the "wrong side" of the line would have to be transferred and resettled. Such a plan struck directly at the heart of the concept of multi-ethnicity—that different ethnic and religious groups could find a common political identity and work in common institutions. When the United States signaled it would not accept such a settlement, the fragile consensus collapsed. The United States, of course, cannot be held responsible for the war; this lies squarely on the shoulders of Bosnia's political leaders. Yet Washington fell victim to what Jonathan Clarke called "faux Wilsonianism," the belief that "high-flown words matter more than rational calculation" in formulating effective policy, which led U.S. policymakers to dispense with the equation of "balancing commitments and resources."12 Indeed, as he notes, the Clinton administration had criticized peace plans calling for decentralized partition in Bosnia "with lofty rhetoric without proposing a practical alternative." The subsequent war led to the deaths of tens of thousands and left more than a million people homeless. After three years of war, the Dayton Accords—hailed as a triumph of American diplomacy—created a complicated arrangement by which the federal union of two ethnic units, the Muslim-Croat Federation, was itself federated to a Bosnian Serb republic. Today, Bosnia requires thousands of foreign troops to patrol its internal borders and billions of dollars in foreign aid to keep its government and economy functioning. Was the aim of U.S. policymakers, academics and journalists—creating a multi-ethnic democracy in Bosnia—not worth pursuing? No, not at all, and this is not what the argument suggests. But aspirations were not matched with capabilities. As a result of holding out for the "most moral" outcome and encouraging the Muslim-led government in Sarajevo to pursue maximalist aims rather than finding a workable compromise that could have avoided bloodshed and produced more stable conditions, the peoples of Bosnia suffered greatly. In the end, the final settlement was very close [End Page 19] to the one that realists had initially proposed—and the one that had also been roundly condemned on moral grounds.

# 2NC

## K

### 2NC Turns Case

#### THEIR EXPLANATIONS FOR AGRICULTURAL CRISIS LEAVE ROOT CAUSES UNADRESSED – OUR CRITIQUE TURNS THE CORE OF THE CASE

ALLEN AND SACHS 1993 – ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR CENTER AGROECOLOGY UC SANTA CRUZ AND PROF AG ECONOMICS PENN STATE U

*SUSTAINABLE AG IN THE UNITED STATES*, FOOD FOR THE FUTURE, PAGE 152-153

Allen, Associate Director at the Center for Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems at UC Santa Cruz, and Sachs, Professor of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology at Pennsylvania State University, ’93 (Patricia and Carolyn “Sustainable Agriculture in the United States: Engagements, Silences, and Possibilities for Transformation” Food for the Future: Conditions and Contradictions of Sustainability ed. Patricia Allen, p 152-153)

Nonsustainability Goes Unexplained

The sustainable agriculture movement has, of necessity, documented and described environmental problems in agriculture. Numerous reports have called our attention to soil erosion, groundwater depletion, the use of fossil-based inputs, and destruction of the genetic base. This is an essential first step. The transition from problem description to problem solution, however, has skipped the intermediate step of problem explanation (Allen, 1991). **Little effort has been focused on answering the "why" questions** of ecological destruction in agriculture.

An analysis of the root causes of nonsustamable agriculture is not apparent in conventional scientific texts on sustainability. Some groups outside formal academic institutions do, however, attribute causes lor the development of nonsustainable agricultural systems. For example, Jackson (1984) states that the lack of an ecological approach has led to an unsustainable agriculture characterized by soil loss, fossil fuel dependence, and chemical dependence. Berry (1984) decries the industrialization and mechanization of corporate agriculture and asserts that the current U.S. agricultural system is unsustaina- ble because of the continual attempt to get the highest possible production with the smallest number of workers. Particularly important for Berry is the erosion of cultural values associates with family farming, such as hard work, respect for place, respect for nature, and commitment to home and community. For food safety advocates, primary causes cited in regard to food contamination are the failure of government to adequately regulate pesticides (Natural Resources Defense Council, 1989) and lack of consumer awareness.

But in offering these explanations of nonsustainability—corporate agricul-ture, inadequate government regulation, and loss of respect for nature**—we have not analyzed why these very conditions, in turn, exist.** While sustainable agriculture discourse delineates proximate causes of sustainability problems,

**it does not get at the "causes behind the causes."** The reasons for the current condition of agriculture, such as the forces that have led to resource-intensive firming practices, are rarely if ever explained. For example, sustainable agri-culture advocate want to reduce pesticide use because pesticides cause groundwater contamination and remain as residues on food. But they do not ask how and why pesticide use has become so common and entrenched m agriculture. Sustainable agriculture discourse addresses the directly visible, surface cause of environmental problems. **It does less well at addressing their less visible, structural causes, i.e., those that reflect the deeper, systemic operating principles of the food and agriculture system.**

### 2NC Turns Case—Environment

#### FLAWED FRAMEWORKS FOR AGRICULTURAL REFORM AND SUSTAINABILITY MAKE ENVIRONMENTALLY DESTRUCTIVE SOIL AND MONOCULTURE PRACTICES INEVITABLE – ONLY RE-FRAMING CAN ADDRESS FUNDAMENTAL SOCIAL STRUCTURES OF THAT MAKE LIFE UNLIVEABLE AND AGRICULTURE IMPOSSIBLE

ALLEN1993 **–** ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR CENTER AGROECOLOGY UC SANTA CRUZ

*FOOD FOR THE FUTURE*, PAGE 7-8

These conceptualizations carry important **political implications,** particu­larly in terms of how they can affect the **life possibilitie**s for those traditionally underprivileged in the global food and agriculture system. This is addressed in the Brumland Report on sustainable development. In this influential docu­ment, as David Goodman (this volume) notes, technical criteria are not al­lowed to "silence a preeminently political question: sustainable development for whom?" Here the emphasis is on meeting basic needs such as access to resources required for day-to-day survival, needs that are not met for one-fifth of the world's people. Altieri, Redclift. and Thrupp also demonstrate that the principal social problem of sustainability is poverty and argue that greater equity or reduction of poverty must be achieved before the question ol environmental quality can be fully addressed. As Goodman explains, for example, while rural poverty is the proximate cause of environmental prob­lems such as desertification and deforestation, this poverty is caused by political economic structures that encourage land concentration, undermine traditional resource management systems, privatize common property re- sources, and subsidize unsustainable technologies. He cites the example of Northeast Brazil, where "the high unequal distribution of property rights and land-use changes associated with heavily subsidized agricultural mod­ernization programs are the principal causes of rural poverty." In addition, as Thrupp discusses, the effects of resource degradation accrue dispropor­tionately to the poor, to women, and to racial minorities. Achieving the goal of environmental preservation, even in the United States, is not possible without **transforming social** institutions and policies. Soil erosion, for example, is a "natural" process but is greatly accelerated by continuous, intensive cultivation practices encouraged by agricultural poli­cies. Similarly, declining water tables, common in many agricultural regions, are caused by extensive irrigation, also encouraged by agricultural investment and tax policies. And increased application of pesticides carries the seed of intensifying future needs for more chemical toxins as pests develop resistance to standard preparations. While meeting human needs requires the preservation of the environment, the inverse is also absolutely necessary. Ecological sustainability cannot be achieved in the absence of e**quitable control and distribution of resources**. According to Richard Jolly of the United Nations Children's Fund, "Unless we focus on the basic human needs of those in absolute poverty, sustainable development isn't going to work" (Myers, 1989). Sustainable agriculture, therefore, must be based on fulfillment first and foremost of basic human needs, both for generations to come and for those generations living now. These needs include consumption (food, water, fuel), protection (clothing, shelter), and regeneration (dignity, self-determination, freedom from exploi­tation) (Allen and Sachs, 1992). Working to meet these needs requires **re-framing our concept of sustainability** to include a social dimension and a concomitant **expansion of our approach to sustainable agriculture research.**

### 2NC Turns Case—Policy Failure

#### IMPACT – FLAWS IN THE FRAMEWORK FOR SUSTAINABILITY DOOM THE POLICY PROCESS\*\*\*

YOUNGBERG SCHALLER AND MERRIGAN 1993 – INSTITUTE FOR ALT AG AND US SENATE COMMITTEE ON AG NUTRITION

*FOOD FOR THE FUTURE*, PAGE 300-301

Third, at least for the time being, the symbolism of sustainability has made strange bedfellows among formerly quite different ideological camps and spokespersons. This, on the surface at least, has created the impression that all of agriculture is marching to the same drummer—a notion with a tantaliz­ing and powerful symbolism of its own. As Edelman (1964:32) noted nearly three decades ago, "Emotional commitment to a symbol is associated with contentment and quiescence regarding problems that would otherwise arouse concern." After several decades of accelerating conflict over the future of American agriculture, sustainability has provided a comforting, although largely unanalyzed, symbolic refuge for an incredibly disparate array of agri­cultural interests.

Finally, the range of ideologies and technologies presently being advanced under the symbol of sustainability has direct **consequences for policymakers and their staffs**. On one hand, sustainability has, indeed, fostered a measure of good will among otherwise competing interests. It has drawn attention to the undeniable fact that all of agriculture—indeed all of society—has an urgent stake in the concept of sustainability. This realization has engendered a vigorous and broad-based dialogue—one often involving widely divergent views. In this way, the concept of sustainability has, to some degree, opened new pathways for discussion and even some limited consensus on needed future directions.

On the other hand, while this process may have brought a measure of civility to the sustainability **debate,** it has also **blurred and confused the policy process.** When virtually all proposals are justified on the grounds that they will contribute to agricultural sustainability, i**t becomes increasingly difficult for decision makers to distinguish among them.** They cannot do so on objective grounds, because the agricultural community has yet to develop scientific criteria lor and indicators of sustainability. Moreover, given the powerful and positive emotional symbolism of sustainability, it is politically difficult for both elected and appointed officials to dismiss proposals and programs bearing the sustainable label, regardless of their content. Finally, **confusion surrounding the definition and character** of sustainability creates an added burden for those in positions of political leadership who would attempt to initiate and fashion **specific policy proposals.**

### 2NC Impact—Sustainability

#### TECHNO-SCIENTIFIC RATIONALITY THREATENS SUSTAINABLE LIVING AND RISKS EXTINCTION

SCHUURMAN2002– PROF PHILOSOPHY AG U WAGININGEN

*THE ETHICS OF TECHNOLOGY*, [http://www.nd.edu/%7Eecoltheo/text\_schuurman.htm](http://www.nd.edu/~ecoltheo/text_schuurman.htm)

In the present culture the shadowy sides of the scientific-technological development becomes clearer.  The technological control motive penetrates and directs the culture.  **It permeates** many, if not all, aspects of **society and infiltrates the human experiential world** as an matter of course.  Culture is thereby conveniently reduced to that which technology, science and economy can offer.

**Not only is man threatened by overrating technology and the economy**, but nature is also exploited and human society disintegrates.  There is talk of threats from n**uclear  weapons or radioactive waste from nuclear power plants, of the exhaustion of natural resources, of the extinction of many plant and animal species, deforestation, siltation and desertification - with loss of food and rich soils - the depletion of the ozone layer,** the emission of exhaust gases with far-reaching consequences for life and climate, the rapid and large-scale destruction and pollution of nature, and the accelerating threat of the over-estimation of genetic manipulation techniques, with as offshoot the technical possibility the cloning and genetic manipulation of humans, etc. Finally the latest information and communication techniques suggest ample information and communication.  But in reality there is less face-to-face contact between people leading to mutual alienation, loneliness and social disintegration.

Western man has, with the passage of time, subjected himself to limitless technical manipulation and economic exploitation of reality, but **with a massive threat of the destruction of the very basis of human existence.  The current technological development threatens the sustainability of the natural environment and of the biosphere.**  The relevant values are simply ignored.

### 2NC Framework

#### Questioning our method and changing our current practices is crucial for any chance of solvency—we link turn their framework args

ALLEN 1993 – ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR CENTER AGROECOLOGY UC SANTA CRUZ

*FOOD FOR THE FUTURE*, PAGE 1-2

Athough the goal of agriculture is first and ultimately sustaining human life, agricultural sustainability has been **constructed** almost exclusively in the discourse and domain of nature and the natural sciences. The effort toward a sustainable reconstruction of agriculture has privileged environmental priorities and natural science approaches while **ignoring social priorities** and approaches, despite the fact that social and ecological problems are insepara­bly connected in food and agriculture systems. Unless we closely examine peoples relations with each other, in addition to those between people and nature, we **foreclose our ability** to bring about the deep **structural changes** on which sustainable agriculture ultimately depends. This book concentrates on the need to integrate the "social" with the "natural" in sustainable agri­culture.

Critics of conventional agriculture in the United States have developed alternative ideas and practices known collectively as "sustainable agriculture." Sustainability proponents have called attention to agricultural resource is­sues, placed agricultural sustainability on public research and policy agendas, increased demand for pesticide-free food, and developed conservation-oriented agricultural techniques. Yet, while the sustainable agriculture move­ment has effectively demonstrated conventional agriculture's problematic treatment of the environment, **too often** this has been **at the expense** of attending to equally pressing social problems. As Carolyn Sachs and I discuss in Part II of this volume, these approaches do not question inequities such as hunger, poverty, racial oppression, or gender subordination that many experience in current agrarian structures (e.g., family farms, rural communi­ties, wage labor).

In the past decade "sustainability" has become a central agricultural sym­bol, moving from a fringe concern to one that is becoming institutionalized (Buttel and Gillespie, 1988). New organizations have emerged to advocate sustainability platforms and established institutions have adopted the mantle of sustainable agriculture. The concept has attracted farmers, consumers, environmentalists, and agricultural experts alike.1 Since agricultural sus­tainability is increasingly embraced as a goal in agriculture (see Youngberg et at., this volume), yet has accomplished relatively tittle of major significance (Buttel, this volume), it is critical that we widen our definition and practice of this concept, for it has great potential as a transformational toot. **A reformu­lation of its theory and practice** is essential **to prevent sustainable agriculture from reproducing the ecological and social problems** of current food and agriculture systems, since agricultural sustainability is a socially constructed, ideologically based discourse that **has as its root a social concept and prob­lem.** The purpose of this chapter is to demonstrate the social basis of sustaina­ble agriculture and why social approaches are required for achieving sus­tainability.

#### Framework solves the case—altering the focus of policy debate from agricultural production towards more contextual analysis is vital to determining the proper agricultural strategies and policies

Dahlberg, Professor of Political Science at Western Michigan University, ’93 (Kenneth, “Regenerative Food Systems: Broadening the Scope and Agenda of Sustainability” Food for the Future: Conditions and Contradictions of Sustainability ed. Patricia Allen, p 75-76)

This overview seeks to broaden the scope of the theoretical, research, and **policy debates** over sustainable agriculture. It does this in several ways. It argues that we must go beyond the typical **narrow focus** on production .agriculture) to a broad analysis of complete **food systems**-which include not only production, but processing, distribution, use, recycling, and waste disposal. These food systems operate at a number of different levels—ulti­mately from the household to the international. In terms of theory, what I term "contextual analysis" is used to help sort out these levels and how they relate one to another. A broadened time horizon is also required, one that includes the ecological and evolutionary dynamics of regenerating both natu-ral and human systems. Broadening the spatial and temporal scope of analysis also requires a broadening of evaluative criteria. At each level, basic goal and value assumptions must be brought out and examined in terms of their irrelevance and adaptability.

Such a broadening offers a better understanding of the basic structures and dynamics of food systems, one that should also be **of value in developing the strategies—**at each level — **for making such systems more regenerative.** Afte discussing some of the more general theoretical, conceptual, and evaluative questions, the broadened policy and research agendas that flow from this approach are outlined at each level.

### 2NC Link

### 2NC AT: Perm

### 2NC Alternative

### 2NC Turns Case—Structural Impact

#### NO SOLVENCY – FEDERAL AGRICULTURAL REFORM IS A SURFACE-LEVEL POLITICAL GAME – THE AFFIRMATIVE IS TRAPPED IN CONVENTIONAL AGRICULTURAL MOVEMENTS THAT PREVENT TRUE CHANGE IN SOCIETY

BUTTEL 1993 – PROF PLURAL SOCIOLOGY U WISCONSIN

*FOOD FOR THE FUTURE*, PAGE 20

The size of and commitment along the multidisciplinary community of sustainable agriculture researchers and advocates suggest a promising future for this area of science and technology. This said, the sustainable agriculture thrust exhibits several weaknesses and vulnerabilities that suggest the need for critical self-reflection on the course that the notion of agricultural sus­tainability has taken and on the **current sociopolitical dynamics** within the natural science and social science sustainability communities. Perhaps most important, it is arguably fair to say that despite the considerable efforts that have been devoted thus far to sustainable agriculture, there are no unambig­uous biological or social-institutional breakthroughs or innovations that have yet emerged or are currently in the pipeline.' **Institutionally, federal policies remain nearly as unsupportive of sustainable agriculture as they were when sustainable agriculture emerged as a popular area of research during the mid-1980s.** Funding lor sustainable agriculture research is modest and vulnerable, and must be fought for during each state legisla­tive session and federal appropriations period. Many suspect that large numbers of land-grant administrators see sustainable agriculture more as a **political concession** to public interest groups than as a serious area of research.

In a sense, then, one purpose of this chapter will be to understand some of the [actors that have caused sustainable agriculture to have been limited in its stature and accomplishments up to this point This chapter, however, will not be devoted entirely, or even mainly, to explaining the modest gains that have been achieved, nor will it aim to be a comprehensive assessment in this regard. In particular, the chapter will not neat the national politi­cal-economic constraints to sustainability in an exhaustive manner (see, e.g., NRC, 1989, for an important treatment of this topic), though I will take up several of what I consider to be neglected considerations in the political economy of sustainability and sustainability movements. Instead, I will con­cern myself primarily with constraints on agricultural sustainability owing to the fact that the sustainability community increasingly faces, self-con­sciously or not, **several dilemmas relating to its being a component of a movement that is simultaneously rooted in (natural) science and implicated in the current milieu of international environmental activism.** The approach to be taken in this chapter will be to apply the basic framework of the sociology of science and scientific knowledge to this problem. The focus will be primarily on sustainable agriculture and agricultural sustainability in the North American and other Western contexts, though many of the observa­tions are germane to related issues such as "sustainable development" in the Third World.

## Case

## Framing

### 2nc overview—util first

#### Comes first – only impact you can’t recover from

Zygmunt Bauman**,** University of Leeds Professor Emeritus of Sociology, 1995, Life In Fragments: Essays In Postmodern Morality, p. 66-71

The being‑for is like living towards‑the‑future: a being filled with anticipation, a being aware of the abyss between future foretold and future that will eventually be; it is this gap which, like a magnet, draws the self towards the Other,as it draws life towards the future, making life into an activity of overcoming, transcending, leaving behind. The self stretches towards the Other, as life stretches towards the future; neither can grasp what it stretches toward, but it is in this hopeful and desperate, never conclusive and never abandoned stretching‑toward that the self is ever anew created and life ever anew lived. In the words of M. M. Bakhtin, it is only in this not‑yet accomplished world of anticipation and trial, leaning toward stubbornly an‑other Other, that life can be lived ‑ not in the world of the `events that occurred'; in the latter world, `it is impossible to live, to act responsibly; in it, I am not needed, in principle I am not there at all." Art, the Other, the future: what unites them, what makes them into three words vainly trying to grasp the same mystery, is the modality of possibility. A curious modality, at home neither in ontology nor epistemology; itself, like that which it tries to catch in its net, `always outside', forever `otherwise than being'. The possibility we are talking about here is not the all‑too‑familiar unsure‑of‑itself, and through that uncertainty flawed, inferior and incomplete being, disdainfully dismissed by triumphant existence as `mere possibility', `just a possibility'; possibility is instead `plus que la reahte' ‑ both the origin and the foundation of being. The hope, says Blanchot, proclaims the possibility of that which evades the possible; `in its limit, this is the hope of the bond recaptured where it is now lost."' The hope is always the hope of *being fu filled,* but what keeps the hope alive and so keeps the being open and on the move is precisely its *unfu filment.* One may say that the paradox *of hope* (and the paradox of possibility founded in hope) is that it may pursue its destination solely through betraying its nature; the most exuberant of energies expends itself in the urge towards rest. Possibility uses up its openness in search of closure. Its image of the better being is its own impoverishment . . . The togetherness of the being‑for is cut out of the same block; it shares in the paradoxical lot of all possibility. It lasts as long as it is unfulfilled, yet it uses itself up in never ending effort of fulfilment, of recapturing the bond, making it tight and immune to all future temptations. In an important, perhaps decisive sense, it is selfdestructive and self‑defeating: its triumph is its death. The Other, like restless and unpredictable art, like the future itself, is a *mystery.* And being‑for‑the‑Other, going towards the Other through the twisted and rocky gorge of affection, brings that mystery into view ‑ makes it into a challenge. That mystery is what has triggered the sentiment in the first place ‑ but cracking that mystery is what the resulting movement is about. The mystery must be unpacked so that the being‑for may focus on the Other: one needs to know what to focus on. (The `demand' is *unspoken,* the responsibility undertaken is *unconditional;* it is up to him or her who follows the demand and takes up the responsibility to decide what the following of that demand and carrying out of that responsibility means in practical terms.) Mystery ‑ noted Max Frisch ‑ (and the Other is a mystery), is an exciting puzzle, but one tends to get tired of that excitement. `And so one creates for oneself an image. This is a loveless act, the betrayal." Creating an image of the Other leads to the substitution of the image for the Other; the Other is now fixed ‑ soothingly and comfortingly. There is nothing to be excited about anymore. I know what the Other needs, I know where my responsibility starts and ends. Whatever the Other may now do will be taken down and used against him. What used to be received as an exciting surprise now looks more like perversion; what used to be adored as exhilarating creativity now feels like wicked levity. Thanatos has taken over from Eros, and the excitement of the ungraspable turned into the dullness and tedium of the grasped. But, as Gyorgy Lukacs observed, `everything one person may know about another is only expectation, only potentiality, only wish or fear, acquiring reality only as a result of what happens later, and this reality, too, dissolves straightaway into potentialities'. Only death, with its finality and irreversibility, puts an end to the musical‑chairs game of the real and the potential ‑ it once and for all closes the embrace of togetherness which was before invitingly open and tempted the lonely self." `Creating an image' is the dress rehearsal of that death. But creating an image is the inner urge, the constant temptation, the *must* of all affection . . . It is the loneliness of being abandoned to an unresolvable ambivalence and an unanchored and formless sentiment which sets in motion the togetherness of being‑for. But what loneliness seeks in togetherness is an end to its present condition ‑ an end to itself. Without knowing ‑ without being capable of knowing ‑ that the hope to replace the vexing loneliness with togetherness is founded solely on its own unfulfilment, and that once loneliness is no more, the togetherness ( the being‑for togetherness) must also collapse, as it cannot survive its own completion. What the loneliness seeks in togetherness (suicidally for its own cravings) is the foreclosing and pre‑empting of the future, cancelling the future before it comes, robbing it of mystery but also of the possibility with which it is pregnant. Unknowingly yet necessarily, it seeks it all to its own detriment, since the success (if there is a success) may only bring it back to where it started and to the condition which prompted it to start on the journey in the first place. The togetherness of being‑for is always in the future, and nowhere else. It is no more once the self proclaims: `I have arrived', `I have done it', `I fulfilled my duty.' The being‑for starts from the realization of the bottomlessness of the task, and ends with the declaration that the infinity has been exhausted. This is the tragedy of being‑for ‑ the reason why it cannot but be death‑bound while simultaneously remaining an undying attraction. In this tragedy, there are many happy moments, but no happy end. Death is always the foreclosure of possibilities, and it comes eventually in its own time, even if not brought forward by the impatience of love. The catch is to direct the affection to staving off the end, and to do this against the affection's nature. What follows is that, if moral relationship is grounded in the being-for togetherness (as it is), then it can exist as a project, and guide the self's conduct only as long as its nature of a project (a not yet-completed project) is not denied. Morality, like the future itself, is forever not‑yet. (And this is why the ethical code, any ethical code, the more so the more perfect it is by its own standards, supports morality the way the rope supports the hanged man.) It is because of our loneliness that we crave togetherness. It is because of our loneliness that we open up to the Other and allow the Other to open up to us. It is because of our loneliness (which is only belied, not overcome, by the hubbub of the being‑with) that we turn into moral selves. And it is only through allowing the togetherness its possibilities which only the future can disclose that we stand a chance of acting morally, and sometimes even of being good, in the present.

# 1NR

## 2NC Impact calc

#### DA outweighs and turns the case - decline causes diversionary wars and a break-down of global cooperation —that’s Harris – that solves every scenario for conflict since interdependence so there’s only a risk of protecionism and resource scarity causing nuclear shootouts because rationality breaks down

#### Don’t let them assert their anthropocentrism and racism links – nuclear war is a global impact which kills indiscriminately and has irreparable environmental impacts – it’s the biggest impact in the round

#### And - Economic stability solves all conflict

Griswold 5 – director of the Center for Trade Policy Studies at the Cato Institute (Daniel, “Peace on earth? Try free trade among men,” 12-29-2005, http://www.freetrade.org/node/282)

Buried beneath the daily stories about car bombs and insurgents is an underappreciated but comforting fact during this Christmas season: The world has somehow become a more peaceful place.

As one little-noticed headline on an Associated Press story recently reported, "War declining worldwide, studies say." According to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, the number of armed conflicts around the world has been in decline for the past half century. In just the past 15 years, ongoing conflicts have dropped from 33 to 18, with all of them now civil conflicts within countries. As 2005 draws to an end, no two nations in the world are at war with each other. The death toll from war has also been falling. According to the AP story, "The number killed in battle has fallen to its lowest point in the post-World War II period, dipping below 20,000 a year by one measure. Peacemaking missions, meanwhile, are growing in number." Those estimates are down sharply from annual tolls ranging from 40,000 to 100,000 in the 1990s, and from a peak of 700,000 in 1951 during the Korean War. Many causes lie behind the good news -- the end of the Cold War and the spread of democracy, among them -- but expanding trade and globalization appear to be playing a major role. Far from stoking a "World on Fire," as one misguided American author has argued, growing commercial ties between nations have had a dampening effect on armed conflict and war, for three main reasons. First, trade and globalization have reinforced the trend toward democracy, and democracies don't pick fights with each other. Freedom to trade nurtures democracy by expanding the middle class in globalizing countries and equipping people with tools of communication such as cell phones, satellite TV, and the Internet. With trade comes more travel, more contact with people in other countries, and more exposure to new ideas. Thanks in part to globalization, almost two thirds of the world's countries today are democracies -- a record high. Second, as national economies become more integrated with each other, those nations have more to lose should war break out. War in a globalized world not only means human casualties and bigger government, but also ruptured trade and investment ties that impose lasting damage on the economy. In short, globalization has dramatically raised the economic cost of war. Third, globalization allows nations to acquire wealth through production and trade rather than conquest of territory and resources. Increasingly, wealth is measured in terms of intellectual property, financial assets, and human capital. Those are assets that cannot be seized by armies. If people need resources outside their national borders, say oil or timber or farm products, they can acquire them peacefully by trading away what they can produce best at home. Of course, free trade and globalization do not guarantee peace. Hot-blooded nationalism and ideological fervor can overwhelm cold economic calculations. But deep trade and investment ties among nations make war less attractive. Trade wars in the 1930s deepened the economic depression, exacerbated global tensions, and helped to usher in a world war. Out of the ashes of that experience, the United States urged Germany, France and other Western European nations to form a common market that has become the European Union. In large part because of their intertwined economies, a general war in Europe is now unthinkable. In East Asia, the extensive and growing economic ties among Mainland China, Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan is helping to keep the peace. China's communist rulers may yet decide to go to war over its "renegade province," but the economic cost to their economy would be staggering and could provoke a backlash among its citizens. In contrast, poor and isolated North Korea is all the more dangerous because it has nothing to lose economically should it provoke a war. In Central America, countries that were racked by guerrilla wars and death squads two decades ago have turned not only to democracy but to expanding trade, culminating in the Central American Free Trade Agreement with the United States. As the Stockholm institute reports in its 2005 Yearbook, "Since the 1980s, the introduction of a more open economic model in most states of the Latin American and Caribbean region has been accompanied by the growth of new regional structures, the dying out of interstate conflicts and a reduction in intra-state conflicts." Much of the political violence that remains in the world today is concentrated in the Middle East and Sub-Saharan Africa -- the two regions of the world that are the least integrated into the global economy. Efforts to bring peace to those regions must include lowering their high barriers to trade, foreign investment, and domestic entrepreneurship. Advocates of free trade and globalization have long argued that trade expansion means more efficiency, higher incomes, and reduced poverty. The welcome decline of armed conflicts in the past few decades indicates that free trade also comes with its own peace dividend.

#### Turns the aff – econ collapse destroys trade flows which makes agricultural exchange impossible – a functioning global economy is a pre-requisite to their aff – that’s Harris

#### Turns the environment – organic and environmentally-friendly agricultural practices are sacrificed for more cost-eff

#### Econ turns the environment

Sanders, Senior Fellow of the World Policy Institute, ‘90

(Jerry, *Bulletin of Peace Proposals*, May)

Among the poorest countries, particularly those burdened by debt, we can expect that a shrinking world market and declining terms of trade will serve to accelerate deforestation and soil exhaustion as nations seek to maximize agricultural, mining, and other commodity exports in a losing effort to stay even. Paradoxically, therefore, stagnant growth very likely will produce increases in carbon dioxide and other trace gases that trigger global warming, acid rain and toxic waste that poison ground water, and desertification that makes the spread of fallow land a growing danger in many regimes of the Third World.

#### Economic decline is the worst structural impact

Ban Ki-Moon, secretary general of the United Nations, 4/2/’9

(<http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2009/apr/02/g20-recession-ban-ki-moon>)

Today's G20 meeting can make the difference between human hope and despair, between economic recovery and a plunge into deepening recession. We have seen the frightening velocity of change. What began as a financial crisis has become a global economic crisis. I fear worse to come: a full-blown political crisis defined by growing social unrest, weakened governments and angry publics who have lost all faith in their leaders and their own future.

We must stop the slide. The recession hurts everyone, but those hurt worst are the poor - people with no homes or savings to lose, who in some countries spend as much as 80% of their income on food, and often lack the basics of healthcare, water and sanitation. They are the majority of the world's people - and they have no safety net.

In good times, economic and social development comes slowly. In bad times, things fall apart alarmingly fast. It is a short step from hunger to starvation, from disease to death, from peace and stability to conflict and wars that spill across borders and affect us all, near and far. Unless we can build a worldwide recovery we face a looming catastrophe in human development.

## 2nc uq

#### Unemployment benefits will be extended – there are disputes now but Obama pressure solves GOP opposition – that’s Bouie

#### Bill close to passage now – needs every ounce of capital

Sargent 1/3 (Greg, writer for Washington Post, “Unemployment insurance extension hangs in the balance”, http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/plum-line/wp/2014/01/03/unemployment-insurance-extension-hangs-in-the-balance/)

Next week, as early as Monday, Senate Democrats will move to vote on a three month extension for unemployment benefits for the 1.3 million people who lost them just after Christmas.¶ But the chances of passage for the measure are “hanging in the balance,” the Democratic Senator who is taking the lead on rounding up Senate votes for the legislation tells me.¶ “It’s not determined yet, but we’re going to do everything we can,” Senator Jack Reed of Rhode Island said in an interview. “Hanging in the balance is probably the right way to say it.”¶ However, Reed sought to project confidence, noting that he thought the bill had “momentum” and vowing to “work straight through” to win over Senators and make it happen.¶ Reed is co-sponsoring the legislation with GOP Senator Dean Heller, and Reid is lobbying both Republican and Democratic Senators to support the bill, but no GOP Senator other than Heller has publicly come out for it.¶ Asked whether he had lined up any other Republican Senators to support it, Reed declined to answer directly. “We’re getting people sincerely saying they’re thinking very seriously about this,” Reed said about his GOP colleagues.¶ Reed noted that a number of GOP Senators represent high unemployment states. If the 55 Dem-aligned Senators vote for an extension, which isn’t assured but is very likely, Dems need five Republicans.¶

And – pressure solves GOP opposition, there’s massive public support

Bernie Becker 12-26, The Hill, Poll: Majority backs renewal of jobless aid, <http://thehill.com/blogs/on-the-money/economy/194038-poll-majority-backs-extending-jobless-benefits>

A solid majority of voters think Congress should extend expiring jobless benefits, a new poll said Thursday, a development Democrats believe could give them a potent issue in next year’s election.

The poll from Hart Research Associates found 55 percent of voters believe that benefits for the long-term unemployed, which expire on Saturday, should be extended.

Only around a third of voters, the Democratic pollster said, believe unemployment insurance should be allowed to expire. The poll was conducted on behalf of the National Employment Law Project.

Around 1.3 million people are expected to lose their benefits when the program expires on Dec. 28, and almost 2 million others could be affected in 2014, if Congress doesn’t act next year.

On a conference call, Democratic lawmakers made clear they would continue to pound the issue, and they believed their efforts to get the House and Senate to approve a short-term extension of the program were starting to be successful.

Sen. Jack Reed (D-R.I.) and Rep. Sandy Levin (D-Mich.), two core supporters of the program, said the Saturday deadline had helped put a human face on the benefits, with stories about the impact of their expiration rolling out across the country.

“I think there is a sense that this is indeed a lifeline,” said Levin, the top Democrat on the House Ways and Means Committee, which has jurisdiction over unemployment programs.

“Now we’re seeing the faces,” Levin added. “People are no longer numbers.”

The two lawmakers also said the stories helped advocates for the program respond to Republicans like Sen. Rand Paul (Ky.), who have said that expanded benefits are a “disservice” to workers.

“These benefits are very modest,” Reed told reporters. “This is not a program that people are leaving a good job for, or not looking for a job for.”

The Rhode Island Democrat added that the benefits offer “barely enough” for some unemployed people to stay afloat.

The Senate is scheduled to vote on a proposed three-month extension of the benefits, from Reed and Sen. Dean Heller (R-Nev.), when they return to Washington in January.

That measure would not offset the roughly $6 billion the program costs over three months, but Democrats say they would use the added time to discuss reforms to the programs with Republicans.

Reed specifically mentioned paying for the program on a more long-term basis by slicing tax loopholes, but that sort of proposal has been a nonstarter among Republicans in recent years.

Levin told reporters that he would work to get the measure to the House floor, but Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) has so far taken a hands-off approach to the expiration of the benefits.

But Guy Molyneux of Hart Research Associates says that tactic could come back to bite Republicans. The extended benefits, Molyneux said, had broad backing across the country, and among both men and women.

Plus, Molyneux said that groups that have started to lean Republican — like seniors and white voters without a college education — also strongly supported the program.

“This is, I think, a politically very powerful issue,” Molyneux told reporters.

Momentum

George Zornick 12-26, Washington Post, Campaign to restore unemployment benefits hits the airwaves, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/plum-line/wp/2013/12/26/campaign-to-restore-unemployment-benefits-hits-the-airwaves/>

For now, the idea is to get a bill passed, which is far from impossible. Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.) has said he will bring a simple three-month extension for a vote as soon as Congress returns, and one Senate Republican is already on board. That means only four more votes are needed there. A small number of House Republicans also favor an extension and are reportedly pressuring Boehner.

To that end, the ad asks viewers to contact their member of Congress and demand the emergency unemployment program be restored. What is particularly useful about this approach is that there’s no pressure coming from the other side — unlike, say, the debate over “Obamacare,” there are no well-funded conservative groups out there pressing for an end to the emergency unemployment program. Based on the polls showing bipartisan support for an extension, the conservative grass roots don’t appear to be fired up about the issue. The passion and activism over jobless benefits is essentially just running in one direction, which is a promising sign.

Key insiders predict passage

Peter Sullivan 12-29, The Hill, Brown predicts GOP control of Senate, <http://thehill.com/blogs/ballot-box/194101-brown-mum-on-senate-run-predicts-gop-control-of-chamber>

Brown also expressed his support for an issue the current Senate will face when it returns from recess, the extension of unemployment benefits, as long as its paid for. “My mom is on welfare,” Brown said. “There is a safety net. It's not a lifelong entitlement. Find a way to pay for it, and then find a way to phase it out and incentivize people to get back to work.”

Sens. Jack Reed (D-R.I.) and Dean Heller (R-Nev.) have proposed a three-month extension of the benefits while Congress works on a longer-term plan. Brown predicted that extension would pass.

Err neg – some Republicans are willing to compromise

Brad Plumer 2-23, Washington Post, Unemployment benefits for 1.3 million expire Saturday. Here’s why., <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2013/12/20/unemployment-benefits-for-1-3-million-workers-expire-next-week-heres-what-you-should-know/>

Is Congress going to do anything to offer more aid? Possibly, though that's not certain. Lawmakers could have folded a one-year extension of the emergency program into their end-of-the-year budget deal, which would have cost $25.2 billion. But that didn't happen.

Senate Democrats are planning to push for a one-year extension when they get back to work in January. That extension would apply retroactively to the 1.3 million people who see their benefits end on Dec. 28.

"It's a good bill, and it deserves a vote, and I hope my Republican colleagues will work with us to schedule a vote in a very timely fashion," Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.) said this week. And at least some Senate Republicans have signaled that they'd be open to an extension.

Are there opponents of an extension? Other Republicans object to the idea, including Sen. Rand Paul (R-Ky.). "I do support unemployment benefits for the 26 weeks that they're paid for. If you extend it beyond that, you do a disservice to these workers," Paul said this month. "When you allow people to be on unemployment insurance for 99 weeks, you're causing them to become part of this perpetual unemployed group in our economy."

Still other conservatives don't want to spend $25.2 billion to extend the program unless it's offset by cuts elsewhere. "What is it coupled with? How is it paid for? Are there reforms in how it's being administered?," Sen. Bob Corker (R-Tenn.) told National Journal.

New polls

George Zornick 12-23, Washington Post, Republicans could face serious backlash over unemployment benefit expiration, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/plum-line/wp/2013/12/23/republicans-could-face-serious-backlash-over-unemployment-benefit-expiration/>

Congressional Republicans returned home for the holidays with empty stockings for constituents who are suffering with long-term unemployment, after the GOP repeatedly blocked renewal of the federal Emergency Unemployment Compensation fund. Now a new poll shows their stinginess could create a significant backlash at the polls next year — including from some Republican voters.

Public Policy Polling (PPP) took a look at four Republican-occupied swing districts in the House, as well as the district of House Speaker John Boehner. Bipartisan majorities of voters in each district supported extending long-term unemployment benefits:

In California’s 31st district, currently held by Rep. Gary Miller, 68 percent of voters want the benefits continued and 28 percent support ending them. Republicans support an extension 54-41.

In Colorado’s 6th district, held by Rep. Mike Coffman, voters want the benefits extended by a 63-33 margin, with a narrow plurality of Republicans (48 percent) in favor.

Rep. Dan Benishek will face voters in Michigan’s 1st district who heavily support an extension, by a 66-29 percent margin, including 60 percent of Republicans.

In Illinois’s 13th district there is also a 66-29 percent split in favor of extending benefits, with 53 percent of Republicans in favor. The seat is currently held by Rep. Rodney Davis.

Even in Boehner’s home district, one finds similar numbers: Sixty-three percent of voters want the fund extended and 34 percent do not, including a majority (52 percent) of Republican voters.

A common rejoinder to such polling data is that perhaps voters will not prioritize the issue when casting a ballot next fall — but PPP also asked if a failure to extend long-term unemployment benefits would make voters less likely to reelect the incumbent. In each district the answer was yes.

This poll was commissioned by the liberal group Americans United for Change and is part of a wider strategy by Democrats and progressives to push Republicans into renewing the benefits as soon as Congress returns next year. As Greg Sargent outlined recently, a key part of this strategy is making sure the issue resonates back home.

Polls like this, along with increasingly brutal local media coverage, must be worrying many a Republican strategist. It reinforces several major negative perceptions about congressional Republicans — that they are pervasively obstructionist, that they have little concern for worse-off Americans and that they allow ideology to hamper the economic recovery. (A failure to renew the Emergency Unemployment Compensation program would cost 240,000 jobs, according to a White House report.)

That’s exactly the message progressives will be hammering over the holiday break, especially when benefits for the long-term unemployed stop three days after Christmas. “It’s not just in America’s economic interest to extend [unemployment] benefits, [but] these polls show it’s in swing-district Republicans’ own political interest to support the jobless in their districts,” said Jeremy Funk of Americans United for Change. “Otherwise they just might join their ranks.”

## 2nc pc key

Obama’s political capital is key to getting republicans on board

Caren Bohan, Reuters, 12/30 [“Obama, Democrats push for extension of unemployment benefits,” https://bangordailynews.com/2013/12/30/politics/obama-democrats-push-for-extension-of-unemployment-benefits/]

WASHINGTON — On the eve of the expiration of federal benefits for the long-term unemployed, President Barack Obama and his Democratic allies are stepping up pressure on Republicans to renew the program.¶ Top White House economic adviser Gene Sperling said in a statement issued on Friday that a failure to renew emergency jobless benefits would harm the economy and he urged Congress to move quickly to pass a short-term extension of the aid.¶ Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, a Democrat, has vowed to bring to a vote a bill extending federal unemployment insurance benefits as soon as Congress returns from its holiday recess on Jan. 6.¶ “While we remain disappointed that Congress did not heed the president’s call to extend emergency unemployment benefits for next year before the holidays, the president as well as the Democratic congressional leadership have made clear the importance of extending the benefits immediately upon Congress’s return,” Sperling said in a statement.¶ Sperling, director of the White House National Economic Council, endorsed legislation introduced by Sen. Jack Reed, D-RI, and Dean Heller, R-Nev., that would extend the unemployment benefits for three months. He said passage of the temporary bill would allow time to consider an extension for all of 2014.¶ Without an extension, some 1.3 million unemployed Americans are scheduled to lose their federal jobless benefits on Saturday.¶ Under an emergency program created during President George W. Bush’s administration in 2008, federal benefits kick in for Americans who have exhausted their state unemployment benefits. In many states, unemployment benefits run out after 26 weeks.¶ The federal jobless aid has been renewed every year since 2008. Many Republicans oppose an extension of jobless benefits, arguing the program was always intended to be temporary. They have also said an extension would add to the federal deficit unless it is offset by spending elsewhere in the budget.

Obama’s backing is key to a deal

Peter Schroeder 12-27, The Hill, Pelosi: End of jobless aid 'simply immoral', <http://thehill.com/blogs/on-the-money/economy/194052-pelosi-blasts-immoral-end-to-jobless-benefits>

Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.) said he plans to bring up an extension as his first order of business in 2014, but some Republicans have indicated they would only be willing to extend the program if the cost of another extension is offset elsewhere.

The emergency federal benefits were first put in place during the 2008 recession, and Congress has opted extending them repeatedly since then.

The program allows the federal government to help states provide much longer unemployment benefits than normally permitted, running up to 73 weeks so long as people are looking for work.

But with the extended benefits headed for a Saturday expiration, roughly 1.3 million unemployed Americans will immediately lose those benefits, while millions more could lose benefits throughout 2014 if they are not extended.

Some Republicans, including Sen. Rand Paul (Ky.), have opposed another extension, arguing the economy has recovered enough to end the emergency lifeline.

Other GOP lawmakers have not said they would oppose an extension, but are concerned about the roughly $26 billion cost of extending the program for another year. Pelosi has said she does not believe that cost has to be offset, arguing the program does more good for the economy than it costs.

President Obama has also called on Congress to extend the benefits, while Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) has said he is willing to consider a specific proposal if the president offers it.

Obama has bipartisan support now

Maeve Reston, political writer, 12/27 [“Obama prods Congress to act on unemployment benefits,” http://www.latimes.com/nation/politics/politicsnow/la-pn-obama-unemployment-benefits-congress-20131227,0,7204946.story#ixzz2pAnXIpQ6]

WAIMANALO, Hawaii -- With unemployment benefits set to expire Saturday for about 1.3 million Americans, President Obama on Friday pressed for Congress to act, calling two senators who have offered legislation that would extend them for three months.¶ The president made the calls from his vacation home on Oahu to Sen. Jack Reed (D-R.I.) and Sen. Dean Heller (R-Nev.), according to White House spokesman Josh Earnest, offering support for their proposal and praising them for “working in a bipartisan fashion” on a problem that he said would adversely affect the nation’s economic growth and job creation.¶ One week ago, during his final news conference of the year at the White House, Obama applauded the rebounding economy but faulted Congress for inaction on unemployment insurance, charging that by not extending jobless benefits it was leaving a million constituents without “a vital economic lifeline at Christmastime.”¶ “We’re a better country than that. We don’t abandon each other when times are tough,” Obama told reporters. He said the benefits go only to Americans “who are actively looking for work -- a mom who needs help feeding her kids when she sends out her resumes, or a dad who needs help paying the rent while working part-time and still learning the skills he needs for that new job.”¶ He called on members of Congress to make the temporary extension of benefits “their first order of business” when they come back into session next year, saying that if lawmakers approve it, he would sign the Reed-Heller proposal “right away.”

## Embargo Link—2NC

#### Plan saps PC—Obama has to make concessions on Cuba to pass other policies like the debt ceiling

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

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

#### Plan costs PC and sparks Congressional backlash—Alan Gross proves it would be a fight

Miroff ‘13 (Nick Miroff, d earned a bachelor's degree in Spanish and Latin American literature at University of California Santa Cruz. He holds a master's degree from the Berkeley Graduate School of Journalism and has won Pulitzer prize, “Can Kerry make friends with Cuba?”, global post, January 2, 2013, http://www.globalpost.com/dispatch/news/regions/americas/cuba/121231/kerry-cuba-secretary-of-state-obama)

Regardless of Kerry’s record on Cuba policy in the Senate, analysts say he will face several obstacles to major change, not least of which will be the man likely to replace him as chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Sen. Bob Menendez (D-New Jersey), a Cuban American.¶ If Menendez becomes chairman, then the committee responsible for shaping US foreign policy in the upper house will be led by a hardliner who wants to ratchet up — not dial back — the US squeeze on Havana.¶ So while Kerry may have some latitude to adjust Cuba policy from inside the White House, Latin America experts don’t expect sweeping change — like an end to the Cuba Embargo — which requires Congressional action.¶ “On Latin America, in general, I think Kerry has a longer and broader vision,” said Robert Pastor, professor of international relations at American University. But when it comes to Cuba, he cautioned, “Kerry is also a political realist.”¶ “Changing US policy is not a high priority for him, but not changing US policy is the only priority for Bob Menendez,” Pastor said.¶ In 2011, Kerry delayed the release of nearly $20 million in federal funds for pro-democracy Cuba projects run by the US Agency for International Development (USAID), questioning their effectiveness and insisting on greater oversight.¶ “There is no evidence that the ‘democracy promotion’ programs, which have cost the US taxpayer more than $150 million so far, are helping the Cuban people,” Kerry said at the time. “Nor have they achieved much more than provoking the Cuban government to arrest a US government contractor.”¶ The US government contractor is Alan Gross, jailed on the island since December 2009. Cuban authorities arrested Gross while he worked on a USAID project to set up satellite communications gear that would allow members of Cuba’s Jewish community to connect to the internet without going through government servers.¶ Cuba sentenced him to 15 years in prison, but now says its willing to work out a prisoner swap for the “Cuban Five,” a group of intelligence agents who have been serving time in a US federal prison.¶ The Obama administration has refused to negotiate, calling on Havana to release Gross unconditionally, and even US lawmakers who advocate greater engagement with Cuba say no change will be possible as long as he’s in jail.¶ The Castro government insists it’s not willing to give up Gross for nothing.¶ Carlos Alzugaray, a former Cuban diplomat and scholar of US-Cuba relations at the University of Havana, said a resolution to the Gross case and other significant changes in US policy would “require a big investment of political capital” by Kerry and Obama.¶ “The question is if Kerry will be willing and able to convince Obama that he should push for change, and if they can neutralize Menendez,” Alzugaray said.¶ “If that happens, then we will see change,” he said. “If not, it will be more of the same: minimal and timid changes but nothing big.”

#### The Cuba lobby are the powerbrokers in engagement with Cuba—removing the embargo would ensure congressional opposition and backlash

Stieglitz ‘11 Matthew, “Constructive Engagement: The Need for a Progressive Cuban Lobby in Obama’s Washington” http://www.thepresidency.org/storage/Fellows2011/Stieglitz-\_Final\_Paper.pdf

This collaboration represented positive dialogue with Cuba, yet it did nothing to improve relations with Cuba. Subsequent to the Balsero crisis, the US Congress acted to enforce stricter standards towards the island in a landmark legislation that would effectively relegate the presidency to the backburner in relation to Cuba. Driven in part by CANF and the lobbying efforts of the exile community, the Cuban Liberty & Solidarity Act was passed in 1996 (also known as the Helms-Burton Act) further complicating relations with Cuba (Bardach, 2002). Essentially, the legislation cedes greater authority to the US Congress in ending the trade embargo, making a potential pro-embargo majority in Congress the powerbrokers on everything US-Cuba related. Simply stated, the Cuban Liberty & Democratic Solidarity Act disempowers the presidency in relation to Cuba. While the legislation calls for a variety of different elements, it has two key components in relation to the presidency: the embargo can only be repealed by Congressional vote, and it cannot be repealed until a democratic government is elected in Cuba that includes neither Fidel nor Raul Castro. This clearly hinders normalization because it effectively mitigates any transition efforts or progressive policies that the Castro brothers sponsor. Unless the legislation is repealed or amended, any progressive efforts or dialogue from the Cuban government will be irrelevant so long as the Castro brothers continue to lead the government. It also constrains the US presidency, as President Obama—or any future president— cannot simply end the embargo with Cuba. Instead, presidents must defer to the US Congress, which will make progressive policy with Cuba difficult. This again exemplifies the strength and importance of the Cuban-American lobby in policy discussions with Cuba. Not only did their efforts result in Congressional legislation that effectively ceded control of US relations with Cuba to Congress, but they also imposed the agenda of the electorate on American foreign policy. Subsequent to this legislation passing, the Cuban-American lobby would again work to have its voice heard when a young boy, Elian González, was found floating in American waters, one of three survivors of an ill-fated voyage that claimed the lives of eleven people, including his mother. Under the Wet Foot, Dry Foot policy, Elian González could not be granted asylum in the United States because he was found in water. While his family in the US was more than willing to take the boy in, his status as a minor complicated matters with his father remaining in Cuba. This placed the Clinton Administration in the middle of a highly contested debate that the Cuban-American electorate immediately moved to shape (Bardach, 2002). The González case called into questions components of family law, immigration law, refugee policy, and politics, and presented the Cuban-American electorate its greatest opportunity to embarrass the Castro government. For President Clinton, it presented a crisis that necessitated caution, and would ultimately entail a moral debate that stirred immense media coverage of the Cuba dilemma itself. González's mother drowned in late 1999 while traveling with her son to the United States, and while the INS originally placed him with paternal family in Miami, his father objected to González remaining in the United States (Bardach, 2002). What ensued was a media nightmare, with national media outlets descending on Miami to interview the boy. Local politicians became involved, with the case eventually being deliberated in court where the family’s asylum petition was dismissed and González was ordered to return to his father. President Clinton almost exclusively deferred to Attorney General Janet Reno during the proceedings, who ultimately ordered the return of González to his father prior to the court decision. González’s return to Cuba coincided with the beginning of yet another decade in which the Cuban trade embargo would continue, and to date is the last controversial event of US-Cuba policy during the Castro regime (Bardach, 2002). Reflecting upon the Castro reign during the 20th century, two themes emerge: the prominence of the Cuban-American community, and the actions of US presidents towards Cuba. The clout of the Cuban-American lobby cannot be understated, as the 2000 presidential election showed us. President George W. Bush secured his victory as president in no small part due to the Cuban-American vote, which he and Al Gore campaign vigorously for. As such, the Gore and Bush campaigns remained relatively silent on the Elian González case, leaving the matter to the courts so as not to risk any backlash from the Cuban-American community. After his victory, President Bush tightened restrictions on Cuba much like his Republican predecessors. He further restricted travel to the island for CubanAmericans, reduced the amount of remittances that could be sent to the island, placed Cuba on terror-watch lists after 9/11, and maintained that Cuba was a strategic threat to national security (Erlich, 2009). Further, cultural and academic exchanges were suspended, and many Cuban and American artists found themselves unable to attain visas to travel between Cuba and the United States to share the rich culture of both nations. By the time President Bush left office, the only Americans legally allowed to enter Cuba were journalists, family members (who could only go once every three years), and those visiting the island for religious reasons.

#### Even small adjustments to the embargo cause massive fights in congress

Cave 12 Damien, “Easing of Restraints in Cuba Renews Debate on U.S. Embargo” [http://www.nytimes.com/2012/11/20/world/americas/changes-in-cuba-create-support-for-easing-embargo.html?pagewanted=all&\_r=0] November 19

With Cuba cautiously introducing free-market changes that have legalized hundreds of thousands of small private businesses over the past two years, new economic bonds between Cuba and the United States have formed, creating new challenges, new possibilities — and a more complicated debate over the embargo.The longstanding logic has been that broad sanctions are necessary to suffocate the totalitarian government of Fidel and Raúl Castro. Now, especially for many Cubans who had previously stayed on the sidelines in the battle over Cuba policy, a new argument against the embargo is gaining currency — that the tentative move toward capitalism by the Cuban government could be sped up with more assistance from Americans.Even as defenders of the embargo warn against providing the Cuban government with “economic lifelines,” some Cubans and exiles are advocating a fresh approach. The Obama administration already showed an openness to engagement with Cuba in 2009 by removing restrictions on travel and remittances for Cuban Americans. But with Fidel Castro, 86, retired and President Raúl Castro, 81, leading a bureaucracy that is divided on the pace and scope of change, many have begun urging President Obama to go further and update American policy by putting a priority on assistance for Cubans seeking more economic independence from the government.“Maintaining this embargo, maintaining this hostility, all it does is strengthen and embolden the hard-liners,” said Carlos Saladrigas, a Cuban exile and co-chairman of the Cuba Study Group in Washington, which advocates engagement with Cuba. “What we should be doing is helping the reformers.”Any easing would be a gamble. Free enterprise may not necessarily lead to the embargo’s goal of free elections, especially because Cuba has said it wants to replicate the paths of Vietnam and China, where the loosening of economic restrictions has not led to political change. Indeed, Cuban officials have become adept at using previous American efforts to soften the embargo to their advantage, taking a cut of dollars converted into pesos and marking up the prices at state-owned stores.And Cuba has a long history of tossing ice on warming relations. The latest example is the jailing of Alan Gross, a State Department contractor who has spent nearly three years behind bars for distributing satellite telephone equipment to Jewish groups in Havana. In Washington, Mr. Gross is seen as the main impediment to an easing of the embargo, but there are also limits to what the president could do without Congressional action. The 1992 Cuban Democracy Act conditioned the waiving of sanctions on the introduction of democratic changes inside Cuba. The 1996 Helms-Burton Act also requires that the embargo remain until Cuba has a transitional or democratically elected government. Obama administration officials say they have not given up, and could move if the president decides to act on his own. Officials say that under the Treasury Department’s licensing and regulation-writing authority, there is room for significant modification. Following the legal logic of Mr. Obama’s changes in 2009, further expansions in travel are possible along with new allowances for investment or imports and exports, especially if narrowly applied to Cuban businesses. Even these adjustments — which could also include travel for all Americans and looser rules for ships engaged in trade with Cuba, according to a legal analysis commissioned by the Cuba Study Group — would probably mean a fierce political fight. The handful of Cuban-Americans in Congress for whom the embargo is sacred oppose looser rules.

#### Obama would have to expend enough PC to overcome a PAC that spends money to prevent 400 Congress-persons from voting against the embargo

Clark 09 (Lesley Clark, Lesley Clark covers the White House for McClatchy Newspapers and Pulitzer prize winner, “Money talks: Report links donations, Cuba embargo support”, McClatchy newspapers, November 16, 2009, http://www.mcclatchydc.com/2009/11/16/78884/money-talks-report-links-donations.html#.Ud2Q5Pm1Fsk)

Supporters of the U.S. embargo against Cuba have contributed nearly $11 million to members of Congress since 2004 in a largely successful effort to block efforts to weaken sanctions against the island, a new report shows.¶ In several cases, the report by Public Campaign says, members of Congress who had supported easing sanctions against Cuba changed their position — and got donations from the U.S.-Cuba Democracy Political Action Committee and its donors.¶ All told, the political action committee and its contributors have given $10.77 million nationwide to nearly 400 candidates and members of Congress, the report says.¶ The contributions include more than $850,000 to 53 Democrats in the House of Representatives who sent a letter to House Speaker Nancy Pelosi earlier this month opposing any change to U.S.-Cuba policy. The average signer, the report says, received $16,344.¶ The top five recipients of the embargo supporters' cash: Miami's three Cuban-American Republican members of Congress, 2008 Republican presidential nominee John McCain and New Jersey Democratic Sen. Robert Menendez, whose parents fled Cuba before his birth.¶ The report comes as defenders of the embargo fend off efforts to repeal a decades-old ban against U.S. travel to Cuba. Proponents of greater engagement with Cuba contend that they have the votes, and a hearing on the issue is scheduled for Thursday before the House Foreign Affairs Committee.¶ Critics of U.S.-Cuba policy long have suggested a link between campaign contributions and policy. Public Campaign — which advocates for public financing of political campaigns — says the contributions raise questions about the role that money plays in lawmakers' decision-making.¶ "The pressure they get to raise money plays heavier in their decisions than it ought to," said David Donnelly, the national campaigns director for Public Campaign. "We think this is a damning pattern. We think these are good people caught in a bad system. If members of Congress have to spend too much time raising money, they have to listen to people who give money."¶ The director of the U.S.-Cuba Democracy PAC, Mauricio Claver-Carone, defended the contributions as support for lawmakers who side with Cuban-Americans who think that easing sanctions against Cuba will only benefit the Castro regime.¶ "I will not apologize for the Cuban-American community practicing its constitutional, democratic right to support candidates who believe in freedom and democracy for the Cuban people over business and tourism interests," Claver-Carone said. "Unions help elect pro-union candidates. The Chamber of Commerce helps elect pro-business candidates. AIPAC (the American Israel Public Affairs Committee) helps elect pro-Israel members. Who are we supposed to help? Pro-Castro members?"¶ Public Campaign looked at the Cuba committee because of a seeming disconnect between congressional votes and public opinion polls that suggest most Americans support lifting a ban on travel to Cuba, Donnelly said.¶ "On this issue there appears to be a clear distinction between what the American public appears to want and what some in Congress are advocating," Donnelly said, pointing to a World Public Opinion survey in April that found 70 percent of Americans support travel to Cuba.¶ Rep. Jeff Flake, R-Ariz., who backs greater engagement with Cuba, said the report wasn't a surprise.¶ "I don't know how else you can explain how our current policy has survived for so long without yielding any meaningful results; it's all politics," Flake said.¶ The report says that at least 18 House members — including several from agriculture-rich districts — received campaign contributions from the PAC or its donors and switched their positions on Cuba, from voting in favor of easing travel restrictions to voting against any efforts to soften the embargo.¶ Rep. Mike McIntyre, D-N.C., said his changed views came from humanitarian interests and concerns about oppression in Cuba. He said he spoke with Florida Republican Reps. Lincoln and Mario Diaz-Balart about their family's experience in Cuba under Fidel Castro.¶ "I thought, 'This is not right, and it's not humanitarian, and it doesn't promote democracy and I'm not going to support someone who is repressive and evil,' " McIntyre said. "Yes, I changed my vote. That's the reason I changed: the horrors they suffered."¶ "They're really savvy people," Lars Schoultz, a professor of political science at the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill and the author of "That Infernal Little Cuban Republic: The United States and the Cuban Revolution," said of the U.S.-Cuba Democracy PAC. "They know one vote is one vote. They scratch around and see who might be open to their way of thinking."¶ Claver-Carone, who started the PAC in 2003, said agricultural and business interests had heavily lobbied members of Congress before the committee was in operation.¶ "The farm lobby came in and they were telling people, 'Cuba is like Costa Rica,' " Claver-Carone said. "We came in and started telling people, 'Hey, here's what's really happening in Cuba.' "¶ Though hard-line embargo supporters traditionally have been considered Republicans, the report shows the PAC shifting contributions to Democrats as they assumed control of the House and Senate in 2006.¶ In the 2004 election cycle, the PAC gave just 29 percent to Democrats. By 2008, the Democrats' share was up to 59 percent.
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#### Collapses the economy – already lost $400 million in a week

Schroeder 1/3 (Robert, writer for Market Watch, “Workers lose $400 million in first week without jobless benefits: report”, http://blogs.marketwatch.com/capitolreport/2014/01/03/workers-lose-400-million-in-first-week-without-jobless-benefits-report/)

Jobless Americans and state economies have lost more than $400 million since the expiration of federal unemployment insurance last week, according to a report released Friday by House Democrats.¶ Congressional Democrats and the White House have been pushing to renew the program, which expired on Dec. 28. It provides up to 47 weeks of benefits to about 1.3 million workers who have exhausted their state benefits. House Republicans say the cost of the program must be offset.¶ Rep. Sander Levin of Michigan, the top Democrat on the House Ways and Means Committee, sought to turn up the pressure on Republicans Friday.¶ “Every week that Republicans fail to act, tens of thousands of additional long-term unemployed Americans lose this vital lifeline as they look to get back on their feet after the worst recession in generations, and the economy in each state is taking a hit,” he said in a statement.¶ Democrats view jobless benefits as a stimulus because recipients often spend the money quickly.¶ But Republicans have balked at extending the program without offsetting spending cuts or changes to the program, which costs about $25 billion. The issue is poised to be the first congressional battle of 2014, with the Senate planning action on a bill next week.