# Wake – Round 6

# 1NC

## Politics

### 1NC DA

#### Comprehensive immigration reform will pass – Obama is pushing.

Elizabeth Liorente, 9-06-2013, politics editor, Fox News Latino, “Already Facing Uphill Battle, Immigration Reform Could Be Doomed By Syrian Conflict,” <http://latino.foxnews.com/latino/politics/2013/09/06/already-facing-uphill-battle-immigration-reform-could-be-doomed-by-syrian/>

“It looks like a lot of excuses for not passing immigration reform,” said Audrey Singer, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, a Washington, D.C., think tank. “But the pressure is on. I don’t think this Congress wants to be blamed for not moving things forward on immigration.” Singer said although immigration efforts have been underway before — such as in 2007, when Bush was heavily involved, and veteran political leaders Sen. John McCain, an Arizona Republican, and Sen. Ted Kennedy, a Massachusetts Democrat, spearheaded the work in Congress — and then failed, this time is different. “We are not seeing a huge push against moving forward with immigration reform like we saw in 2007,” Singer said. “That includes key people in leadership positions, who were talking about immigration reform in 2007 in not a positive way.” Anastasia Mann, a visiting associate for the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers University, said that this time, there is too large a groundswell of support for an overhaul to immigration — particularly the aspect that would bring many of the nation’s undocumented immigrants out of the shadows. “Business people need reform to happen, workers need this to happen,” she said. Obama administration officials, meanwhile, adamantly rejected the notion that immigration reform is in peril. They insisted President Obama is not giving up on immigration. “An American president has to be able to walk, chew gum and juggle at the same time,” Dan Pfeiffer, a senior adviser to Obama, told The New York Times. “The president and his team will do everything they can to implement his overall agenda while this [Syria] debate happens.” Frank Sharry, the executive director of America’s Voice, a pro-immigrant lobby group that is regular contact with lawmakers over immigration reform measures, remained optimistic that a comprehensive could still pass before the end of the year.

#### Engagement with Cuba is massively unpopular with the GOP.

Think Progress, 4-09-2013, “How the GOP Response to Beyoncé’s Cuba Trip Highlights Broken Policy,” <http://thinkprogress.org/security/2013/04/09/1838661/rubio-beyonce-cuba/>

Experts at CAP and the Cato Institute alike agree that the policy has been an abject failure at achieving the goals the United States set out. On taking office, President Obama sought to roll-back some of the harsher restrictions the previous administration placed on Cuba, including removing a ban on remittances from Cubans in the U.S. to their families back home and reducing travel restrictions on Americans with immediate family in Cuba. Every step towards reforming Cuba policy, however, has been met with kicking and screaming, mostly from the GOP with some Democrats joining in. While the human rights violations the Cuban regime continues to perpetrate are most certainly a concern, campaign funding may play a strong role in the perpetuation of U.S. policies. A 2009 report from Public Campaign highlighted the nearly $11 million the U.S.-Cuba Democracy Political Action Committee, along with a “network of hard-line Cuban American donors,” spent on political campaigns since 2004. In the report, those candidates who received funding displayed a shift in voting patterns on Cuba policy in the aftermath of the gift

#### Political capital is key to immigration reform.

Thomas Barr1 and Iam Bloom2, 8-30-2013, writer and activist whose work has been featured on CNN.com and other locations across the net1, writer for Guardian Express2, “Will Obama Save Immigration Reform?” <http://guardianlv.com/2013/08/will-obama-save-immigration-reform-video/>

Will Obama save immigration reform and issue an executive order to placate the movement? “Some people feel like we need to cut our losses, legalize as many people as we can,” Juanita Molina, of Humane Boarder, told the National Journal. Proponents are now looking to an alternate method to pass some type of legislation to push along the reform movement. “Organizers think long term, so they know that legislation is one way, but that DACA (Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program), has proven that the administration can provide another way,” said Richard Morales, director of deportation prevention for the PICO National Network. He had reached out to faith based organizations by email and cultivated support for an alternative approach. Critics contend that the Republicans are sandbagging the issue and truly would like for the reform issue to fail. “The only solution to this problem is for Congress to fix the broken immigration system by passing comprehensive reform,” a spokesman said. “The White House cuts off the conversation whenever it comes up. They want to keep the pressure on Republicans to pass legislation, as do we,” said Frank Sharry of America’s Voice. “Our goal is legislation that will put the 11 million (current undocumented immigrants) on an eventual path to citizenship. That’s permanent protection for millions of people,” said Sharry. Sharry’s group is intent on winning the legislative fight and pushing for movement on the issue. It is believed that Sharry also supports white house action on the issue if it is called for. Will it come down to White House support and Obama saving immigration reform garnering the support of the growing Hispanic base? Many believe that it may occur, if not the threat could force the hand of the Republicans to take action.

#### Visas are key to cybersecurity preparedness

McLarty 9 (Thomas F. III, President – McLarty Associates and Former White House Chief of Staff and Task Force Co-Chair, “U.S. Immigration Policy: Report of a CFR-Sponsored Independent Task Force”, 7-8, http://www.cfr.org/ publication/19759/us\_immigration\_policy.html)

We have seen, when you look at the table of the top 20 firms that are H1-B visa requestors, at least 15 of those are IT firms. And as we're seeing across industry, much of the hardware and software that's used in this country is not only manufactured now overseas, but it's developed overseas by scientists and engineers who were educated here in the United States.¶ We're seeing a lot more activity around cyber-security, certainly noteworthy attacks here very recently. It's becoming an increasingly dominant set of requirements across not only to the Department of Defense, but the Department of Homeland Security and the critical infrastructure that's held in private hands. Was there any discussion or any interest from DOD or DHS as you undertook this review on the security things about what can be done to try to generate a more effective group of IT experts here in the United States, many of which are coming to the U.S. institutions, academic institutions from overseas and often returning back? This potentially puts us at a competitive disadvantage going forward.¶ MCLARTY: Yes. And I think your question largely is the answer as well. I mean, clearly we have less talented students here studying -- or put another way, more talented students studying in other countries that are gifted, talented, really have a tremendous ability to develop these kind of technology and scientific advances, we're going to be put at an increasingly disadvantage. Where if they come here -- and I kind of like Dr. Land's approach of the green card being handed to them or carefully put in their billfold or purse as they graduate -- then, obviously, that's going to strengthen, I think, our system, our security needs.

#### Cyber-vulnerability causes great power nuclear war

Fritz 9 Researcher for International Commission on Nuclear Nonproliferation and Disarmament [Jason, researcher for International Commission on Nuclear Nonproliferation and Disarmament, former Army officer and consultant, and has a master of international relations at Bond University, “Hacking Nuclear Command and Control,” July, <http://www.icnnd.org/latest/research/Jason_Fritz_Hacking_NC2.pdf>]

This paper will analyse the threat of cyber terrorism in regard to nuclear weapons. Specifically, this research will use open source knowledge to identify the structure of nuclear command and control centres, how those structures might be compromised through computer network operations, and how doing so would fit within established cyber terrorists’ capabilities, strategies, and tactics. If access to command and control centres is obtained, terrorists could fake or actually cause one nuclear-armed state to attack another, thus provoking a nuclear response from another nuclear power. This may be an easier alternative for terrorist groups than building or acquiring a nuclear weapon or dirty bomb themselves. This would also act as a force equaliser, and provide terrorists with the asymmetric benefits of high speed, removal of geographical distance, and a relatively low cost. Continuing difficulties in developing computer tracking technologies which could trace the identity of intruders, and difficulties in establishing an internationally agreed upon legal framework to guide responses to computer network operations, point towards an inherent weakness in using computer networks to manage nuclear weaponry. This is particularly relevant to reducing the hair trigger posture of existing nuclear arsenals. All computers which are connected to the internet are susceptible to infiltration and remote control. Computers which operate on a closed network may also be compromised by various hacker methods, such as privilege escalation, roaming notebooks, wireless access points, embedded exploits in software and hardware, and maintenance entry points. For example, e-mail spoofing targeted at individuals who have access to a closed network, could lead to the installation of a virus on an open network. This virus could then be carelessly transported on removable data storage between the open and closed network. Information found on the internet may also reveal how to access these closed networks directly. Efforts by militaries to place increasing reliance on computer networks, including experimental technology such as autonomous systems, and their desire to have multiple launch options, such as nuclear triad capability, enables multiple entry points for terrorists. For example, if a terrestrial command centre is impenetrable, perhaps isolating one nuclear armed submarine would prove an easier task. There is evidence to suggest multiple attempts have been made by hackers to compromise the extremely low radio frequency once used by the US Navy to send nuclear launch approval to submerged submarines. Additionally, the alleged Soviet system known as Perimetr was designed to automatically launch nuclear weapons if it was unable to establish communications with Soviet leadership. This was intended as a retaliatory response in the event that nuclear weapons had decapitated Soviet leadership; however it did not account for the possibility of cyber terrorists blocking communications through computer network operations in an attempt to engage the system. Should a warhead be launched, damage could be further enhanced through additional computer network operations. By using proxies, multi-layered attacks could be engineered. Terrorists could remotely commandeer computers in China and use them to launch a US nuclear attack against Russia. Thus Russia would believe it was under attack from the US and the US would believe China was responsible. Further, emergency response communications could be disrupted, transportation could be shut down, and disinformation, such as misdirection, could be planted, thereby hindering the disaster relief effort and maximizing destruction. Disruptions in communication and the use of disinformation could also be used to provoke uninformed responses. For example, a nuclear strike between India and Pakistan could be coordinated with Distributed Denial of Service attacks against key networks, so they would have further difficulty in identifying what happened and be forced to respond quickly. Terrorists could also knock out communications between these states so they cannot discuss the situation. Alternatively, amidst the confusion of a traditional large-scale terrorist attack, claims of responsibility and declarations of war could be falsified in an attempt to instigate a hasty military response. These false claims could be posted directly on Presidential, military, and government websites. E-mails could also be sent to the media and foreign governments using the IP addresses and e-mail accounts of government officials. A sophisticated and all encompassing combination of traditional terrorism and cyber terrorism could be enough to launch nuclear weapons on its own, without the need for compromising command and control centres directly.
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#### Economic engagement must be 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 unilaterally signs a treaty with Mexico – it’s not quid pro quo

#### Vote negative – LIMITS – there are a near infinite range of “one exception” affs – conditionality forces to find significant deals that Mexico will accept

#### GROUND – unconditional engagement denies us “say no” and backlash arguments which are a crucial part of the engagement debate.
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#### US-Brazil Relations are high now.

John Kerry, 8-13-2013, Secretary of State of the United States, “Remarks With Brazilian Foreign Minister Antonio de Aguiar Patriota After Their Meeting,” <http://www.state.gov/secretary/remarks/2013/08/213105.htm>

Now, obviously we have also had some moments of disagreement, and I’m sure I’ll have an occasion in the questions to be able to address some of that with you. But the United States and Brazil – I want to emphasize, rather than focus on an area of disagreement – the United States and Brazil share a remarkable and dynamic partnership. Every single day we work together to advance economic opportunity, human rights, environment protection, regional peace and security, democracy, as well as major global challenges in the Middle East and elsewhere – Syria for instance and the question of the humanitarian challenge in Syria. The United States respects and appreciates that Brazil is one of the world’s largest free market democracies, and our partnership is only made stronger as all of the world continues to grow. The United States recognizes and welcomes and greatly appreciates the vital leadership role, the increasing leadership role, that Brazil plays on the international stage – excuse me – and that ranges from its participation in global peace initiatives to its stability operations and promotion of human rights and its efforts to try to help either promote the peace or keep the peace in certain parts of the world. Through the Global Peace Operations Initiative, we are working with Brazil and the United Nations to build the capacity of countries to be able to contribute themselves to peacekeeping operations. Brazil has provided more than 1,400 uniformed personnel to the stabilization mission in Haiti. We’re very grateful for that. And we’re also exploring opportunities for closer collaboration on peacekeeping in Africa. It’s fair to say that protecting universal rights is at the very heart of the shared values between Brazil and the United States. And together, we remain committed to advancing those rights and to advancing the cause of equality for all people. The United States also supports a very vibrant and active Organization of American States, and the OAS Charter reminds us of our responsibilities to offer our citizens liberty and to create the conditions in which all people can reach their aspirations, can live their aspirations. We believe that it is important that Brazil engage fully with the OAS and use its strong voice for a hemispheric vision of democracy and fundamental freedoms. Now, our relationship is not only rooted in shared values, it is literally strengthened every single day by our citizens. Each year thousands of people travel between the United States and Brazil, forging new ties between our countries. Student exchanges under President Rousseff’s Scientific Mobility Program, which I had the privilege of visiting this morning and sensing firsthand the amazing energy and excitement and commitment of these young people, that’s something we share in common. And together with President Rousseff’s program and President Obama’s 100,000 Strong in the Americas Initiative, we are encouraging together approaches to address the shared concerns of our young people to include social inclusion and to work towards things like environmental sustainability.

#### Unilateral interference in Latin America greatly upsets Brazil – collapses relations.

David Rothkopf, 3-xx-2009, President and CEO of Garten Rothkopf, an international advisory firm specializing in transformational global trends, notably those associated with energy, security, and emerging markets, “The Perils of Rivalry,” <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2009/03/pdf/brazil.pdf>

There are other areas in which tension could enter the relationship. How the United States interacts with the Americas writ large under President Obama will shape relations and create potential pitfalls, and so will domestic political considerations both in the United States and Brazil. Any real or perceived interference in the region by the United States would greatly upset Brazil. If the United States decided that heavy-handed political pressure or intervention were required in regard, for example, to Venezuela, Bolivia, or Ecuador, this could put Brazil in an uncomfortable position where it has to choose between the United States and its neighbors. Since Brazil has spent years arguing for South American unity, it would likely choose its neighbors or—even more likely—choose to interject itself as a third party with a third point of view.

#### US-Brazil relationship is key to successful Asia pivot.

Zachary Keck, 5-03-2012, deputy editor of e-International Relations and an editorial assistant at The Diplomat, “With Eye on Asia, U.S. Seeks Greater Global Security Role for Brazil,” <http://www.opeal.net/index.php?option=com_k2&view=item&id=10961%3Awith-eye-on-asia-us-seeks-greater-global-security-role-for-brazil&Itemid=149>

With Eye on Asia, U.S. Seeks Greater Global Security Role for Brazil Last week’s inaugural U.S.-Brazilian Defense Cooperation Dialogue was the latest example of the Obama administration’s efforts to enhance defense cooperation with Brazil. Though improving broader relations with Brazil has been a priority for the Obama administration, the U.S. emphasis on bilateral defense ties should also be seen as part of Washington’s ongoing effort to get Brazil to increase its global security profile as the U.S. focuses more of its strategic attention and shrinking defense resources on the Western Pacific. Even before announcing the U.S. pivot to Asia last fall, the Obama administration had actively pursued expanded security ties with Brazil. The two countries signed a defense cooperation agreement in April 2010 and another agreement the following November to facilitate information-sharing. Both agreements have already resulted in greater military-to-military cooperation, at times in new domains. Although the U.S.-Brazilian navies have a long history of cooperation, most recently jointly participating in a maritime security exercise near Africa in February, cooperation between their air forces is a relatively new phenomenon. In 2010, the U.S. Air Force participated in Brazil’s annual Cruzex multinational air exercise for the first time. Next year, Brazil will reciprocate by joining the annual multilateral Red Flag exercise in Nevada. Since the Asia pivot, however, the Obama administration’s efforts have taken on a greater urgency. The White House dispatched Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. Martin Dempsey to Brasilia last March to further expand military-to-military ties. It has also been urging Congress to loosen restrictions on technology transfers to Brazil. The bilateral Defense Cooperation Dialogue was subsequently publicly unveiled during Brazilian President Dilma Rousseff’s trip to Washington last month. The first meeting of the new initiative took place April 24, during the Brazilian leg of U.S. Defense Secretary Leon Panetta’s weeklong trip to Latin America. During his two-day visit, Panetta repeatedly called on Brazil to increase its role in global security. Washington’s interest in such an expanded Brazilian role stems from its need to increase its force posture in Asia while reducing overall defense spending. Brazil can help facilitate this shift in two ways. First, the U.S. will need to increase its arms sales if it hopes to maintain its defense industrial base in the face of its own budgetary constraints. Brazil’s robust economic growth and responsible global track record make it an attractive defense customer from Washington’s perspective. Brazil’s GDP in current dollars grew from $558 billion in 2000 to $1.78 trillion in 2010, a roughly 220 percent increase over the decade. Brazil is also wealthy relative to other large rising powers. As the world’s fifth-most-populous country, its GDP per capita is nearly equal to China and India’s combined. Brazil is already looking to purchase 36 multirole combat aircraft at a cost of $4 billion to $7 billion. The U.S.-based Boeing Corporation’s F/A-18 Super Hornet is competing with the French Rafale and Swedish Gripen for the contract. With Brazil’s decision expected in the coming weeks, Panetta wasn’t bashful in pushing for the Super Hornet during his trip, stating, “With the Super Hornet, Brazil's defense and aviation industries would be able to transform their partnerships with U.S. companies and . . . plug into worldwide markets." Second, by expanding its participation in international security operations, Brazil can help free up U.S. forces for the Western Pacific. The most obvious roles for the Brazilian military are in hemispheric security and patrolling the Atlantic Ocean. The latter is especially crucial as Washington stations more of its shrinking fleet in the Pacific. Interestingly, last week Panetta also said the U.S. wants Brazil to play a larger role in training African security forces. While the defense secretary justified this on the basis of Brazil’s historical ties to Africa -- Brazil was the largest destination of the Atlantic Slave Trade -- the main driver of U.S. policy is its pivot to Asia. Since the attacks of Sept. 11, U.S. Marines have taken the lead in training African partner nations for counterterrorism operations. With the U.S. looking to station more of its Marines in Asia, even as terrorist groups flourish in Africa, Washington needs others to perform this role. Once again, the Obama administration sees Brazil as a viable candidate.

#### Successful Asia pivot solves China war.

Friedberg 11 Princeton IA professor, 9-4-11, (Aaron L., “China’s Challenge at Sea,” http://www.nytimes.com/2011/09/05/opinion/chinas-challenge-at-sea.html?\_r=1, accessed 9-30-11)

If the United States and its Asian friends look to their own defenses and coordinate their efforts, there is no reason they cannot maintain a favorable balance of power, even as China’s strength grows. But if they fail to respond to China’s buildup, there is a danger that Beijing could miscalculate, throw its weight around and increase the risk of confrontation and even armed conflict. Indeed, China’s recent behavior in disputes over resources and maritime boundaries with Japan and the smaller states that ring the South China Sea suggest that this already may be starting to happen. Many of China’s neighbors are more willing than they were in the past to ignore Beijing’s complaints, increase their own defense spending and work more closely with one another and the United States. They are unlikely, however, to do those things unless they are convinced that America remains committed. Washington does not have to shoulder the entire burden of preserving the Asian power balance, but it must lead.

#### Otherwise, it goes nuclear.

Glaser 11 GW University Political Science Professor, 11 (Charles, HARLES GLASER is Professor of Political Science and International Affairs and Director of the Institute for Security and Conflict Studies at the Elliott School of International Affairs at George Washington University., "Will China's Rise Lead to War? ", Foreign Affairs, Mar/April 2011, Vol. 90, Issue 2, factiva, accessed 11-9-11, )

The prospects for avoiding intense military competition and war may be good, but growth in China's power may nevertheless require some changes in U.S. foreign policy that Washington will find disagreeable- particularly regarding Taiwan. Although it lost control of Taiwan during the Chinese Civil War more than six decades ago, China still considers Taiwan to be part of its homeland, and unification remains a key political goal for Beijing. China has made clear that it will use force if Taiwan declares independence, and much of China's conventional military buildup has been dedicated to increasing its ability to coerce Taiwan and reducing the United States' ability to intervene. Because China places such high value on Taiwan and because the United States and China-whatever they might formally agree to-have such different attitudes regarding the legitimacy of the status quo, the issue poses special dangers and challenges for the U.S.-Chinese relationship, placing it in a different category than Japan or South Korea. A crisis over Taiwan could fairly easily escalate to nuclear war, because each step along the way might well seem rational to the actors involved. Current U.S. policy is designed to reduce the probability that Taiwan will declare independence and to make clear that the United States will not come to Taiwan's aid if it does. Nevertheless, the United States would find itself under pressure to protect Taiwan against any sort of attack, no matter how it originated. Given the different interests and perceptions of the various parties and the limited control Washington has over Taipei's behavior, a crisis could unfold in which the United States found itself following events rather than leading them. Such dangers have been around for decades, but ongoing improvements in China's military capabilities may make Beijing more willing to escalate a Taiwan crisis. In addition to its improved conventional capabilities, China is modernizing its nuclear forces to increase their ability to survive and retaliate following a large-scale U.S. attack. Standard deterrence theory holds that Washington's current ability to destroy most or all of China's nuclear force enhances its bargaining position. China's nuclear modernization might remove that check on Chinese action, leading Beijing to behave more boldly in future crises than it has in past ones. A U.S. attempt to preserve its ability to defend Taiwan, meanwhile, could fuel a conventional and nuclear arms race. Enhancements to U.S. offensive targeting capabilities and strategic ballistic missile defenses might be interpreted by China as a signal of malign U.S. motives, leading to further Chinese military efforts and a general poisoning of U.S.-Chinese relations.

## Section 110(5) CP
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#### The United States Federal Government should repeal Section 110(5) of the US Copyright Act.

#### That solves WTO – at worst it’s a massive alt cause

Their author, New, 3/26/2013 (William – Intellectual Property Watch, United States Chided As TRIPS Scofflaw at WTO, Intellectual Property Watch, p. <http://www.ip-watch.org/2013/03/26/united-states-chided-as-trips-scofflaw-at-wto/>)

For instance, Cuba said the recently announced US-European Union trade agreement contains the goal of “maintaining and promoting a high level of protection” of IPRs, and said this bilateral trade agreement should be “critically question[ed].” Even the 27-member European Union weighed in on the Section 211 case, thanking the US for its report and adding the hope that “US authorities will very soon take steps towards implementing the DSB ruling and resolve this matter.” The EU also urged that the US comply with another IP case – Section 110(5) of the US Copyright Act – which involved the US commercial practice of playing music recordings, such as Irish music, aloud in bars without paying royalties. “We refer to our previous statements that we would like to resolve this case as soon as possible,” the EU said. Venezuela joined Cuba in condemning the United States for its failure to comply with the rum case, and raised deep concerns about a continued lack of action. “This situation is unacceptable, disappointing, and worrying, not only because it affects a developing country member of this organisation, but also for the grave repercussions against the credibility of DSB and the multilateral system of trade,” Venezuela said in its statement (unofficial translation).

## Regional Commitment Conditions CP
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#### [CP TEXT: The United States federal government ought to offer to repeal Section 211 of the Omnibus Appropriations Act of 1998 if, and only if, the governments of Brazil, Chile and Mexico agree to commit to actively seeking a naturalization process between the United States and Cuba, and to compelling the Cuban government to work towards establishing representative democracy and better respect for human rights.]

#### Conditioning economic ties on Brazilian, Chilean and Mexican commitment to Cuban democratization solves the case and avoids political backlash – the plan’s unconditional end to the embargo kills Latin American democracy.

Jorge G. Castañeda, 4-21-2009, professor at New York University and fellow at the New America Foundation, was Mexico's foreign minister from 2000 to 2003, “The Right Deal on Cuba,” <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB124027198023237151.html>

The question of what to do about the embargo has once again cornered an American president. If President Barack Obama lifts the embargo unilaterally, he will send a message to the Castros and the rest of Latin America that human rights and democracy are not his bailiwick. Furthermore, he lacks the votes in the Senate to do so, unless he obtains an explicit Cuban quid pro quo, which Raúl Castro cannot grant him, especially with his brother back in charge. Conversely, if Mr. Obama limits change to the recently announced freer flow of remittances and family visits to the island, Democrats in the House, Latin American leaders, and the Castros will remain unsatisfied. And if he insists on political change as a precondition for lifting the embargo, Mr. Obama would be pursuing the policy that his last 10 predecessors have fruitlessly followed. There might be a way to square the circle. It begins with a unilateral end to the embargo: Nothing is expected from Cuba. But in exchange for eliminating the embargo, key Latin American players would be expected to commit to actively seeking a normalization process between Washington and Havana, and to forcing Cuba to establish representative democracy and respect for human rights. As democrats who experienced authoritarian rule and sought international support in their struggle against it, leaders like Brazilian President Lula da Silva, Chilean President Michelle Bachelet, and Mexican President Felipe Calderón have been incredibly cynical and irresponsible about Cuba. Mr. Calderón and Ms. Bachelet have forsaken their commitment to democracy and human rights in order to accommodate the left wing. Mr. da Silva, despite having been jailed by the military dictatorship in the early 1980s, has pursued the traditional Brazilian policy of avoiding controversy. By nudging the Latin leaders toward a principled stance, Mr. Obama would turn the tables. This policy would give the Cubans what they say they want: an unconditional end to the embargo, the beginning of a negotiation process, and perhaps even access to international financial institutions' funds. The Latin American leaders would get a major concession from the new administration on a highly symbolic issue. And human-rights defenders in Latin America and elsewhere would see their concerns regarding free elections, freedom of the press, freedom of association, and the liberation of political prisoners addressed as a demand from Cuba's friends -- not as an imposition from Washington. Mr. Obama would look great, since U.S. policy would shift in exchange for Latin leaders' dedication to principles like democracy and human rights that he and they espouse. A clear commitment from Latin leaders to a normalization that would not follow the Vietnamese course (economic reform with no political change) would be a major foreign policy victory for Mr. Obama.

#### Latin America-led push for hemispheric democracy is critical for global democracy – Cuba’s a key starting point.

Carl Gershman, 10-12-2012, President, the National Endowment for Democracy, Address in the Congress of the Republic of Peru, “Latin America and the Worldwide Movement for Democracy,” <http://www.ned.org/about/board/meet-our-president/archived-presentations-and-articles/latin-america-and-the-worldwide-m>

I believe that the defense of democracy in Latin America must come from within. It needs the effective support of the United States, of course. But the lead must come from within Latin America, and for that there must be a clear and consistent Latin American voice for the defense of democracy in the hemisphere. Peru can be that voice, and it can help mobilize others in Latin America to defend and support democracy. It has the legitimacy to do this, and it has the experience, given its own long struggle for democracy, especially its effort to achieve political and economic inclusion of the poor and it success in achieving reconciliation after violent conflict. So let us build a new partnership for democracy in the hemisphere, a partnership of democracies. In holding its Seventh Assembly in Peru, the World Movement for Democracy is making a statement that what happens in Peru is important for democracy in Latin America, and that the steady but uncertain democratic progress in Latin America has important meaning for the future of democracy in the world. The struggles for democracy that have occurred in this hemisphere were not isolated events. They were, as Professor Huntington said, part of a global wave, drawing influence from earlier democratic struggles and from developments in other regions, and in turn influencing events taking place elsewhere and at a later time. Moreover, this process was not just the unfolding of objective forces but involved real people with ideas, aspirations, and a sense of their own dignity. While assuming responsibility for their own fate, they also asked for and expected the solidarity of others in their own country and beyond, especially those fortunate enough to enjoy the benefits of human freedom. Peru can and, I think, should give that kind of solidarity. It can give it to the troubled countries of Central America, as well as to people who are fighting for democracy in Cuba and Venezuela and in the neighboring countries of Ecuador and Bolivia.

#### Democracy solves extinction.

Larry Diamond, 1995, senior fellow at the Hoover Institution, December 1995, Promoting Democracy in the 1990s, http://wwics.si.edu/subsites/ccpdc/pubs/di/1.htm

OTHER THREATS This hardly exhausts the lists of threats to our security and well-being in the coming years and decades. In the former Yugoslavia nationalist aggression tears at the stability of Europe and could easily spread. The flow of illegal drugs intensifies through increasingly powerful international crime syndicates that have made common cause with authoritarian regimes and have utterly corrupted the institutions of tenuous, democratic ones. Nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons continue to proliferate. The very source of life on Earth, the global ecosystem, appears increasingly endangered. Most of these new and unconventional threats to security are associated with or aggravated by the weakness or absence of democracy, with its provisions for legality, accountability, popular sovereignty, and openness. LESSONS OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY The experience of this century offers important lessons. Countries that govern themselves in a truly democratic fashion do not go to war with one another. They do not aggress against their neighbors to aggrandize themselves or glorify their leaders. Democratic governments do not ethnically "cleanse" their own populations, and they are much less likely to face ethnic insurgency. Democracies do not sponsor terrorism against one another. They do not build weapons of mass destruction to use on or to threaten one another. Democratic countries form more reliable, open, and enduring trading partnerships. In the long run they offer better and more stable climates for investment. They are more environmentally responsible because they must answer to their own citizens, who organize to protest the destruction of their environments. They are better bets to honor international treaties since they value legal obligations and because their openness makes it much more difficult to breach agreements in secret. Precisely because, within their own borders, they respect competition, civil liberties, property rights, and the rule of law, democracies are the only reliable foundation on which a new world order of international security and prosperity can be built.

## WTO Advantage

### 1NC – WTO ADV

#### Turn – drawing attention to the WTO dispute mechanism erodes support for the WTO, international law, and multilateralism.

Alter – ‘3 – assistant professor of political science, Northwestern University, member of the Council on Foreign Relations (Karen J. Alter, July 2003, “Resolving or exacerbating disputes? The WTO’s new dispute resolution system,” International Affairs 79.4, Blackwell Synergy)

At their best, international legal mechanisms facilitate the peaceful resolution of disputes and have a prophylactic effect, encouraging political actors to think about how their actions might hold up if scrutinized by a third party, such as the court. But there is a problem inherent in the international legal process that raises the question of whether this trend towards using legal bodies to enforce international rules is a positive development. Put simply: the political-judicial balance that at the domestic level allows legal bodies to offer independent and authoritative rulings, while keeping courts in harmony with political sentiment, does not work well at the international level. International courts are more likely than most courts to generate conflict, yet the international legal and political system is less able to respond in a timely manner to address valid public concerns. Left unaddressed, these concerns can erode support for the international legal system and multilateral strategies in general. / The new dispute mechanism of the World Trade Organization (WTO) is a case in point. The WTO’s dispute resolution mechanism was reformed in 1995, as part of the Uruguay Round, to make it more effective in enforcing WTO trade rules. Ironically, the greater ability to enforce WTO rules has contributed directly to the political difficulties the WTO currently faces. From the transatlantic trade wars over bananas and beer with hormones to the pressure on developing countries to respect intellectual property rights and to allow non-governmental organizations to participate more in WTO proceedings, dispute resolution rulings have given groups on the left and the right of the political spectrum, and in the North and South of the international political system, reason to be deeply unhappy and united in opposition to the WTO. The enhanced dispute resolution system is not the only reason protestors are fighting globalization in the streets of Seattle, Sydney, and elsewhere; but the issues provoked by the dispute resolution process have mobilized opposition, and shaped the demands of many countries in negotiations in the Doha trade round. How can improving a system of resolve disputes actually exacerbate conflict?

#### No internal link to WTO impacts – even if trade is good the Copley evidence is terrible and does not warrant it’s nuclear war claim – the argument is empirically denied because nuclear weapons existed for almost half a century before the WTO came into existence and escalation never occurred.

#### No trade wars – talks won’t end

**Blustein,** Washington Post Writer, **’08** (Paul, “Don’t Trade Recession for Depression”, December 07, 2008, <http://articles.washingtonpost.com/2008-12-07/opinions/36838817_1_trade-barriers-doha-talks-protectionism/2>, accessed 7/24/13, JF)

The complete termination of global trade talks is unthinkable. Nothing of the sort has happened since the '30s. Previous trade rounds had very dark moments, too: The Uruguay Round, which was finalized in 1994, took eight years. One way or another, the Doha Round will get done eventually. Those sentiments are articles of faith among many trade experts. Experience has taught them that, in the end, the self-interest of the community of nations in preserving the multilateral trading system always prevails. They are probably right. But the risk that they might be proven wrong this time looks uncomfortably high.

#### Cred low now – DOHA talks failed

**Blustein, Foreign Policy, 10** (Paul, “RIP WTO: Why 2010 could mark the death of the global trade system as we know it”, January/February 2010, <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/01/04/rip_wto>, accessed 7/25/13, JF)

Someday historians may look back on 2010 as the year the global trade system died -- or contracted a terminal illness. A pledge by world leaders to complete the Doha round of global trade negotiations this year looks increasingly likely to end in yet another flop, and that would deal a crushing blow to the trade system as we know it. Of course, commerce will continue across national borders, and one-off deals between countries will still happen. But the slow-but-steady, across-the-board opening of markets that has fueled growth for decades is grinding to a halt. After eight painful years of standstill and failure, with each meeting just a shoveling of intractable problems forward to the next, the Doha talks might collapse once and for all in 2010, possibly taking the World Trade Organization (WTO) down in the process. Yes, negotiators could once again defer the day of reckoning by setting a new deadline and resolving to try again later -- just as they've already done in Cancún, Geneva (three times), Hong Kong, and Potsdam. But they're running out of chances. No less an authority than Stuart Harbinson, the former WTO General Council chairman who played a key role in the round's launch in 2001, wrote recently: "This time ... the crisis is real. Too many deadlines have come and gone and the WTO simply cannot afford a repeat. The fundamental credibility of the institution is now at stake ... 2010 is a real deadline."

Trade does not solve war—there’s no correlation between trade and peace

MARTIN et al ‘8 (Phillipe, University of Paris 1 Pantheon—Sorbonne, Paris School of Economics, and Centre for Economic Policy Research; Thierry MAYER, University of Paris 1 Pantheon—Sorbonne, Paris School of Economics, CEPII, and Centre for Economic Policy Research, Mathias THOENIG, University of Geneva and Paris School of Economics, The Review of Economic Studies 75)

Does globalization pacify international relations? The “liberal” view in political science argues that increasing trade flows and the spread of free markets and democracy should limit the incentive to use military force in interstate relations. This vision, which can partly be traced back to Kant’s Essay on Perpetual Peace (1795), has been very influential: The main objective of the European trade integration process was to prevent the killing and destruction of the two World Wars from ever happening again.1 Figure 1 suggests2 however, that during the 1870–2001 period, the correlation between trade openness and military conflicts is not a clear cut one. The first era of globalization, at the end of the 19th century, was a period of rising trade openness and multiple military conflicts, culminating with World War I. Then, the interwar period was characterized by a simultaneous collapse of world trade and conflicts. After World War II, world trade increased rapidly, while the number of conflicts decreased (although the risk of a global conflict was obviously high). There is no clear evidence that the 1990s, during which trade flows increased dramatically, was a period of lower prevalence of military conflicts, even taking into account the increase in the number of sovereign states.

Trade conflicts won’t escalate

NYE ‘96 (Joseph, Dean of the Kennedy School of Government – Harvard University, Washington Quarterly, Winter)

The low likelihood of direct great power clashes does not mean that there will be no tensions between them. Disagreements are likely to continue over regional conflicts, like those that have arisen over how to deal with the conflict in the former Yugoslavia. Efforts to stop the spread of weapons of mass destruction and means of their delivery are another source of friction, as is the case over Russian and Chinese nuclear cooperation with Iran, which the United States steadfastly opposes. The sharing of burdens and responsibilities for maintaining international security and protecting the natural environment are a further subject of debate among the great powers. Furthermore, in contrast to the views of classical Liberals, increased trade and economic interdependence can increase as well as decrease conflict and competition among trading partners. The main point, however, is that such disagreements are very unlikely to escalate to military conflicts.

#### Increased trade has no effect on decreasing risk of conflict between nations – prefer stats

Gelpi and Greico 5 [Chris, Joseph, Associate Professor and Professor of Political Science, Duke University, “Democracy, Interdependence, and the Sources of the Liberal Peace”, Journal of Peace Research]

As we have already emphasized, increasing levels of trade between an autocratic and democratic country are unlikely to constrain the former from initiating militarized disputes against the latter. As depicted in Figure 1, our analysis indicates that an increase in trade dependence by an autocratic challenger on a democratic target from zero to 5% of the former's GDP would increase the probability of the challenger’s dispute initiation from about 0.31% to 0.29%. Thus, the overall probability of dispute initiation by an autocratic country against a democracy is fairly high (given the rarity of disputes) at 23 nearly .3% per country per year. Moreover, increased trade does little or nothing to alter that risk. Increases in trade dependence also have little effect on the likelihood that one autocracy will initiate a conflict with another. In this instance, the probability of dispute initiation remains constant at 0.33% regardless of the challenger’s level of trade dependence.

## IP Leadership Advantage

### 1NC – IP Leadership ADV

#### Biotech expansion leads to better bioterrorism – more effective weapons and diverse users

**Huang 11** (Yanzhong, Senior Fellow @ Council on Foreign Relations and Associate Professor @ Whitehead School of Diplomacy and International Relations @ Seton Hall University, “Managing Biosecurity Threats in China,” Biosecurity and Bioterrorism: Biodefense Strategy, Practice, and Science, March 11 2011, Volume 9 Issue 1, accessed 12/6/11)

Furthermore, rapid advances in biotechnology allow for greater effectiveness in the actual use of better controlled and deadlier biological agents, which, according to a Chinese military researcher, ‘‘poses [China] a potential threat of the proliferation of more dangerous biological weapons.’’ 27(p73) In addition to this ‘‘vertical progression,’’ horizontal proliferation of bioscience sectors multiplies the diversity of people trained and engaged in biotech research, increasing the likelihood of scientists becoming terrorists or being willing to share or sell their know-how to potential bio-offenders.

#### Bolstered biotech industry will concentrate on creating new genetically modified foods

**Inter Press Service 99** (Danielle Knight, reporter for US News and World Report and other reputable sources, “Biotech, Help or Harm to Developing Countries?” October 22, 1999, printed in the South-North Development Monitor, http://www.twnside.org.sg/title/harm-cn.htm, accessed 12/6/11)

With the world's population now at six billion, the biotech industry proclaimed that the new technology offered important new tools in boosting food output and feeding the burgeoning population. The application of biotechnology held great potential for creating plants that were more drought resistant, more tolerant to poor soil, and more resistant to pests without pesticides, according to company officials. But, opponents of the technology said hunger was not due to overpopulation but rather the unequal distribution of economic resources. They said more tests were needed to ensure that biologically-engineered crops harmed neither health nor the environment.

#### That causes antibiotic resistance, turns pandemic strains

**Pusztai 01** (Arpad, Ph.D., worked with several universities on genetically modified crop research and has published about 300 primary peer-reviewed papers, “Genetically Modified Foods: Are They a Risk to Human/Animal Health?” June 2001, http://www.actionbioscience.org/biotech/pusztai.html, accessed 12/6/11)

GM foods may cause bacteria to become resistant to antibiotics. They can also produce allergies. Current testing methods need radical improvements. When food-crops are genetically modified, (“genetically modified” food is a misnomer!) one or more genes are incorporated into the crop’s genome using a vector containing several other genes, including as a minimum, viral promoters, transcription terminators, antibiotic resistance marker genes and reporter genes. Data on the safety of these are scarce even though they can affect the safety of the GM crop. For example: DNA does not always fully break down in the alimentary tract.3,4 Gut bacteria can take up genes and GM plasmids5 and this opens up the possibility of the spread of antibiotic resistance. Insertion of genes into the genome can also result in unintended effects, which need to be reduced/eliminated by selection, since some of the ways the inserted genes express themselves in the host or the way they affect the functioning of the crop’s own genes are unpredictable. This may lead to the development of unknown toxic/allergenic components, which we cannot analyze for and seriously limiting the selection criteria. Currently, toxicity in food is tested by chemical analysis of macro/micro nutrients and known toxins. To rely solely on this method is at best inadequate and, at worst, dangerous. Better diagnostic methods are needed, such as mRNA fingerprinting, proteomics and secondary metabolite profiling.6 However, consuming even minor constituents with high biological activity may have major effects on the gut and body’s metabolism, which can only be revealed from animal studies. Thus novel toxicological/nutritional methods are urgently needed to screen for harmful consequences on human/animal health and to pinpoint these before allowing a GM crop into the food chain.7

#### Biotech causes food shortages and kill earthworms

**Altieri 01** (Miguel, Ph.D., teaches agroecology @ UC Berkeley, “The Ecological Impacts of Agricultural Biotechnology,” February 2001, http://www.actionbioscience.org/biotech/altieri.html, accessed 12/6/11)

Toxins from GMCs remain active in the soil, decreasing soil fertility. There is long term persistence of insecticidal products (Bt and proteinase inhibitors) in soil. The insecticidal toxin produced by Bacillus thuringiensis subsp. kurskatki remain active in the soil, where it binds rapidly and tightly to clays and humic acids. The bound toxin retains its insecticidal properties and is protected against microbial degradation by being bound to soil particles, persisting in various soils for at least 234 days. The presence of the toxin in exudates from Bt corn and verified that it was active in an insecticidal bioassay using larvae of the tobacco hornworm. Given the persistence and the possible presence of exudates, there is potential for prolonged exposure of the microbial and invertebrate community to such toxins, and therefore studies should evaluate the effects of transgenic plants on both microbial and invertebrate communities and the ecological processes they mediate.3 If transgenic crops substantially alter soil biota and affect processes such as soil organic matter decomposition and mineralization, this would be of serious concern to organic farmers and most poor farmers in the developing world. These farmers cannot purchase or don’t want to use expensive chemical fertilizers. They rely instead on local residues, organic matter and especially soil organisms for soil fertility (e.g., key invertebrate, fungal or bacterial species) which can be affected by the soil bound toxin. Soil fertility could be dramatically reduced if crop leachates inhibit the activity of the soil biota and slow down natural rates of decomposition and nutrient release.

#### Earthworm loss causes extinction

Tompkin & Bird, ‘99 (Peter, and Christopher, no quals, “secrets of the sol,” taken from Microsoil, <http://www.microsoil.com/earthworm.htm>)

Only where you find earthworms will you find rich, healthy soil with high amounts of organic matter and vice versa. Earthworms simply cannot proliferate and flourish in areas where chemical fertilizers and pesticides are paramount. Earthworms, actually, act as a barometer for soil health. Many agriculture oriented people still do not understand or appreciate the tremendous enriching value that earthworms have on our soils. It took a French scientist and ecologist, André Voisin, author of the insightful Soil, Grass and Cancer, to point out that the earthworm, and in particular the slippery lumbricid, most common in the United States and Europe, is not only essential to good agriculture but is the very foundation of all civilization. In Better Grassland Sward, Voisin traces man's civilizations in relation to the distribution of active earthworms, of which he lists some three thousand species. Among the most ancient of terrestrial animal groups, several hundred million years old, they come in various colors and sizes: brown, purple, red, pink, blue, green and light tan, the smallest barely an inch long, the largest a ten-foot giant in Australia, though South African newspapers reported a boa-constrictor-sized monster twenty feet long, a yard wide through the middle. The most common European and American earthworm, Lumbricus terrestris, grows barely longer than six inches. Ten thousand years ago, immediately after the last ice age,the lumbricid earthworms were to be found only in certain restricted areas of the planet, such as in the valleys of three great civilizations - the Indus, the Euphrates, and the Nile - where crops grew almost without cultivation in a soil of immensely fruitful richness. As Jerry Minnich points out in The Earthworm Book, other areas of the earth offered ideal climates and rich soils, but produced, with the exception of China, no such civilizations. The Egyptian experience alone, says Minnich, is strong indication that a complex civilization cannot develop until the basic agricultural needs of its people are met, and that requires the earthworm. Not that the point was entirely overlooked by the USDA. an agricultural report on investigations carried out in the valley of the Nile in 1949, before the folly of the Aswan Dam, indicated that the great fertility of the soil was due in large part the work of earthworms. It was estimated that during the six months of active growing season each year the castings of earthworms on these soils amounted to a stunning 120 tons per acre, and in each handful of that soil are more microorganisms than there are humans on the planet. Thirty years before the birth of Darwin, as the American colonists were breaking away from the mother country, an English naturalist, Gilbert White, was writing: Worms seem to be the great promoters of vegetation, perforating and loosening the soil, rendering it to pervious to rains and the fibers of plants by drawing straws and stalks of leaves and twigs into it; and, most of all, by throwing up such infinite numbers of lumps of earth called worm-casts, which being their excrement, is a fine manure for grain and grass…. The earth without worms would soon become cold, hard-bound and void of fermentation and consequently sterile. That the phenomenon was understood before the time of Christ is clear from Cleopatra's decree that the earthworm be revered and protected by all her subjects as a sacred animal. Egyptians were forbidden to remove it from the land, and farmers were not to trouble the worms for fear of stunting the renowned fertility of the Nilotic valley's soil.

#### Price spikes cause global instability – collapses Russia and China – highest risk of war.

Matthey Lynn, 1-26-2013, financial journalist based in London, “Food prices may be catalyst for 2013 revolutions,” <http://www.marketwatch.com/story/food-prices-may-be-catalyst-for-2013-revolutions-2013-01-16>

LONDON (MarketWatch) — What is the trigger for a revolution? Sometimes it a brutal act of repression. Sometimes it a lost war, or a natural catastrophe, that exposes the failings of a regime. But more often than not, it is soaring food prices. The easiest prediction to make for 2013 is that everything we eat will once again rise sharply in price. So where will the revolutions start this year? Keep an eye on Algeria and Greece — and if you want to feel very nervous, Russia and China. And if you are smart, keep your money out of those countries as well. The link between the cost of feeding your family and political turmoil is too well-established to be ignored. We saw it most recently with the Arab Spring of 2011. The uprisings that deposed the autocracies of the Middle East had their roots in food inflation. Most of the Middle East countries import 50% or more of their food, making them acutely vulnerable to rising commodity prices. In Egypt the food inflation rate hit 19% in early 2011. For President Hosni Mubarak that was game over. The regime was finished. It goes back much further than that, however. Failed harvests in France in 1788 and 1789 meant that the cost of bread soared. From taking 50% of the average working man’s wages it went up to 88%. The result? The French Revolution. The economists Helge Berger and Mark Spoerer have pinned the European revolutions of 1848 on the soaring price of wheat. Likewise, a shortage of food and soaring prices led to strikes in Petrograd in 1917 — and sparked the Russian Revolution. So there isn’t any question that food inflation can create revolts. There are other factors at play as well, of course. The Swiss don’t take to the barricades when the price of fondue goes through the roof. It usually takes a repressive regime, a rising middle class, a lot of unemployment and an aging leader who has gotten out of touch to complete the picture. But soaring food prices are often the spark: once that is lit, the flames take hold. Nor can it be disputed that food is rising in price right now. The U.S. is set to have a poor harvest this year because of a widespread drought. So will Russia and the Ukraine, both massive wheat producers. Europe, not a particularly major agricultural power, had the opposite problem. Too much rain, even by drizzly British standards, has wreaked havoc on basic crops such as potatoes. The price of chips is now going through the roof right across Europe. In France, for example, potato prices have gone from $40 a ton to $330, an eight-fold increase. Other major food markets are just as bad. Corn and soybean prices already hit record highs last year, and, even if they have fallen back a little in recent weeks, they could easily start climbing again in the summer. The United Nations food agency has already warned that 2013 is likely to see dangerous rises in food prices. That comes against the backdrop of an increasing long-term shortage of food. A surge in global population and the increasing wealth of many developing nations — richer people eat more, and they eat more meat as well, which increases demand for animal feed — means the long term trend in food is upwards. Against that backdrop, it doesn’t take much tightening of supply to send prices rocketing. So if you figure that rising food prices create revolts, and prices will rocket this year, then where might we see political turmoil? It is a question that matters to investors, because a revolution means a collapse in stock-markets. Just take a look at Egypt in 2011 — the Cairo index plunged from 7,200 to 3,600 as the regime fell. If the revolt is big enough, markets may tumble globally. Algeria is one obvious candidate. It was the one country that didn’t get caught up in the Arab Spring. But it has many of the same issues as Libya and Egypt. Don’t be surprised to see demonstrations on the streets there. Morocco may well get caught up in the turmoil. And food shortages may spell the end for President Bashar Assad in Syria. Greece is the second possibility. Unemployment is now at 27%. Many people are on the breadline — and bread is about to get a lot costlier. There are increasing reports of people having to rely on food handout in Athens and other major cities. Taxes are constantly being pushed higher to meet the deficit targets and wages are still being cut and jobs slashed. More expensive food could easily be the spark for an extremist party to seize power and take the country out of the euro. More worrying still, Russia. There have already been protests against the autocratic rule of Vladimir Putin. Rising grain prices have toppled Russian leaders in the past — Putin could follow the czars into oblivion. It is the Russian grain harvest that has been especially badly hit, and this is still a country where poverty is widespread. Putin has stayed in power thanks to rising living standards. If they drop, his regime will be under pressure. Or, most seriously of all, China. It has grown much richer, but there are millions and millions of people who have moved to the new cities — if they start to go hungry that could prompt a wave of rebellions. Cold weather is playing havoc with food supplies there. Usually, it could import more food if it needed it. But this year that won’t be possible — or at least only at huge cost. Minor revolts in the Middle East don’t have the potential to knock more than local markets. Egypt was the major stock market in the region, and that has already been through a regime change. But a Greek exit from the euro, or a Russian or Chinese political rebellion, would massively destabilize the global economy — and send equity, bond and currency markets into turmoil. Whichever nation it is, it looks like food may be the most likely cause of turmoil in the markets this year.

#### Enforcing IPRs kills small farms around the world

Devlin Kuyek, 3-01-2001, “Intellectual Property Rights,” <http://www.grain.org/article/entries/30-intellectual-property-rights-ultimate-control-of-agricultural-r-d-in-asia>

Intellectual property rights (IPRs) and plant breeding have, historically, had nothing to do with each other. In Asia, and much of the South, patents were never allowed on life forms because of ethics, colonial legacies and the threat that statutory monopolies in the health and food sectors pose to peoples’ basic needs. Until recently, industrialized countries also excluded living organisms from intellectual property (IP) regimes. Unlike manufactured products, biological material was considered the realm of nature and therefore regarded as a "discovery", not an invention. Besides, living organisms reproduce themselves, so the tenets of IP law would need to be bent to suit their characteristics. But with the dawn of the hybrid seed industry and, later, the biotechnology-driven life sciences industry, plant breeding has become big business and those businesses want exclusive rights to their research results. By the mid-1900s, some industrialized countries began to offer limited forms of plant variety protection (PVP) to breeders of new crop varieties. PVP was constructed as a so-called "alternative" to patenting that would supposedly be attuned to the needs of agriculture. It guaranteed breeders a commercial monopoly on the use of their varieties while leaving loopholes open for farmers and other breeders. Since then, both those loopholes have been tightened up drastically

and industry is pressuring governments to provide full scale patent rights on any form of tinkering with the very stuff of life. Today, with the breeding sector dominated by a few mega-corporations, patents on plants and livestock, and draconian restrictions on farmers, are the norm in most industrialized nations. Asia has followed a different path, but it appears increasingly likely that it will meet the same end.

#### Small farms prevent extinction

Altieri 8 [Professor of agroecology @ University of California, Berkeley. [Miguel Altieri (President, Sociedad Cientifica LatinoAmericana de Agroecologia (SOCLA), “Small farms as a planetary ecological asset: Five key reasons why we should support the revitalization of small farms in the Global South,” Food First, Posted May 9th, 2008, pg. http://www.foodfirst.org/en/node/2115]

The Via Campesina has long argued that farmers need land to produce food for their own communities and for their country and for this reason has advocated for genuine agrarian reforms to access and control land, water, agrobiodiversity, etc, which are of central importance for communities to be able to meet growing food demands. The Via Campesina believes that in order to protect livelihoods, jobs, people's food security and health, as well as the environment, food production has to remain in the hands of small- scale sustainable farmers and cannot be left under the control of large agribusiness companies or supermarket chains. Only by changing the export-led, free-trade based, industrial agriculture model of large farms can the downward spiral of poverty, low wages, rural-urban migration, hunger and environmental degradation be halted. Social rural movements embrace the concept of food sovereignty as an alternative to the neo-liberal approach that puts its faith in inequitable international trade to solve the world’s food problem. Instead, food sovereignty focuses on local autonomy, local markets, local production-consumption cycles, energy and technological sovereignty and farmer to farmer networks.¶ This global movement, the Via Campesina, has recently brought their message to the North, partly to gain the support of foundations and consumers, as political pressure from a wealthier public that increasingly depends on unique food products from the South marketed via organic, fair trade, or slow food channels could marshal the sufficient political will to curb the expansion of biofuels, transgenic crops and agro-exports, and put an end to subsidies to industrial farming and dumping practices that hurt small farmers in the South. But can these arguments really captivate the attention and support of northern consumers and philanthropists? Or is there a need for a different argument—one that emphasizes that the very quality of life and food security of the populations in the North depends not only on the food products, but in the ecological services provided by small farms of the South. In fact, it is herein argued that the functions performed by small farming systems still prevalent in Africa, Asia and Latin America—in the post-peak oil era that humanity is entering—comprise an ecological asset for humankind and planetary survival. In fact, in an era of escalating fuel and food costs, climate change, environmental degradation, GMO pollution and corporate- dominated food systems, small, biodiverse, agroecologically managed farms in the Global South are the only viable form of agriculture that will feed the world under the new ecological and economic scenario.¶ There are at last five reasons why it is in the interest of Northern consumers to support the cause and struggle of small farmers in the South:¶ 1. Small farmers are key for the world’s food security¶ While 91% of the planet’s 1.5 billion hectares of agricultural land are increasingly being devoted to agro-export crops, biofuels and transgenic soybean to feed cars and cattle, millions of small farmers in the Global South still produce the majority of staple crops needed to feed the planet’s rural and urban populations. In Latin America, about 17 million peasant production units occupying close to 60.5 million hectares, or 34.5% of the total cultivated land with average farm sizes of about 1.8 hectares, produce 51% of the maize, 77% of the beans, and 61% of the potatoes for domestic consumption. Africa has approximately 33 million small farms, representing 80 percent of all farms in the region. Despite the fact that Africa now imports huge amounts of cereals, the majority of African farmers (many of them women) who are smallholders with farms below 2 hectares, produce a significant amount of basic food crops with virtually no or little use of fertilizers and improved seed. In Asia, the majority of more than 200 million rice farmers, few farm more than 2 hectares of rice make up the bulk of the rice produced by Asian small farmers. Small increases in yields on these small farms that produce most of the world´s staple crops will have far more impact on food availability at the local and regional levels, than the doubtful increases predicted for distant and corporate-controlled large monocultures managed with such high tech solutions as genetically modified seeds.¶ 2.Small farms are more productive and resource conserving than large-scale monocultures¶ Although the conventional wisdom is that small family farms are backward and unproductive, research shows that small farms are much more productive than large farms if total output is considered rather than yield from a single crop. Integrated farming systems in which the small-scale farmer produces grains, fruits, vegetables, fodder, and animal products out-produce yield per unit of single crops such as corn (monocultures) on large-scale farms. A large farm may produce more corn per hectare than a small farm in which the corn is grown as part of a polyculture that also includes beans, squash, potato, and fodder. In polycultures developed by smallholders, productivity, in terms of harvestable products, per unit area is higher than under sole cropping with the same level of management. Yield advantages range from 20 percent to 60 percent, because polycultures reduce losses due to weeds, insects and diseases, and make more efficient use of the available resources of water, light and nutrients. In overall output, the diversified farm produces much more food, even if measured in dollars. In the USA, data shows that the smallest two hectare farms produced $15,104 per hectare and netted about $2,902 per acre. The largest farms, averaging 15,581 hectares, yielded $249 per hectare and netted about $52 per hectare. Not only do small to medium sized farms exhibit higher yields than conventional farms, but do so with much lower negative impact on the environment. Small farms are ‘multi-functional’– more productive, more efficient, and contribute more to economic development than do large farms. Communities surrounded by many small farms have healthier economies than do communities surrounded by depopulated, large mechanized farms. Small farmers also take better care of natural resources, including reducing soil erosion and conserving biodiversity.¶ The inverse relationship between farm size and output can be attributed to the more efficient use of land, water, biodiversity and other agricultural resources by small farmers. So in terms of converting inputs into outputs, society would be better off with small-scale farmers. Building strong rural economies in the Global South based on productive small-scale farming will allow the people of the South to remain with their families and will help to stem the tide of migration. And as population continues to grow and the amount of farmland and water available to each person continues to shrink, a small farm structure may become central to feeding the planet, especially when large- scale agriculture devotes itself to feeding car tanks.¶ 3. Small traditional and biodiverse farms are models of sustainability¶ Despite the onslaught of industrial farming, the persistence of thousands of hectares under traditional agricultural management documents a successful indigenous agricultural strategy of adaptability and resiliency. These microcosms of traditional agriculture that have stood the test of time, and that can still be found almost untouched since 4 thousand years in the Andes, MesoAmerica, Southeast Asia and parts of Africa, offer promising models of sustainability as they promote biodiversity, thrive without agrochemicals, and sustain year-round yields even under marginal environmental conditions. The local knowledge accumulated during millennia and the forms of agriculture and agrobiodiversity that this wisdom has nurtured, comprise a Neolithic legacy embedded with ecological and cultural resources of fundamental value for the future of humankind.¶ Recent research suggests that many small farmers cope and even prepare for climate change, minimizing crop failure through increased use of drought tolerant local varieties, water harvesting, mixed cropping, opportunistic weeding, agroforestry and a series of other traditional techniques. Surveys conducted in hillsides after Hurricane Mitch in Central America showed that farmers using sustainable practices such as “mucuna” cover crops, intercropping, and agroforestry suffered less “damage” than their conventional neighbors. The study spanning 360 communities and 24 departments in Nicaragua, Honduras and Guatemala showed that diversified plots had 20% to 40% more topsoil, greater soil moisture, less erosion, and experienced lower economic losses than their conventional neighbors.¶ This demonstrates that a re-evaluation of indigenous technology can serve as a key source of information on adaptive capacity and resilient capabilities exhibited by small farms—features of strategic importance for world farmers to cope with climatic change. In addition, indigenous technologies often reflect a worldview and an understanding of our relationship to the natural world that is more realistic and more sustainable that those of our Western European heritage.¶ 4. Small farms represent a sanctuary of GMO-free agrobiodiversity¶ In general, traditional small scale farmers grow a wide variety of cultivars . Many of these plants are landraces grown from seed passed down from generation to generation, more genetically heterogeneous than modern cultivars, and thus offering greater defenses against vulnerability and enhancing harvest security in the midst of diseases, pests, droughts and other stresses. In a worldwide survey of crop varietal diversity on farms involving 27 crops, scientists found that considerable crop genetic diversity continues to be maintained on farms in the form of traditional crop varieties, especially of major staple crops. In most cases, farmers maintain diversity as an insurance to meet future environmental change or social and economic needs. Many researchers have concluded that this varietal richness enhances productivity and reduces yield variability. For example, studies by plant pathologists provide evidence that mixing of crop species and or varieties can delay the onset of diseases by reducing the spread of disease carrying spores, and by modifying environmental conditions so that they are less favorable to the spread of certain pathogens. Recent research in China, where four different mixtures of rice varieties grown by farmers from fifteen different townships over 3000 hectares, suffered 44% less blast incidence and exhibited 89% greater yield than homogeneous fields without the need to use chemicals.¶ It is possible that traits important to indigenous farmers (resistance to drought, competitive ability, performance on intercrops, storage quality, etc) could be traded for transgenic qualities which may not be important to farmers (Jordan, 2001). Under this scenario, risk could increase and farmers would lose their ability to adapt to changing biophysical environments and increase their success with relatively stable yields with a minimum of external inputs while supporting their communities’ food security.¶ Although there is a high probability that the introduction of transgenic crops will enter centers of genetic diversity, it is crucial to protect areas of peasant agriculture free of contamination from GMO crops, as traits important to indigenous farmers (resistance to drought, food or fodder quality, maturity, competitive ability, performance on intercrops, storage quality, taste or cooking properties, compatibility with household labor conditions, etc) could be traded for transgenic qualities (i.e. herbicide resistance) which are of no importance to farmers who don’t use agrochemicals . Under this scenario risk will increase and farmers will lose their ability to produce relatively stable yields with a minimum of external inputs under changing biophysical environments. The social impacts of local crop shortfalls, resulting from changes in the genetic integrity of local varieties due to genetic pollution, can be considerable in the margins of the Global South.¶ Maintaining pools of genetic diversity, geographically isolated from any possibility of cross fertilization or genetic pollution from uniform transgenic crops will create “islands” of intact germplasm which will act as extant safeguards against potential ecological failure derived from the second green revolution increasingly being imposed with programs such as the Gates-Rockefeller AGRA in Africa. These genetic sanctuary islands will serve as the only source of GMO-free seeds that will be needed to repopulate the organic farms in the North inevitably contaminated by the advance of transgenic agriculture. The small farmers and indigenous communities of the Global South, with the help of scientists and NGOs, can continue to create and guard biological and genetic diversity that has enriched the food culture of the whole planet.¶ 5. Small farms cool the climate¶ While industrial agriculture contributes directly to climate change through no less than one third of total emissions of the major greenhouse gases — Carbon dioxide (CO2), methane (CH4), and nitrous oxide (N2O), small, biodiverse organic farms have the opposite effect by sequestering more carbon in soils**.** Small farmers usually treat their soils with organic compost materials that absorb and sequester carbon better than soils that are farmed with conventional fertilizers. Researchers have suggested that the conversion of 10,000 small- to medium-sized farms to organic production would store carbon in the soil equivalent to taking 1,174,400 cars off the road.¶ Further climate amelioration contributions by small farms accrue from the fact that most use significantly less fossil fuel in comparison to conventional agriculture mainly due to a reduction of chemical fertilizer and pesticide use, relying instead on organic manures, legume-based rotations, and diversity schemes to enhance beneficial insects. Farmers who live in rural communities near cities and towns and are linked to local markets, avoid the energy wasted and the gas emissions associated with transporting food hundreds and even thousands of miles.¶ Conclusions¶ The great advantage of small farming systems is their high levels of agrobidoversity arranged in the form of variety mixtures, polycultures, crop-livestock combinations and/or agroforestry patterns. Modeling new agroecosystems using such diversified designs are extremely valuable to farmers whose systems are collapsing due to debt, pesticide use, transgenic treadmills, or climate change. Such diverse systems buffer against natural or human-induced variations in production conditions. There is much to learn from indigenous modes of production, as these systems have a strong ecological basis, maintain valuable genetic diversity, and lead to regeneration and preservation of biodiversity and natural resources. Traditional methods are particularly instructive because they provide a long-term perspective on successful agricultural management under conditions of climatic variability.¶ Organized social rural movements in the Global South oppose industrial agriculture in all its manifestations, and increasingly their territories constitute isolated areas rich in unique agrobiodiversity, including genetically diverse material, therefore acting as extant safeguards against the potential ecological failure derived from inappropriate agricultural modernization schemes. It is precisely the ability to generate and maintain diverse crop genetic resources that offer “unique” niche possibilities to small farmers that cannot be replicated by farmers in the North who are condemned to uniform cultivars and to co-exist with GMOs. The “ cibo pulito, justo e buono” that Slow Food promotes, the Fair Trade coffee, bananas, and the organic products so much in demand by northern consumers can only be produced in the agroecological islands of the South. This “difference” inherent to traditional systems, can be strategically utilized to revitalize small farming communities by exploiting opportunities that exist for linking traditional agrobiodiversity with local/national/international markets, as long as these activities are justly compensated by the North and all the segments of the market remain under grassroots control.¶ Consumers of the North can play a major role by supporting these more equitable markets which do not perpetuate the colonial model of “agriculture of the poor for the rich,” but rather a model that promotes small biodiverse farms as the basis for strong rural economies in the Global South. Such economies will not only provide sustainable production of healthy, agroecologically-produced, accessible food for all, but will allow indigenous peoples and small farmers to continue their millennial work of building and conserving the agricultural and natural biodiversity on which we all depend now and even more so in the future.

#### No impact to disease – human diversity and medicine check

Gladwell 95 [Malcolm, New York bureau chief of The Washington Post, New Republic, July 17]

This is what is wrong with the Andromeda Strain argument. Every infectious agent that has ever plagued humanity has had to adopt a specific strategy, but every strategy carries a corresponding cost, and this makes human counterattack possible. Malaria is vicious and deadly, but it relies on mosquitoes to spread from one human to the next, which means that draining swamps and putting up mosquito netting can all but halt endemic malaria. Smallpox is extraordinarily durable, remaining infectious in the environment for years, but its very durability, its essential rigidity, is what makes it one of the easiest microbes to create a vaccine against. aids is almost invariably lethal because its attacks the body at its point of great vulnerability, that is, the immune system, but the fact that it targets blood cells is what makes it so relatively uninfectious. I could go on, but the point is obvious. Any microbe capable of wiping us all out would have to be everything at once: as contagious as flu, as durable as the cold, as lethal as Ebola, as stealthy as HIV and so doggedly resistant to mutation that it would stay deadly over the course of a long epidemic. But viruses are not, well, superhuman. They cannot do everything at once. It is one of the ironies of the analysis of alarmists such as Preston that they are all too willing to point out the limitations of human beings, but they neglect to point out the limitations of microscopic life forms. If there are any conclusions to be drawn about disease, they are actually the opposite of what is imagined in books such as The Hot Zone and The Coming Plague. It is true that the effect of the dramatic demographic and social changes in the world over the past few decades is to create new opportunities for disease. But they are likely to create not homogeneous patterns of disease, as humans experienced in the past, so much as heterogeneous patterns of disease. People are traveling more and living in different combinations. Gene pools that were once distinct are mixing through intermarriage. Adults who once would have died in middle age are now living into their 80s. Children with particular genetic configurations who once died at birth or in infancy are now living longer lives. If you talk to demographers, they will tell you that what they anticipate is increasing clusters of new and odd diseases moving into these new genetic and demographic niches. Rare diseases will be showing up in greater numbers. Entirely unknown diseases will emerge for the first time. But the same diversity that created them within those population subgroups will keep them there. Laurie Garrett's book is mistitled. We are not facing "the coming plague." We are facing "the coming outbreaks."
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### Counter-Interpretation

#### 1NC quid pro quo

Helweg – 2000 – International Affairs Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations (M. Diana Helweg, 2000, “Taking Sanctions into the Twenty-First Century,” Economic Strategy and National Security: a next generation approach, ed. Patrick DeSouza, p. 143-145)

To fill the policy vacuum left by the reduced use of sanctions, the United States should adhere to a policy of political and economic engagement that balances "sticks" such as sanctions and other restrictive measures with additional "carrots" of trade and aid. Only broader economic engagement can open up the relationship with a country and create the mutual economic and strategic benefits that will enable subsequent restrictive policies to encourage the targeted regime to change its undesirable behavior. / Stated most simply, engagement is the opposite of isolation. It includes the flow of ideas, goods, and money under the umbrella of official diplomatic relations. Engagement can be effected through strategic and political dialogue, investment, trade, and even joining forces on appropriate issues in multilateral fora. Since the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, the United States has pursued a policy of political and economic engagement with some previously isolated regimes through dialogue, investment, and support of free trade. In doing so, the United States has indirectly helped promote democracy, freedom of association, freedom of speech, and civil and human rights. To be sure, progress has occurred slowly and with differing degrees of success. Although difficult to measure, engagement with democracies provides the citizens of closed countries the opportunity to learn what types of political freedoms and economic successes are possible. The past decade is replete with instances of ordinary people using that education to try to change their political worlds from Eastern Europe to Latin America and from Africa to Asia. / Countries that have initiated trade and diplomatic relations with the United States have definitely benefited more than those that remain isolated from the United States. For example, compare the civil reforms that have accompanied economic reforms in the former Soviet Union that have been triggered by Western investment and trade, against those that have yet to occur in an isolated Cuba. The same dichotomy can be seen when comparing the improvements in quality of life in a virtually capitalist China thriving on foreign investment with an unstable, famine-stricken North Korea. This argument does not suggest that further significant reforms are still not needed in Russia and China, but there have been improvements over the last decade. One of the keys to the gradual improvements in the Chinese and Russian regimes has been the coupling of economic and political engagement with economic restrictions for behavior incompatible with international norms. / Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright has argued that a U.S. policy of economic engagement with a country does not mean endorsement of its regime.34 In fact, the U.S. version of engagement is different from countries, such as France and Japan, which often practice a policy of unlimited economic engagement based on the rationale that unfettered trade and investment best promotes democratic values for the targeted nation, and financial success for themselves. By contrast, U.S.-"style" engagement must be coupled with a range of policy tools that includes the targeted use of economic restrictions. In other words, it is a variation on the traditional carrot and stick approach rather than one or the other. / Engagement, coupled with the availability of discrete penalties, establishes a functional dialogue and practical relationship between the United States and the targeted government. It constructs a bilateral relationship that the targeted country values and wants to preserve. In the context of that relationship, the United States has more opportunity and more credibility to potentially influence a country's behavior. The targeted country has more at stake, in the form of economic profits, enhanced security, and even international status. It, therefore, has more reason to adapt its policies to maintain a good relationship with the United States. Studies over the years have shown that sanctions combined with a healthy trade relationship often succeed in getting a targeted country to change its offending behavior before it loses more business.35

### Limits

#### Here’s proof – they allow tons of random unilateral measures

CSG 13 [Cuba Study Group, a non-profit, non-partisan organization, comprised of business and community leaders of Cuban descent who share a common interest and vision of a free and democratic Cuba, “Restoring Executive Authority Over U.S. Policy Toward Cuba,” Feb 2013, http://www.cubastudygroup.org/index.cfm/files/serve?File\_id=45d8f827-174c-4d43-aa2f-ef7794831032]

4. Additional Steps the U.S. President Can Take to Promote Change in Cuba¶ While we wait for Congress to act, the Executive Branch should exercise its licensing authority to further safeguard the flow of contacts and resources into the Island, encourage independent economic and political activity, and further empower the Cuban people. To that end, the Cuba Study Group proposes that the President pursue the following measures:¶ i) Modify Remittance and Export Limitations: Increase the $3,000 limit on remittances that can be carried to Cuba by authorized travelers and expand the types of goods that travelers may legally take to Cuba to support micro entrepreneurs. Fewer limitations in these areas will make it easier for U.S. travelers to provide seed capital and in-kind contributions for start-ups.¶ ii) Authorize Travel by General License for NGOs and Allow Them to Open Cuban Bank Accounts: Regulations enacted on January 28, 2011 allow U.S. full- and part-time university staff to travel to Cuba by general license. These regulations also allow U.S.-based academic institutions to open accounts in Cuban banks with funds to support their educational programs in Cuba. A similar license for foundations and NGOs whose mission involves support for micro and small businesses would also help support this growing segment of civil society.¶ iii) Establish New Licenses for the Provision of Services to Cuban Private Entrepreneurs: The President could build on existing authorizations that allow U.S. persons and institutions to pay individual Cuban scholars musicians and artists for their work. New licenses could extend to additional groups, such as artisans or farmers, and authorize a greater scope of activities such as recording, publication, distribution, etc.¶ iv) Authorize Imports of Certain Goods and Services to Businesses and Individuals Engaged in Certifiably Independent Economic Activity in Cuba: The President could authorize the importation of limited types of Cuban-origin goods and services under general or specific licenses, particularly when such authorizations could be justified as providing support for the Cuban people or democratic change in Cuba. For example, the President could authorize imports from private producers or allow U.S. persons to directly engage and hire Cuban professionals.¶ v) Authorize Export and Sale of Goods and Services to Businesses and Individuals Engaged in Certifiably Independent Economic Activity in Cuba: Amend existing licensing policy to establish a presumption of approval for specific items deemed to support the U.S.-stated policy goal of promoting independent economic activity on the Island. Since 2000, legislation has allowed the export of a broad range of agricultural products and a limited range of medicines and medical devices. This should be expanded to include other inputs in demand by indepen - dent businesses, including—but not limited to—good such as art supplies, food preparation equipment, bookkeeping materials, and basic electronic equipment and software required for retail sales and business administration.¶ vi) Authorize the Sale of Telecommunications Hardware in Cuba : Current U.S. regulations, as amended by the Obama administration in 2009, allow for donations of some telecommunications equipment, thereby recognizing that these goods by themselves do not violate the embargo. The next step should be to allow for the sales of those same goods inside the Island. Along with those provisions, changes should also allow for the provision of general travel licenses for research, marketing and sale of those goods.¶ vii) Authorize the Reestablishment of Ferry Services to Cuba : Current U.S. regulations allow both “aircraft and vessels” to serve Cuba as an exception to the U.S. embargo against the Island. The use of chartered aircrafts to transport Cuban-Americans and other licensed U.S. travelers to and from Cuba has long been authorized by the U.S. Department of Treasury. The next step should be to reestablish safe and secure chartered ferry services to transport the same categories of passengers to and from Cuba. Ferry service offers an affordable alternative to airline travel to Cuba and would allow an increase in the amount of goods that Cuban-Americans and other licensed travelers may legally take to Cuba to support their families and micro entrepreneurs.¶ viii) Simplify the Provision of Controlled Commodities, such as Computers and Laptops Direct the Department of Commerce to provide more detailed guidance for individuals to determine whether or not controlled commodities, such as laptops and printers, qualify under the general export waiver.¶ ix) Allow Licensed U.S. Travelers Access to U.S.-Issued Debit, Credit, and Pre-Paid Cards and Other Financial Services While on Authorized Travel in Cuba: Currently, U.S. travelers to Cuba have no access to U.S. bank accounts, credit cards, debit cards or other basic financial services. With few exceptions, U.S. travelers are forced to carry cash with them to Cuba. Allowing U.S. travelers access to electronic payment systems would help ensure their safety and security while being on the Island. Moreover, authorizing new electronic payment systems would facilitate the Administration’s goal of promoting people-to-people contacts and facilitating private economic activity by safeguarding the transfer of money from U.S. residents to relatives and independent entrepreneurs on the island.¶ x) Review Cuba’s Designation as a State Sponsor of Terrorism: Cuba’s status on the State Department’s list of state sponsors of terrorism has been subject to debate for more than a decade. The President should order a comprehensive, apolitical review to determine whether this designation reflects the reality of Cuba today.¶ xi) Develop an expanded bilateral agenda with a range of specific topics of mutual interest : Agenda should include topics such as the resolution of property claims to help foster an environment of dialogue, problem- solving and trust building— thereby helping to set the stage for an eventual normalization of relations.

### Aff Ground

#### Cuba QPQs are predictable in the literature

Haass 00 – Richard Haass & Meghan O’Sullivan, Brookings Institution Foreign Policy Studies Program, “Terms of Engagement: Alternatives to Punitive Policies”, Survival, 42(2), Summer, p. 15-16

Rather than maintaining the status quo, the US should simultaneously pursue two forms of engagement with Cuba. First, it should actively seek out Castro’s willingness to engage in a conditional relationship and to chart a course towards more satisfactory relations. It should attempt to strike a dialogue with Castro in which reasonable benefits are offered to him in return for reasonable changes. Rather than accentuating the desire for a regime change or immediate democratic elections, US policy-makers should make lesser goals the focus of their policy, as the more ambitious the demands, the less likely Castro is to enter into a process of engagement. For instance, the release of political prisoners and the legitimisation of political parties might be offered in exchange for the selected lifting of elements of the embargo. Regardless of Castro’s reaction to such an approach, benefits would accrue to the United States. If Castro accepted this dialogue, US policy would be seen as pushing forward real political liberalisation on the island; if Castro rejected these attempts, America would still ease tensions with its European allies by demonstrating it was willing to take a more flexible line towards Cuba.

#### Venezuela QPQs are predictable

Christy 3/15, [Patrick Christy is a senior policy analyst at the Foreign Policy Initiative, http://www.usnews.com/opinion/blogs/world-report/2013/03/15/after-chavez-us-must-encourage-democratic-venezuela](file:///C:\Users\Nirav%20Ilango\Dropbox\camp%202013!\Patrick%20Christy%20is%20a%20senior%20policy%20analyst%20at%20the%20Foreign%20Policy%20Initiative,%20http:\www.usnews.com\opinion\blogs\world-report\2013\03\15\after-chavez-us-must-encourage-democratic-venezuela)

What's perverse is how the Obama administration's move to "reset" relations with Maduro is doing more to legitimize him as the rightful heir to Venezuela's presidency than to resuscitate relations between the two governments. The move showed itself to be even more naive after Maduro accused the United States of plotting to poison Chavez shortly after the strongman's death.Washington must realize that a strategy of engagement alone will not ensure a renewed and improved partnership with Caracas. Failure to realize this will not only undermine whatever influence America has in the months ahead, but also send a troubling signal to Venezuela's increasingly united political opposition. The Obama administration should instead pursue a more principled policy towards a post-Chavez Venezuela. In particular, it should:Pressure Caracas to implement key election reforms.Venezuela's opposition faces formidable obstacles. Interim President Maduro will use the government's near-monopoly control of public airwaves, its established networks of political patronage and last-minute public spending programs to bolster his populist agenda.Washington should stress publicly and privately that any attempts to suppress or intimidate the opposition runs contrary to Venezuela's constitution and the principles defined in the Inter-American Democratic Charter, which was adopted by Venezuela in 2001. To this point, José Cárdenas, a former USAID acting assistant administrator for Latin America, [writes](http://shadow.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2013/03/06/the_struggle_for_venezuela_s_future),The Venezuelan opposition continues to insist that the constitution (which is of Chavez's own writing) be followed and have drawn up a list of simple electoral reforms that would level the playing field and better allow the Venezuelan people to chart their own future free of *chavista* and foreign interference.Demand free, fair and verifiable elections. Although Venezuela announced that a special election to replace Chavez will be held next month, it is important to remember that elections alone do not make a democracy. Indeed, Chavez long embraced the rhetoric of democracy as he, in reality, consolidated executive power, undermined Venezuela's previously democratic political system and altered the outcomes of election through corruption, fraud and intimidation.The Obama administration should make clear that free and fair elections,[properly monitored](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2012/09/the-chavez-plan-to-steal-venezuelas-presidential-election-what-obama-should-do) by respected international election observers, are essential to Venezuela's future standing in the hemisphere and the world. Likewise, Secretary of State John Kerry should work with regional partners—including (but not limited to) Brazil, Canada, Colombia and Mexico—to firmly encourage Maduro's interim government. A unified regional voice would send a powerful signal to Chavez's cronies in Caracas and longtime enablers in China, Iran and Russia.Condition future diplomatic and economic relations**.** Corruption and criminality were widespread under the Chavez regime, as high-level government and military officials benefited from close ties to corrupt businesses and international drug traffickers. Yet to date, the Obama administration has done little to hold Venezuela's leaders accountable. Washington should make clear that full diplomatic relations with the United States will be contingent upon Venezuela ending ties to international terrorist groups and rogue regimes like Iran. If Venezuela takes meaningful steps to end these ties and ensure future elections, the United States should work with Caracas and the private sector to reform Venezuela's energy industry and identify key development projects and reforms to improve the country's economic future.The United States can play an important role in shaping Venezuela's post-Chavez future. But to do so, the Obama administration will need to stand with the people of Venezuela by publicly defending democratic principles and the impartial rule of law in Latin America.

## Regional Commitment Conditions CP

### Say Yes

**Brazil, Mexico and Chile say yes – OAS talks prove consensus is likely.**

Jim **Lobe**, 6-01-20**09**, Washington Bureau Chief for Inter Press Service, “Obama Still Moving Cautiously Toward Normalisation,” online: <http://ipsnews.net/news.asp?idnews=47061>

"We've made more progress in four months than has been made in a number of years," Clinton bragged to reporters in San Salvador Sunday. "We need to work together to continue that kind of progress, keeping in mind the legitimate aspirations and human rights of the people in Cuba." But analysts here said **the resumption of migration talks**, which had been suspended under former President George W. Bush in 2003, was the least that Obama could do, particularly after his speech last month at the Summit of the Americas where **he cited immigration explicitly** as one of the **key issues on which he was prepared to engage**. "He should've started these talks the day after his inauguration," said Wayne Smith, former head of the U.S. Interests Section in Havana who has long worked to normalise ties between the two nations as a fellow at the Centre for International Policy (CIP) here. "**They still need to remove the restrictions** on academic and scientific exchanges and people-to-people programmes and **issue visas to Cubans** so they can come here for academic conferences and the like; it seems like they haven't even thought of that yet," he noted. Smith added, however, that **the resumption of the immigration talks**, as well an apparent agreement to also address drug interdiction and hurricane relief efforts on a more formal basis than before, showed that the new administration was "at least moving". William LeoGrande, a Cuba expert at American University, echoed Smith's analysis, noting as well that the decision to restore direct postal service was a "logical follow-on" to Obama's decision to end restrictions on Cuban-American travel and remittances to their homeland. But he said the latest announcement showed that **Obama wanted to move cautiously on Cuba** and suggested that the fact it occurred just before the OAS meeting was not coincidental. "Just as they relaxed the restrictions on Cuban Americans just before the Summit of the Americas, now they are offering migration talks just before the OAS meeting," he said. "It seems clear that they're trying to **inoculate themselves from criticism by Latin Americans** about Cuba policy and **at the same time** **avoid picking political fights** **with (anti-Castro) forces at home. It's calculated**." How much the new measures will provoke opposition remains to be seen, but they did succeed in gaining the endorsement of one key group, the Cuban American National Foundation (CANF). "This is a very positive development and something that our organisation has recommended," said Francisco Hernandez, CANF's president. The latest exchanges between Havana and Washington were initiated May 22, when the State Department delivered a diplomatic note to the Cuban Interests Section here asking to resume migration talks. Washington received a positive reply Saturday, according to a senior State Department official. In their reply, the Cubans said they were also willing to engage in talks with Washington regarding counter-terrorism, drug trafficking, hurricane relief, and direct postal service. Clinton said Sunday she was "very pleased" with the response. Clinton was in San Salvador as part of a three-day swing through the region beginning with Funes's inauguration Monday and culminating in the first day of annual OAS meeting Tuesday in San Pedro Sula, Honduras. The re-admission of Cuba into the hemispheric body will almost certainly be the most controversial issue at the OAS meeting. Significantly, as one of his first acts as president, Funes, the leader of the left-wing Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front (FMLN), a former guerrilla group, is expected to announce the normalisation of relations between El Salvador and Cuba, leaving the U.S. as the only nation in the hemisphere without full diplomatic ties with Havana. Largely at Washington's behest, the OAS suspended Cuba's membership in the OAS in 1962, one year after the Central Intelligence Agency's disastrous Bay of Pigs invasion and a month before Washington imposed its trade embargo against the island. **Virtually all of Latin America's leaders**, including OAS Secretary-General Jose Miguel Insulza, have called for Havana to be re-instated as a full member, despite the fact that the government of President Raul Castro has denied any interest in rejoining an organisation that it calls "that decrepit old house of Washington." The OAS headquarters, built by Andrew Carnegie, is located just off the Ellipse within shouting distance of the White House. The Obama administration has said it is willing to end Cuba's suspension but that its formal re-admission **should be conditioned on Havana's implementing political reforms** that meet the requirements of the Inter-American Democratic Charter. Last week, the OAS permanent council formed a small working group to come up with a compromise that most observers here believe will result in lifting the suspension and beginning talks with Havana over the terms of its re-admission. "None of the parties involved oppose ending Cuba's suspension, and so the issue is, will Cuba want to re-join the OAS and what kind of discussion needs to happen to make that possible," said Geoff Thale, a Cuba specialist at the Washington Office on Latin America (WOLA).

### AT: P/ CP

#### “Resolved” necessitates certainty.

American Heritage Dictionary, 11-xx-2011, The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, an American dictionary of the English language published by Boston publisher Houghton Mifflin, “resolve,” <http://www.ahdictionary.com/word/search.html?q=resolved&submit.x=-826&submit.y=-210>

re·solved, re·solv·ing, re·solves v.tr. 1. a. To make a firm decision about: resolved that I would do better next time. See Synonyms at decide.

#### “Should” mandates certainty.

The Collins English Dictionary, 12-31-2011, the Collins English Dictionary, a printed and online dictionary of English, “English Dictionary – definition of “should”,” <http://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/should?showCookiePolicy=true>

should Definitions verb the past tense of shall: used as an auxiliary verb to indicate that an action is considered by the speaker to be obligatory ( you should go) or to form the subjunctive mood with I or we ( I should like to see you; if I should be late, go without me) See also shall Should has, as its most common meaning in modern English, the sense ought as in I should go to the graduation, but I don't see how I can. However, the older sense of the subjunctive of shall is often used with I or we to indicate a more polite form than would: I should like to go, but I can't. In much speech and writing, should has been replaced by would in contexts of this kind, but it remains in formal English when a conditional subjunctive is used: should he choose to remain, he would be granted asylum Word Origin Old English sceold; see shall shall Definitions verb Word forms: past tense should takes an infinitive without to or an implied infinitive esp with I or we as subject used as an auxiliary to make the future tense ⇒ we shall see you tomorrow Compare will1 (sense 1) with you, he, she, it, they, or a noun as subject used as an auxiliary to indicate determination on the part of the speaker, as in issuing a threat ⇒ you shall pay for this! used as an auxiliary to indicate compulsion, now esp in official documents ⇒ the Tenant shall return the keys to the Landlord used as an auxiliary to indicate certainty or inevitability ⇒ our day shall come

#### “Should” requires immediacy.

**Summers, 94** — Justice on the Oklahoma Supreme Court (“Kelsey v. Dollarsaver Food Warehouse of Durant”, 199hgghj4 OK 123, 11-8, <http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn13>)

4 The legal question to be resolved by the court is whether the word "should"[13](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn13) in the May 18 order connotes futurity or may be deemed a ruling in praesenti.[14](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn14) The answer to this query is not to be divined from rules of grammar;[15](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287" \l "marker3fn15) it must be governed by the age-old practice culture of legal professionals and its immemorial language usage. To determine if the omission (from the critical May 18 entry) of the turgid phrase, "and the same hereby is", (1) makes it an in futuro ruling - i.e., an expression of what the judge will or would do at a later stage - or (2) constitutes an in in praesenti resolution of a disputed law issue, the trial judge's intent must be garnered from the four corners of the entire record.[16](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn16)  5 Nisi prius orders should be so construed as to give effect to every words and every part of the text, with a view to carrying out the evident intent of the judge's direction.[17](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn17) The order's language ought not to be considered abstractly. The actual meaning intended by the document's signatory should be derived from the context in which the phrase to be interpreted is used.[18](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn18) When applied to the May 18 memorial, these told canons impel my conclusion that the judge doubtless intended his ruling as an in praesenti resolution of Dollarsaver's quest for judgment n.o.v. Approval of all counsel plainly appears on the face of the critical May 18 entry which is [885 P.2d 1358] signed by the judge.[19](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn19) True minutes[20](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn20) of a court neither call for nor bear the approval of the parties' counsel nor the judge's signature. To reject out of hand the view that in this context "should" is impliedly followed by the customary, "and the same hereby is", makes the court once again revert to medieval notions of ritualistic formalism now so thoroughly condemned in national jurisprudence and long abandoned by the statutory policy of this State. [Continues – To Footnote] [14](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker2fn14) In praesenti means literally "at the present time." BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY 792 (6th Ed. 1990). In legal parlance the phrase denotes that which in law is presently or immediately effective, as opposed to something that will or would become effective in the future [in futurol]. See Van Wyck v. Knevals, [106 U.S. 360](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/deliverdocument.asp?box1=106&box2=U.S.&box3=360), 365, 1 S.Ct. 336, 337, 27 L.Ed. 201 (1882).

#### “Substantial” means unconditional and immediate.

Words and Phrases, 1964 (40 W&P 759)

The words “outward, open, actual, visible, substantial, and exclusive,” in connection with a change of possession, mean substantially the same thing. They mean not concealed; not hidden; exposed to view; free from concealment, dissimulation, reserve, or disguise; in full existence; denoting that which not merely can be, but is opposed to potential, apparent, constructive, and imaginary; veritable; genuine; certain; absolute; real at present time, as a matter of fact, not merely nominal; opposed to form; actually existing; true; not including admitting, or pertaining to any others; undivided; sole; opposed to inclusive.

#### “Increase” must be immediate relative to the status quo.

Rogers 5 Judge, STATE OF NEW YORK, ET AL., PETITIONERS v. U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, RESPONDENT, NSR MANUFACTURERS ROUNDTABLE, ET AL., INTERVENORS, 2005 U.S. App. LEXIS 12378, \*\*; 60 ERC (BNA) 1791, 6/24, lexis

[\*\*48]  Statutory Interpretation. [HN16](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=1fe428155fdfc9074f3623f0dae9d78a&docnum=14&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAW&_md5=0ebd338d6a7793de8561db53b915effd&focBudTerms=term%20increase&focBudSel=all#clscc16)While the CAA defines a "modification" as any physical or operational change that "increases" emissions, it is silent on how to calculate such "increases" in emissions. [42 U.S.C. § 7411(a)(4)](http://www.lexis.com/research/buttonTFLink?_m=8541fbf7a7f5554ca588059b132acd17&_xfercite=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b367%20U.S.%20App.%20D.C.%203%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_butType=4&_butStat=0&_butNum=103&_butInline=1&_butinfo=42%20U.S.C.%207411&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=14&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAW&_md5=1f89a0e47b1996a5400e8d865d8da08a). According to government petitioners, the lack of a statutory definition does not render the term "increases" ambiguous, but merely compels the court to give the term its "ordinary meaning." See [Engine Mfrs.Ass'nv.S.Coast AirQualityMgmt.Dist., 541 U.S. 246, 124 S. Ct. 1756, 1761, 158 L. Ed. 2d 529(2004)](http://www.lexis.com/research/buttonTFLink?_m=8541fbf7a7f5554ca588059b132acd17&_xfercite=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b367%20U.S.%20App.%20D.C.%203%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_butType=3&_butStat=2&_butNum=104&_butInline=1&_butinfo=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b541%20U.S.%20246%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=14&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAW&_md5=48f016ea3eabfdb898b67b348b11662c); [Bluewater Network, 370 F.3d at 13](http://www.lexis.com/research/buttonTFLink?_m=8541fbf7a7f5554ca588059b132acd17&_xfercite=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b367%20U.S.%20App.%20D.C.%203%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_butType=3&_butStat=2&_butNum=105&_butInline=1&_butinfo=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b370%20F.3d%201%2cat%2013%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=14&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAW&_md5=78fdfe9d48c7b91d7659b90c0198707e); [Am. Fed'n of Gov't Employees v. Glickman, 342 U.S. App. D.C. 7, 215 F.3d 7, 10 [\*23]  (D.C. Cir. 2000)](http://www.lexis.com/research/buttonTFLink?_m=8541fbf7a7f5554ca588059b132acd17&_xfercite=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b367%20U.S.%20App.%20D.C.%203%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_butType=3&_butStat=2&_butNum=106&_butInline=1&_butinfo=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b342%20U.S.%20App.%20D.C.%207%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=14&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAW&_md5=fb18ff0b92931ac00621d88dae997e67). Relying on two "real world" analogies, government petitioners contend that the ordinary meaning of "increases" requires the baseline to be calculated from a period immediately preceding the change. They maintain, for example, that in determining whether a high-pressure weather system "increases" the local temperature, the relevant baseline is the temperature immediately preceding the arrival of the weather system, not the temperature five or ten years ago. Similarly,  [\*\*49]  in determining whether a new engine "increases" the value of a car, the relevant baseline is the value of the car immediately preceding the replacement of the engine, not the value of the car five or ten years ago when the engine was in perfect condition.

#### “Toward” implies certainty.

Anne Marie Lofaso, 2-24-2010, West Virginia University, College of Law, “Talking is Worthwhile: The Role of Employee Voice in Protecting, Enhancing, and Encouraging Individual Rights to Job Security in a Collective System,” <http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1558563>

The obligations placed on employers are significant in two ways. First and significantly, the Collective Redundancies Directive places on employers a duty to consult "with a view to reaching an agreement." n172 Given the Directive's language choice, this consultation right seems to be at least coextensive with the federal right to bargain under the National Labor Relations Act and perhaps even greater than the right granted under the NLRA. Federal courts interpreting NLRA Section 8(d)'s definition of the bargaining duty n173 have made clear that the duty to bargain does not include the duty to come to agreement. n174 Perhaps this is why Professor [\*86] Summers, in describing the duty to bargain under Section 8(d) always referred to it as obligating the parties to bargain in good faith with "a view toward reaching agreement." The use of the preposition "toward" suggests a duty to come close to agreement but not a duty to close the deal.
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## WTO Advantage

### Trade Defense

#### Increased trade has no effect on decreasing risk of conflict between nations – prefer stats

Gelpi and Greico 5 [Chris, Joseph, Associate Professor and Professor of Political Science, Duke University, “Democracy, Interdependence, and the Sources of the Liberal Peace”, Journal of Peace Research]

As we have already emphasized, increasing levels of trade between an autocratic and democratic country are unlikely to constrain the former from initiating militarized disputes against the latter. As depicted in Figure 1, our analysis indicates that an increase in trade dependence by an autocratic challenger on a democratic target from zero to 5% of the former's GDP would increase the probability of the challenger’s dispute initiation from about 0.31% to 0.29%. Thus, the overall probability of dispute initiation by an autocratic country against a democracy is fairly high (given the rarity of disputes) at 23 nearly .3% per country per year. Moreover, increased trade does little or nothing to alter that risk. Increases in trade dependence also have little effect on the likelihood that one autocracy will initiate a conflict with another. In this instance, the probability of dispute initiation remains constant at 0.33% regardless of the challenger’s level of trade dependence.

## IP Leadership Advantage

### Bioweapons Impact

#### Extinction

Richard J Ochs, 6-9-2002, frmr president of the Aberdeen Proving Ground Superfund Citizens Coalition, member of the Depleted Uranium Task force of the Military Toxics Project and a member of the Chemical Weapons Working Group, “Biological Weapons Must Be Abolished Immediately,” http://www.freefromterror.net/other\_articles/abolish.html

While a "nuclear winter," resulting from a massive exchange of nuclear weapons,could also kill off most of life on earth and severely compromise the health of future generations, they are easier to control.Biological weapons, on the other hand, can get out of control very easily, as the recent anthrax attacks has demonstrated. There is no way to guarantee the security of these doomsday weapons because very tiny amounts can be stolen or accidentally released and then grow or be grown to horrendous proportions. The Black Death of the Middle Ages would be small in comparison to the potential damage bioweapons could cause. Abolition of chemical weapons is less of a priority because, while they can also kill millions of people outright, their persistence in the environment would be less than nuclear or biological agents or more localized. Hence, chemical weapons would have a lesser effect on future generations of innocent people and the natural environment. Like the Holocaust, once a localized chemical extermination is over, it is over.With nuclear and biological weapons, the killing will probably never end. Radioactive elements last tens of thousands of years and will keep causing cancers virtually forever.

### Wetlands Small Farms Impact

#### Continued reliance on industrial mechanized ag results in wetland destruction

Cummins 10 – Ronnie is the International Director of the Organic Consumers Association. (“Industrial Agriculture and Human Survival: The Road Beyond 10/10/10”, Organic Consumer’s Association, October 7, 2010, <http://www.organicconsumers.org/articles/article_21747.cfm>)

Although transportation, industry, and energy producers are obviously major fossil fuel users and greenhouse gas polluters, not enough people understand that the worst U.S. and global greenhouse gas emitter is "Food Incorporated," transnational industrial food and farming, of which Monsanto and GMOs constitute a major part. Industrial farming, including 173 million acres of GE soybeans, corn, cotton, canola, and sugar beets, accounts for at least 35% of U.S. greenhouse gas emissions (EPA's ridiculously low estimates range from 7% to 12%, while some climate scientists feel the figure could be as high as 50% or more). Industrial agriculture, biofuels, and non-sustainable cattle grazing - including cutting down the last remaining tropical rainforests in Latin America and Asia for GMO and chemical-intensive animal feed and biofuels - are also the main driving forces in global deforestation and wetlands destruction, which generate an additional 20% of all climate destabilizing GHGs. In other words the direct (food, fiber, and biofuels production, food processing, food distribution) and indirect damage (deforestation and destruction of wetlands) of industrial agriculture, GMOs, and the food industry are the major cause of global warming. Unless we take down Monsanto and Food Inc. and make the Great Transition to a relocalized system of organic food and farming, we and our children are doomed to reside in Climate Hell. Overall 78% of climate destabilizing greenhouse gases come from CO2, while the remainder come from methane, nitrous oxide, and black carbon or soot. To stabilize the climate we will need to drastically reduce all of these greenhouse gas emissions, not just CO2, and sequester twice as much carbon matter in the soil (through organic farming and ranching, and forest and wetlands restoration) as we are doing presently. Currently GMO and industrial/factory farms (energy and chemical-intensive) farms emit at least 25% of the carbon dioxide (mostly from tractors, trucks, combines, transportation, cooling, freezing, and heating); 40% of the methane (mostly from massive herds of animals belching and farting, and manure ponds); and 96% of nitrous oxide (mostly from synthetic fertilizer manufacture and use, the millions of tons of animal manure from factory-farmed cattle herds, pig and poultry flocks, and millions of tons of sewage sludge spread on farms). Black carbon or soot comes primarily from older diesel engines, slash and burn agriculture, and wood cook stoves. Per ton, methane is 21 times more damaging, and nitrous oxide 310 times more damaging, as a greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide, when measured over a one hundred year period. Damage is even worse if you look at the impact on global warming over the next crucial 20-year period. Many climate scientists admit that they have previously drastically underestimated the dangers of the non-CO2 GHGs, including methane, soot, and nitrous oxide, which are responsible for at least 22% of global warming.

#### Wetlands are key to the hydrological cycle---extinction

Ramsar Convention 96, “Ramsar Convention on Wetlands, Wetlands and Biodiversity, Executive Summary”, <http://www.ramsar.org/about/about_biodiversity.htm>, ACC: 12.20.08, p. online

Wetlands - including (inter alia) rivers, lakes, marshes, estuaries, lagoons, mangroves, seagrass beds, and peatlands - are among the most precious natural resources on Earth. These highly varied ecosystems are natural areas where water accumulates for at least part of the year. Driven by the hydrological cycle, water is continuously being recycled through the land, sea and atmosphere in a process which ensures the maintenance of ecological functions. Wetlands support high levels of biological diversity: they are, after tropical rainforests, amongst the richest ecosystems on this planet, providing essential life support for much of humanity, as well as for other species. Coastal wetlands, which may include estuaries, seagrass beds and mangroves, are among the most productive, while coral reefs contain some of the highest known levels of biodiversity (nearly one-third of all known fish species live on coral reefs). Other wetlands also offer sanctuary to a wide variety of plants, invertebrates, fishes, amphibians, reptiles and mammals, as well as to millions of both migratory and sedentary waterbirds. Wetlands are not only sites of exceptional biodiversity, they are also of enormous social and economic value, in both traditional and contemporary societies. Since ancient times, people have lived along water courses, benefiting from the wide range of goods and services available from wetlands. The development of many of the great civilisations was largely based on their access to, and management of, wetland resources. Wetlands are an integral part of the hydrological cycle, playing a key role in the provision and maintenance of water quality and quantity as the basis of all life on earth. They are often interconnected with other wetlands, and they frequently constitute rich and diverse transition zones between aquatic ecosystems and terrestrial ecosystems such as forests and grasslands.
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## Conditions CP

### Should =/= Ought

#### Should does not mean “ought”

EF, 8-27-2006, <http://www.englishforums.com/English/OughtToVsShould/drjxm/post.htm>

Do you think there is a large difference between these two words? Is ought to more polite than should? Is should more commanding? What is your interpretation of the difference between these two words? 7th August 2006 New Member31 REPLY Aperisic: If we take the basis meaning of ought and should (just to mention "ought" is a modal verb that does not have the same scope of meanings as "should")