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### 1AC—Transition

#### CONTENTION 1 IS THE CUBAN TRANSITION:

#### Cuba’s current reforms are *slow*, *contradictory*, and *insufficient*—the plan is key

Shifter et al 10/15 – Michael is an Adjunct Professor of Latin American Studies at Georgetown University's School of Foreign Service. He is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations and writes for the Council's journal Foreign Affairs. He serves as the President of Inter-American Dialogue. Matthew Aho is a consultant in the corporate practice group of Akerman Senterfitt in New York. Collin Laverty is the founder and president of Cuba Educational Travel. Kirby Jones is the president of Alamar Associates in Arizona. Carmelo Mesa-Lago is a professor emeritus of economics and Latin American studies at the University of Pittsburgh. Archibald Ritter is a distinguished research professor emeritus of economics and international affairs at Carleton University. (“Are Raul Castro’s Reforms Helping Cuba’s Economy, 10/15/13, *Latin America Adviser*, pdf)

\*This card is from pages 1,3, and 4 of the pdf. Page two contains a wholly different article. “Are Raúl Castro's Reforms Helping Cuba's Economy?” is published on pages 1, 3 and 4 of the PDF. Our evidence is the entirety of the article. We will provide you the PDF if you are curious\*

In late September, Cuba's government¶ announced the legalization¶ of 18 new categories of private¶ employment, including real¶ estate agents, bringing the total number of¶ approved types of independent employment¶ to 199. While Raúl Castro's government¶ has issued more than 430,000 private¶ employment licenses since 2010, the latest¶ employment legalization effort also¶ included bans on certain economic activities,¶ including the reselling of imported¶ goods. Are Cuba's newest economic¶ reforms likely to bear fruit? How much has¶ the state ceded control of the economy to¶ market forces in recent years? What surprises¶ might lie in store for Cuba's economy¶ and its business climate?¶ AMatthew Aho, consultant in the¶ corporate practice group of¶ Akerman Senterfitt in New York:¶ "The decision to legalize new categories¶ of private employment is yet¶ another incremental step that—combined¶ with other changes since 2010—clearly¶ indicates a shift away from total state control¶ and toward a 21st-century mixed market¶ economy. Other recent examples¶ include the September publication of new¶ rules governing foreign investment at the¶ Mariel Export Processing Zone and the¶ Oct. 9 decision to allow state tourism agencies¶ to do business with private enterprises,¶ such as bed and breakfasts and restaurants.¶ The Cuban state will remain the economy's¶ dominant player, but the space it has yielded¶ so far was inconceivable five years ago.¶ And it's paying off: visitors to Havana¶ report a never-before-seen economic¶ vibrancy transforming the urban landscape,¶ as black-market businesses leave the¶ shadows and new, remittance-fueled ventures¶ arise. What's more, the recent loosening¶ of migration restrictions and the passage¶ (likely in 2014) of new foreign investment¶ laws signal that policymakers are¶ preparing for infusions of foreign investment¶ and remittance capital in the medium-¶ to-long terms. There is a bevy of potential surprises, foreign and domestic.¶ At home, the recent ban on reselling¶ imported goods met swift and unusually¶ vocal opposition from entrepreneurs¶ vowing to disobey the rules. In the¶ months ahead, the government must¶ decide how to engage 430,000 private¶ economic actors (and those dependent¶ on them) as a rising political force on the¶ island. Abroad, President Obama will¶ decide whether to support the Cuban people in their pursuit of greater economic¶ self-determination through¶ proactive policies or do nothing—thereby¶ **clinging to decades of failed sanctions**—¶ because he sees no political¶ upside. 2014 could be a real tipping¶ point in U.S.–Cuba relations, but only if¶ both sides seize the moment. That,¶ unfortunately, would be the biggest surprise¶ of all."¶ ACollin Laverty, founder and¶ president of Cuba Educational¶ Travel: "Time will tell how far¶ and how fast the reforms go,¶ which will determine their economic,¶ political and social impact. Up until now,¶ the government has been very cautious—¶ prioritizing stability while also¶ making drastic changes within the context¶ of the last five decades of communist¶ rule. Legalizing small-scale enterprise,¶ expanding cooperatives and creating a¶ housing market are important steps,¶ affecting the psychology of Cubans and¶ how they see and operate in the market.¶ However, **these important reforms will**¶ **not result in significant improvements** in¶ the overall performance of the economy.¶ Larger, more controversial and difficult¶ reforms will need to be implemented in¶ order to fundamentally change the¶ makeup and output of the economy,¶ such as currency reform, increased foreign¶ investment, legalization of more¶ private enterprises, including those of¶ medium-scale, the organic creation of¶ cooperatives, an end to excessive subsidies¶ to inefficient state-owned enterprises¶ and increased access to telecommunications.¶ The government's decision in late September to expand private enterprise but simultaneously restrict the sale of imported goods shows contradictions¶ in the process. Official discourse is to¶ remove the state from non-essential¶ areas of the economy, but **the forces that be are unwilling to relinquish their monopoly** in the retail sector. A better¶ approach would be to remove luxury¶ taxes on goods sold at dollar stores and¶ focus on currency reform and economywide¶ pricing adjustments, which would¶ allow it to compete with the private sector.¶ Albeit slowly, the process continues¶ to be two steps forward, a half step backwards,¶ and demographics and economic¶ necessity should keep it that way."¶ AKirby Jones, president of¶ Alamar Associates in Arizona:¶ "The numbers speak for themselves:¶ the reforms in Cuba are¶ real, will continue and have already¶ changed the face of Cuba. If you had¶ asked me just a few years ago whether I¶ would expect what is going on in Cuba¶ today, I would say a resounding no. But¶ the reforms have already borne fruit.¶ The Batistianos like Rep. Ileana Ros-¶ Lehtinen and Sen. Robert Menendez can¶ question the reforms all they want, but¶ their criticisms do not change the reality¶ on the ground. And now we hear of pilot¶ projects with only one currency. Facts¶ speak for themselves. And through all of¶ this, the United States is on the outside¶ clinging to a policy rooted in the last¶ century. The Cuban government has¶ ceded some control on economic matters,¶ and true market forces are at work.¶ Is that not what the United States wants? These reforms are like toothpaste that¶ cannot be put back into the tube. There¶ will be problems as well as starts and¶ stops along the way. The United States¶ could be helping this process instead of¶ **trying to stop it**. Meanwhile Brazil,¶ China and many others are part of the¶ change, realize that it is real, are investing¶ in Cuba and are making money in¶ the process. The United States should do¶ the same." Carmelo Mesa-Lago, professor¶ emeritus of economics and¶ Latin American studies at the¶ University of Pittsburgh: "The¶ re-authorization/extension of selfemployment¶ is a key of Raúl's reform to¶ enlarge the private sector and dismiss 1.8¶ million workers unneeded in the state sector.¶ Currently, 22 percent of the labor¶ force is in the non-state sector. It should¶ jump to around 40 percent by 2015 and¶ account for a rising percentage of GDP.¶ But self-employment is obstructed by several¶ constraints: 1.) The large majority of¶ occupations are unskilled or require little¶ skills, whereas most of the state employees to be fired are professionals or skilled¶ workers. 2.) University graduates (badly¶ needed in the private sector, such as managers,¶ engineers and architects) can't practice as self-employed, hence they may¶ work as taxi drivers or food sellers but not¶ in their professions. 3.) Taxes are quite a burden. For instance, the tax rates on the¶ labor force gradually increase with the¶ number of employees hired, therefore¶ penalizing those self-employed that hire¶ more employees, which is a disincentive¶ for the self-employed and counterproductive¶ in the state quest to get rid of surplus¶ labor. 4.) The government sends contradictory signals, such as raids to shut down self-employed Cubans who have stands¶ under Havana porches, or the government¶ first taxes and then bans the sale of¶ imported goods. Currently the reforms are insufficient to solve the many economic and social problems accumulated under half a century of centralized, inefficient socialism. There is a wide consensus¶ inside and outside Cuba that they **must be deepened and accelerated** to accomplish¶ that task, but Raúl has little time left to do¶ so before he retires in 2018."¶ AArchibald Ritter, distinguished¶ research professor emeritus of¶ economics and international¶ affairs at Carleton University:¶ "Major changes have been implemented¶ already, and further reforms are in the¶ works or on the horizon. The reforms will¶ continue to orient economic policy and¶ lead to substantial improvements in the¶ Cuban economy and in citizens' living¶ standards. The market-oriented component¶ of the Cuban economy has expanded¶ and now includes about 27.5 percent¶ of the employed labor force. It will¶ expand dramatically if the pseudo-cooperative¶ state farms and non-agricultural¶ state enterprises become authentic cooperatives.¶ Registered micro-enterprises¶ now include 430,000 people, 8.6 percent¶ of the employed labor force. The marketoriented¶ joint foreign/state enterprises¶ employ about 1 percent of the labor¶ force. The market-oriented underground¶ economy provides full- or part-time first¶ or second jobs for maybe 10 percent of¶ the labor force. Under September 2012¶ legislation, the Unidades Básicas de¶ Producción Cooperativa should become¶ real cooperatives, increasing the mainly¶ private sector in agriculture to approximately¶ 11.6 percent of the labor force.¶ Non-agricultural cooperatives in time¶ should include most of the goods- and¶ services-producing state sector. They are¶ to be worker-managed and under the¶ forces of supply and demand. The new¶ Mariel Export Processing Zone may¶ attract major investments, especially¶ from China and Brazil, and provide a¶ strong market-propelled stimulus. The transformation of state enterprises into authentic market-oriented cooperatives would constitute a change and improvement of historic dimension. Cuba could¶ become a country of 'worker ownership¶ and management' and continue to be¶ unique in the world. In contrast to the¶ ideology-based policy impetuosity and¶ vacillation of President Fidel Castro over¶ 47 years, the approach of President Raúl¶ Castro has been cautious, gradual, pragmatic,¶ stable and 'evidence-based.' There¶ are downside risks. Bureaucratic footdragging¶ may slow the reforms. The 'special¶ relationship' with Venezuela may falter¶ with political change and changed¶ economic priorities in that country. But¶ the economic surprises are more likely to¶ be positive, and there may even be some¶ positive political surprises—I never cease¶ to hope. **A most welcome surprise would**¶ **be a normalization of U.S.-Cuba relations**¶ during the presidency of Barack Obama."

#### A *total repeal* of the embargo is critical to *provide foreign capital* and incentivize *liberalization and democracy*

CSG 13 – The Cuba Study Group is a non-profit and non-partisan organization studying Cuba. (“Restoring Executive Authority Over U.S. Policy Toward Cuba”, February 2013, <http://www.cubastudygroup.org/index.cfm/files/serve?File_id=45d8f827-174c-4d43-aa2f-ef7794831032>)

Beyond failing to advance its stated objectives, the most counterproductive aspect of Helms-Burton is that it codifies U.S. embargo sanctions toward Cuba, and conditions the suspension of any and all such sanctions on congressional recognition of a transition government in Cuba. This is counterproductive in two ways. First, it hinders the United States’ ability to respond rapidly and strategically to developments on the Island as they occur. For example, if the Executive Branch wishes to increase assistance to the 400,000 private entrepreneurs currently operating small businesses in Cuba, it can only do so in a limited way through its licensing authority. Second, it creates a dynamic of “all-or-nothing” conditionality that effectively places U.S. policy in the hands of the Cuban government, making it easier for Cuban officials to resist political reform and dictate the degree of American influence on the Island. Defenders of the status quo inside the Cuban government have shown that they view greater engagement with the United States as a threat to their hold on power. As Elizardo Sanchez, the head of the Cuban Commission for Human Rights, has recognized: “The more American citizens in the streets of Cuban cities, the better for the cause of a more open society.” The Cuban government has become increasingly adept at manipulating U.S. policy choices. This is why any sign of a thaw from the United States has repeatedly been followed by confrontation or repression, which in turn has been followed by U.S. domestic pressure to tighten economic sanctions. This pattern has become somewhat predictable, as recently exemplified by Cuba’s imprisonment of U.S. contractor Alan Gross after President Obama relaxed family travel and remittance restrictions in 2009 and U.S. policymakers’ refusal to pursue improved bilateral relations in response.xvi It can be reasonably concluded that elements of the Cuban government do not, in fact, seek any substantial liberalization from U.S. sanctions. Indeed, Helms-Burton provides them with an alibi for their own failures and may well be essential to their political survival. Senator Jesse Helms famously said that Helms-Burton “tightened the noose around the neck of the last dictator in the Western Hemisphere, Fidel Castro.”xvii In practice, however, Helms-Burton may have served as an incredibly convenient life raft, giving a struggling and failing system the legitimacy that comes from the appearance of being a “state under siege.” Repealing Helms-Burton and related statutory provisions that limit the Executive Branch’s authority over Cuba policy. Over time, U.S. policies toward Communist countries with poor human rights records and histories of adversarial relations—such as China and Vietnam—have evolved toward diplomatic normalization and economic engagement. Policymakers in both parties have rightly judged that engagement, rather than isolation, better serves U.S. national interests and lends greater credibility to calls for political and economic reform. The Cuba Study Group believes the most effective way to break the deadlock of “all-or-nothing” conditionality and remedy the ineffectiveness of current U.S. policy is by de-codifying the embargo against Cuba through the repeal of Helms-Burton and related statutory provisions that limit the Executive Branch’s authority over Cuban policy.xviii Repealing Helm-Burton and related statutory provisions would shift the primary focus of U.S. Cuba policy away from the regime and toward empowering Cuban people. It would also enhance the leverage of the United States to promote a multilateral approach toward Cuba, as well as embolden reformers, democracy advocates and private entrepreneurs inside the island to press their government for greater change. De-codifying the embargo would allow the Executive Branch the flexibility to use the entire range of foreign policy tools at its disposal—diplomatic, economic, political, legal and cultural—to incentivize change in Cuba. The President would be free to adopt more efficient, targeted policies necessary for pressuring the Cuban leadership to respect human rights and implement political reforms, while simultaneously empowering all other sectors of society to pursue their economic wellbeing and become the authors of their own futures.xix Repealing Helms-Burton would also free civil society development and assistance programs to be implemented outside of a contentious sanctions framework. Repealing the extraterritorial provisions of Helms-Burton would allow the United States greater leverage in persuading the international community, especially key regional partners, to adopt a multilateral and targeted approach toward focusing on the advancement of human rights in Cuba. This would fundamentally transform the international dynamic that has long helped the Cuban government stifle dissent, since its efforts to isolate critics at home would increasingly lead to its own isolation from the international community. While it is difficult to prove a direct causal connection between economic reforms and an open society, modern history has taught us that it is increasingly difficult for dictatorial governments to maintain political control the more prosperity their people enjoy.xx Repealing Helms-Burton and related statutory provisions would allow the U.S. the ability to efficiently promote and provide direct support to Cuba’s private sector. Such support would empower a greater plurality within Cuban society, including government reformers, democracy advocates, Cuban entrepreneurs and society as a whole by increasing their access to the resources and expertise of the world’s most prosperous private sector (and largest Cuban diaspora), located a mere 90 miles from Cuba’s shores. In turn, this would enhance the relative power of Cuban society to that of the state, while stripping the latter of its preferred scapegoat for its oppressive practices and economic blunders. U.S. policy should also seek to incentivize the Cuban government to end state monopolies on economic activities and allow greater private participation in the economy. The Cuba Study Group believes that any forthcoming congressional review of current legislation relating to Cuba, such as a review of the Cuban Adjustment Act, must require a review of the totality of the legislative framework codified in HelmsBurton and related statutory provisions so that the United States may finally develop a coherent policy toward the Island. The U.S. should pursue this course of action independent of actions taken by the Cuban government so as not to place the reigns of U.S. policy in the hands of Cuban proponents of the status quo.

**More moderate approaches *comparatively fail* to stabilize Cuba**

Koenig 10 – Lance is a US Army Colonel. This is a paper submitted for a Masters in Strategic Studies at the US Army War College. (“Time for a New Cuba Policy”, March 11, 2010, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA518130)

The United States requires a policy that will lead to better relations between the United States and Cuba, increase the soft power of the United States in the Latin American world, and pull the Cuban government towards a more representative form of governance. These conditions will contribute to the national security of the United States as well as to the western hemisphere. So with this in mind, what are our likely options? Options

• Path of least resistance, stay the course. The United States can continue with the current policy of trade embargo, travel restrictions, and limited diplomatic relations. The United States will not likely choose this path, but will rather go down it because it is easier politically to not change the status quo. This policy requires a long-term commitment and continuing patience. The Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act of 1996 provides the way ahead that the Cuban government must follow in order to gain normalized relations with the United States. This option follows the path of the last forty nine years and no significant change is required on the part of the United States. Politically, this avoids the problems generated by going against the Cuban voters of Florida that have been strong supporters of the current policy. The risk is that the United States will miss a window of opportunity to make fundamental positive changes to our relationship with Cuba. Additionally, Cuba could attain economic prosperity in spite of the United States’ actions. Cuba would be forced to continue to look towards China and Venezuela for trade and security relationships. Additionally, for both trade and tourism, Cuba will continue to develop relationships with Canada and the European Union, while the United States’ influence will continue to wane.

**• Strengthen the current policy**. Eliminate the billions of dollars per year in remittances from Cuban-Americans to relatives within Cuba. Work multilaterally with other countries to increase the effectiveness of the current embargoes on trade and travel. Fully implement the “Powell Commission Report” recommendations to end the Castro dictatorship and undermine the succession strategy.31 The Powell Commission Report seeks to reverse the recent economic gains to put added pressure on the government of Cuba. 32 Additionally, pressure the European Union to stop trading with Cuba and restrict the ability of EU citizens to travel to Cuba. The EU nations provide a great opportunity to make up for lost trade with the United States and have a large population of potential tourists for Cuban beaches. The United States must deter actions by the Organization of American States to work closer with Cuba. The Organization of American States should also warn its members to limit the scope of bilateral relations with Cuba in order to support the efforts of the United States. The United States must use Radio and TV Marti to inform the Cuban people of the true cause of their economic difficulty, the dysfunctional communist centrally controlled economy vice economic sanctions. And finally, tighten the noose around the economy and government of Cuba to attempt to bring down the government in a shorter period of time. This option assumes that our current policy is the correct policy, but needs to be strengthened. It eliminates half measures and contradicting policies to produce a more powerful embargo with devastating effect on the Cuban dictatorship. The risk is that the United States will become further isolated from the world in regards to its Cuba policy and will create additional sympathy for Cuba. This could result in open disregard for the embargo by the European Union and other countries interested in trade with Cuba, with a **collapse of** the **effectiveness** of the embargo. The soft power of the United States would suffer with possibly no gain. The United States could lose all possible influence over the future direction of the Cuban government as the Castro regime is replaced.

**• Limited easing of** economic and travel **sanctions.** Engage the Cuban government and reward concessions by easing sanctions. Engage the Cuban government and use a carrot and stick program to encourage the Cuban leadership to transition from a dictatorship towards a more representative form of government, with more emphasis on the stick and less on the carrot. Reward concessions on human rights and moves toward democratization with increased levels of trade and travel. Use the enticement of increased revenue to the government through higher levels of trade as well as the income generated when Americans (of both Cuban descent and nonCuban descent) visit the island and spend dollars. This approach should be less threatening to the Cuban government as they have a level of control over the pace of change. The risk is that the government of Cuba would have the opportunity to adjust to the gradual changes and maintain control while conditions for the Cuban people improve, removing the pressure for a change towards market reforms and a more democratic form of government.

• Support the Cuban people, but not the government. This option would completely and unilaterally lift the embargo on trade and travel.33 Reestablish normal diplomatic relations with Cuba. Engage the Cuban government and use a carrot and stick program to encourage the Cuban leadership to transition from a dictatorship towards a more representative form of government, with more emphasis on the carrot and less on the stick. Included in the carrots are: military to military exchanges and exercises; observer status in the Organization of American States (OAS); and provide assistance transitioning the economic and financial aspects of the economy towards a free market system. Use the economic element of power to demonstrate the superior qualities of a free market economy. Encourage Cuba to allow United States businesses to operate in Cuba without the restrictions of government ownership and government collection of wages for labor. Help Cuba develop an economy that takes advantage of their educated workforce (literacy rate of 99.8%) 34 to move away from low value added products to high value added products with the goal of improving the per capita gross domestic product (GDP) and thus the quality of life for the average Cuban citizen. This option has risk politically, as Cuban voters in Florida have traditionally supported isolating the Cuban government and economic sanctions. There are recent indications that Cuban-American opinions are shifting towards more engagement with Cuba. The recent poll conducted by the Brookings Institution, in collaboration with Florida International University and the Cuba Study Group, found that over 55% of Cuban-Americans oppose continuing the embargo and seems to indicate that this risk has lessened recently.35 But, with a viable economy that improves the standard of living for the population of Cuba, their government will feel less pressure to change from a dictatorship into a more representative form of government.

Recommendations

The option with the **greatest possibility of success and reward** for the United States **is to** support the Cuban people, but not the Cuban government. The United States should take the following actions unilaterally • **Lift completely the economic embargo.** Establish banking and financial relationships to facilitate the trading of goods and services between the two countries.

• Lift completely the travel ban to allow not only Cuban-Americans with relatives but also all other Americans to travel to Cuba. This interaction of Americans with Cubans will help raise the awareness of Cubans about their northern neighbor.

• Next, the United States should engage the Cuban government to develop a bilateral trade agreement. The goal of this initiative would be to **achieve normal trade relations** between the two countries.

This leaves the issue of compensation for United States companies and individuals whose property was expropriated by the Cuban government. With the embargo lifted, the United States should enlist the assistance of the European Union and Canada to apply pressure to Cuba as well as to assist in negotiations with the World Trade Organization to address issues with illegally confiscated property.36 The United States will gain leverage with the Cuban government as relations improve, and that will be the time to address human rights in Cuba. The return of the Cuban Five, a group of Cuban spies arrested and convicted in Florida, should be worth some human rights concessions. In Cuba, these men are known as the “Cinco Heroes” and their plight is well known.37 So what leverage do we have now that we have unilaterally given the Cuban government most of what they have wanted? Offer to return back to Cuba the Guantanamo Naval Base after the government of Cuba shifts towards a representative form of government. The foundation for this action has already been laid with the Libertad Act. “The future of the Guantanamo base, a provision in the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act of 1996 states that once a democratically elected Cuban government is in place, United States policy is to be prepared to enter into negotiations either to return the base to Cuba or to renegotiate the present agreement under mutually agreeable terms.” The United States Congress should soften the language referring to a democratically elected government and instead substitute that a representative form of government is required before entering into negotiations for the Guantanamo base. Once Cuba makes changes towards a representative form of government the United States can start working on democratic reforms. The carrot is to offer Cuba, in exchange for changes to a democratic form of government, support for their return to the Organization of American States (OAS). Until Cuba makes changes towards democracy, the United States should block the request of several member states to let Cuba into the organization. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said it well in a recent interview. “Many member countries originally sought to lift the 1962 suspension and allow Cuba to return immediately, without conditions, others agreed with us that the right approach was to replace the suspension — which has outlived its purpose after nearly half a century — with a process of dialogue and a future decision that will turn on Cuba’s commitment to the organization’s values.” These values include promoting democracy and defending human rights. The window of opportunity is open now for this type of change. The Obama administration has taken some steps in this direction with the lifting of remittance limits, unlimited visits to relatives in Cuba, and the ability to provide cell phones to relatives in Cuba. The other recent change is the new majority of Cuban-Americans, in Florida, that support removal of the embargo. Based on votes in the United Nations and the European Union it is clear that world opinion would definitely be supportive of this action. The combination of the above mentioned events now points to an opportunity to make real progress that will benefit both nations. The United States would gain in soft power, gain an additional economic trading partner, and have a chance to influence the type of changes in the Cuban government as the Castro influence wanes. Clearly, support to the Cuban people will indirectly provide support to the Cuban government, but that could work against the regime as well if the people realize that improvements in their living conditions are not the result of communism, but from the interaction with the capitalist world. There is a sound reason for unilaterally lifting the trade and travel embargoes without first seeing positive actions from the Cuban government. From Cuba expert Carlos A. Saladrigas, Co-Chairman, Cuba Study Group, “We can go back in the history -- in the 50-year history of United States-Cuba relations and clearly see that any time we begin to see a little bit of relaxation of tensions in the relationship, whenever we begin to see a little bit of openness on the part of the United States or Cuba, historically the Cuban government has done something to counteract that trend and significantly revert back to their playbook.” 40 The United States needs to take the initiative away from the Castro regime, and have them react to actions they have publicly called for (removal of the embargo), but in reality are unsure of the second and third order effects and their ability to control the outcome. One of the first problems for the Cuban government after the removal of the embargo will be the excuse for the poor performing economy. “… the embargo and the United States policy of confrontation and isolation have been incredibly useful to the Cuban regime as an alibi for the failures of the regime to meet the fundamental needs of the people on the island, but also is a significant source of legitimacy, both internal and external.” 41 Conclusion This situation may present the United States with the opportunity to step in to assist with market reforms if the Cuban economy sputters and the government realizes they don’t have a scapegoat. The efforts expended by the United States to keep the embargo effective, the loss of trade, and the loss of soft power in most of the world are clearly not worth it in comparison to the threat that Cuba poses today. The gains to be achieved by following any path other than the unilateral removal of the economic and travel embargoes are small in comparison to the overall costs of continuing the current failed policy. The United States is losing far too much soft power in its efforts to punish and isolate the government of Cuba. American firms could be left out of any economic gains as Cuba continues to grow its economy. As Cuba emerges from the economic difficulties of the last two decades, the United States has an opportunity to influence the future direction of our southern neighbor. The current United States policy has many passionate defenders, and their criticism of the Castro regime is justified. Nevertheless, we must recognize the ineffectiveness of our current policy and deal with the Cuban regime in a way that enhances United States interests.42 The United States cannot afford to miss out on the window of opportunity to affect a positive change in the relationship with Cuba. If Cuba is able to continue on a path of economic progress and emerge once again as a true regional power, with communism intact, the United States will be the loser in this half century struggle. Cuba is spreading its limited influence to Venezuela, Honduras, Nicaragua, and will be ready to bring in any other countries in the Americas that want to move away from the United States orbit. The United States can’t stand by and watch Cuba regain strength, intact as a communist country, but must take this opportunity to create an inflection point for Cuba that guides her onto a path that will benefit the nations of the Americas.

#### The impact is the *Cuban health care sector*—it depends upon a *democratic* and *market-based* transition

Ullmann 05 – Steven G. Ullmann is a Professor and Director, Programs in and Center for Health Sector Management and Policy at U of Miami. This article is part of the Cuba Transition Project, part of the Institute for Cuban and Cuban-American Studies at Miami. (“The Future of Health Care in a Post-Castro Cuba”, 2005, http://ctp.iccas.miami.edu/Research\_Studies/StevenUllman.pdf)

As a transition occurs, further deterioration of medical care services and, in turn, the public’s health is likely to take place. Indeed, often during transitions, a reallocation of funds occurs to meet other needs of the changing state. Health care services are at risk under such a real location. This is what countries in Eastern Europe experienced subsequent to the collapse of the Soviet Union (WHO Regional Office 1998). Further, when changes occur in economic, political, and/or social conditions, there appear to be greater incidences of heart disease and suicide due to stress, especially among the young and middle-aged male population (“UNICEF Warns” 1994). When socioeconomic pressures manifest themselves in these ways, they add further strains on an already overburdened health care system. Transition may open up additional important roles for NGOs. The influence of NGOs to date has been limited in Cuba, due to distrust regarding their political motivations (Gonzalez and Coil 1997) and the role of a centralized government in making services available independently of NGOs. In other countries during transitions, NGOs have had a strong track record of providing assistance to restore infrastructure and provide basic food, shelter, and health care needs. Their role may be of great importance in Cuba’s transition. One area of focus would be in rural regions, where indications are that infrastructure has deteriorated and health problems have been even more prominent than in urban areas. NGOs may also be involved in assessing the continued provision of basic medical services and blood bank services, as they did once before when Castro first came to power and a health care personnel exodus caused a crisis (Claudio 1999). Indeed, one of the many functions that NGOs can have during a period of transition is the tracking of medical data. Even if a transition is smooth with insignificant changes in political processes, blood supply and vaccination programs nonetheless will be put at risk. NGOs can help to ensure the continuation of global immunizations and the safety of the blood supply. These programs will have to be monitored closely, as a breakdown would be very problematic for the country. Depending upon the openness of the new regime. NGOs will have a strong or a minimal role. The needs, however, that could be served by NGOs will be diverse and significant. **The nature of regime change will be instrumental** in determining the future focus of Cuban society as well as the level of openness to the growth of NGO involvement, private sector participation, and the provision of health care. With all that could potentially occur, there are certain indications that opportunities for development of a private sector, including the medical private sector, may be limited, even though there is so much potential. The actual outcome is a **function of the type of political system that emerges** after Castro is no longer on the scene. Several writers have been developing theories relating to democratization and emergence of a market-based economy. Edward Gonzalez of the RAND Corporation argues that a number of potential scenarios exist in a post-Castro Cuba (Gonzalez and ColI 1997). These scenarios would, in turn, impact the health care delivery system in the country. Gonzalez argues that the probability of a reformist or a coalition government. focused on democratic reform and the development of market systems, is quite limited He indicates that as Castro passes on, a strong possibility is that the military, under the direction of Raúl Castro, Fidel’s brother, would retain power with a possible allowance for minimal market opportunities. A second scenario reflects the establishment of a coalition government, although Gonzalez claims that the possibility of an open coalition is not great. Gonzalez suggests that there is so much invested in the underlying concepts of the Fidelistas and so much distrust of any reform movement, either from within or from outside the country by the Cuban exile community, that this is not a viable option. As such, the opportunities for a market-based health care system layered upon the current public health care system may also be limited in scope. As Alberto Coil indicates in his paper. The Future of US-Cuban Relations, the importance of social security cannot be overestimated (Gonzalez and Coil 1997). Fear of the impact of market reform on distribution of wealth is of great concern. Further, the advent of capitalism is not without consequences. Full employment, zero inflation, and perceived egalitarianism have been mainstays of the Castro communist system (putting aside the strong black market that exists in the country). Fears of loss of jobs, security, and homes, and reduced access to a perceived high-quality health care system are some of the concerns that would accompany any market reforms. Policy changes will have to be introduced very carefully, smoothly, and incrementally in a post-Castro Cuba, even though, as indicated, elements of it already exist. The implication, however, from these studies is that there may be only limited prospects for real market-based health care reform in the near term. More widespread reforms may only be forthcoming over time. With the end of the Fidel Castro regime, negligible changes in the politics within Cuba and in foreign relations and trade between Cuba and the United States are indeed a possibility. Recent moves to strengthen the military infrastructure within the country seem to indicate this. If little political change occurs after a regime change, U.S. frustration will cause, if anything, increased U.S. restraints on trade with Cuba. If this scenario occurs, then it is quite possible that there will be more of the same, namely, continued deterioration of the economic situation within Cuba with carryover to the health care sector. One can assume that the medical infrastructure, operating under compromised conditions within hospitals and clinics, would continue to deteriorate, with even more constraints on technology and equipment and fewer basic sanitary supplies. Housing and food shortages and current nutritional concerns would not be alleviated; vulnerable populations would continue to be at risk, and their health care problems would become worse. This would put increased strains on the already stressed medical care system. It is reasonable to expect that aggregate mental health would also continue to decline with resultant increases in murder and suicide rates. The government of Cuba would attempt to counter this situation by generating revenues with increased tourism, a factor already discussed as one of the major causes of an increased incidence of STDs and AIDS and a variable affecting the high rate of abortion in the country. More efforts to trade doctors and medications for oil will result from continued political processes, as Cuba will seek markets that are not foreclosed to trade. With this situation, however, will come continued frustration on the part of medical professionals. A combination of an oversupply of medical personnel, poor working conditions. and very poor remuneration will only reduce the morale of the medical care workforce even further. Ultimately, all these stresses will have consequences in terms of stress on the political system. The period of transition post-Castro will be an extremely critical period in the lives of Cubans. So far, we have discussed issues associated with changes inside the country. What about the potential for investment of foreign capital in medical and health care from external sources? Again, concerns relate to the concept of significant market opportunities in Cuba after the fall of Castro. These opportunities may actually be more limited than has been anticipated by the exile community, not only for political reasons but also for economic reasons. Pointing out the large amount of foreign debt Cuba owes to numerous Western and Eastern Bloc countries and the fact that the economy has been handicapped over the last 10 to 15 years, Jaime Suchlicki indicates that these circumstances reinforce the concept that Cuba is now a poor country without the near-term resources to rebuild (1997). Until the economy improves and at least some of the debt is repaid or resolved, there may be fewer opportunities for investment in Cuba than many anticipate. If there are to be any major opportunities for investment and potential growth, they may be found in the health care industry. As discussed, Cuba has developed its own pharmaceutical and biotechnology industries out of necessity. The country has highly trained scientific and medical talent and has invested in an infrastructure to meet domestic needs. Further, Cuba has sold pharmaceutical supplies and biotechnology in foreign markets, but it has been essentially foreclosed from selling to less developed countries, as they do not necessarily have the financial resources to afford products produced by Cuban firms. Given that Cuba’s talented and experienced professionals are paid minimally and that the appropriate infrastructures for production, research, and development are in place, partnerships with U.S. and other foreign-based pharmaceutical and biotechnology firms may present worthwhile opportunities for all parties. Foreign pharmaceutical and biotechnology firms would have access to relatively inexpensive professional labor and capital. The potential for scientists’ brain drain, just as for medical personnel, could be lowered by offering professionals financial incentives to remain in the country. Partnerships like these would stimulate an infusion of new capital into Cuba, and the participation of foreign firms would allow for the **expansion of output into the international marketplace**, currently foreclosed to Cuban producers. With an infusion of capital, additional technology, necessary inputs, and know- how, these firms will be able to meet the pharmaceutical needs of the domestic economy as well. Such partnerships will also encourage imports of other necessary pharmaceuticals: hence, a wide selection of medications would be available. **Such opportunities hinge upon the** post-Castro **administration’s degree of openness and disposition toward the rest of the world.** Transition, by its very nature, brings about instability. This is especially true when transitions rarely occur, offering few patterns associated with change. As Fidel Castro leaves power, whether voluntarily, by force, or by death, there will be many unknowns. This monograph has attempted to provide insights into how health care systems may react and adjust to change. Ultimately, we will not know the outcome until a change actually occurs. What is certain, however, is the fact that the health care system in Cuba will be an extremely important component of any political, economic, and social transition in the country as well as in this active region of the world.

#### That model stops disease spread worldwide

Cooper et al 06 – Richard S. Cooper is in the Department of Preventive Medicine and Epidemiology at Loyola University – Stritch School of Medicine, Maywood, IL, USA. (“Health in Cuba”, International Journal of Epidemiology, May 4, 2006, <http://ije.oxfordjournals.org/content/35/4/817.full.pdf+html>)

Infectious diseases The combination of high levels of community participation, access to primary care and an aggressive public health approach has made the Cuban campaign against epidemic infectious diseases particularly successful.58–60 A number of common illnesses have been eliminated altogether, often for the first time in any country [poliomyelitis (1962), neonatal tetanus (1972), diphtheria (1979), measles (1993), pertussis (1994), rubella and mumps (1995)]. In 1962, against the advice of external health officials, ‘vaccination days’ were established with the goal of reaching the entire population. When this method quickly proved to be effective in eliminating polio it was subsequently adopted elsewhere as the primary strategy.58 After dengue was introduced in 1981 Cuba adopted a campaign of community mobilization, focusing on elimination of mosquito breeding sites, which lead to prompt control.20,58,59 International attention for infectious disease control in Cuba has focused primarily on HIV/AIDS.10,20,61–63 Among 300 000 military personnel returning from Africa in the 1980s 84 were found to be infected with the virus [Ref. (20), p. 85]. A nation-wide screening programme which began in 1987 reached 80% of the sexually active population (~3.5 million people) and identified 268 HIV-positive individuals.20 In the initial phases, the Cuban HIV/AIDS strategy provoked controversy, some of which was negative.20,64 While assessing the public health impact of this unknown epidemic, persons infected with HIV were quarantined in health facilities where they received supplemental nutrition and available medical care.20,61,62 Treatment is now provided in the outpatient setting; domestically produced triple therapy has been provided free to all paediatric patients since 1998 and to adults with HIV or AIDS since 2000.62 With the rapid increase in foreign tourists, and the development of a local sex trade, the HIV incidence has risen in the past 5 years, although it remains the lowest in the Americas.23 Increased integration into the global economy may continue to pose challenges which Cuban public health has not previously had to address. Cuba’s role in global health assistance Given its limited economic resources, Cuba can only rarely afford direct aid.20 Instead it has adopted a strategy that relies on human resources. First targeted to Africa, the programme has now placed physicians, nurses, dentists, and other professionals in 52 countries.20,65,66 The most prominent episodes involved sending doctors to post-apartheid South Africa, providing long-term care for Chernobyl victims, and giving disaster aid to Central America after hurricane Mitch. Cuban personnel also staffed a new hospital in Gonaives, Haiti, which had been constructed with the Japanese aid; this facility was subsequently destroyed during the anti-Aristide strife in 2004 although the Cuban physicians have remained.67 To move from emergency assistance to a sustainable programme, a multicountry collaborative plan has recently been developed to improve health services in poor Latin American countries.66 A medical school was established in Havana in 1999 and more than 6000 students, primarily from Africa and Latin America, are currently being given a medical education at no expense.7,68,69 In the past 3 years more than 14 000 physicians and dentists have been placed in slums and rural communities in Venezuela as part of the new the partnership between Cuba and the Chavez government, and this number is set to rise to 20 000.68 Cuba has also agreed to educate 40 000 new physicians for Venezuela over the next several years.69 Cuba’s medical assistance campaign has a number of dimensions. Like all foreign aid programmes, it assumes that some political benefits will be forthcoming in return. However, most of the countries that have been assisted, for example, Ethiopia, The Gambia, and Haiti, have nothing to offer in return. Unlike many donor programmes, placing physicians where none have practiced before has been overwhelmingly well received by the local communities.69 Thus, while the arrangement with Venezuela has direct economic benefit to Cuba, it has also transformed the health system by giving large segments of the Venezuelan population access to modern medical care.69 The special character of health sector development in Cuba can perhaps be best appreciated by considering the challenge any other society would face if it tried to send tens of thousands of physicians to live in slum communities in a foreign country for 2 years. While a range of incentives and motivating factors unique to the Cuban social context are operating, these assignments are accepted as a professional obligation by the vast majority of the Cuban practitioners and they perform effectively in the host communities. Much like the experience of military personnel on long tours of duty, the Cuban programme of assistance does nonetheless require extraordinary sacrifice and the hardship is not always borne lightly. Furthermore, the mobilization for assistance to Venezuela has meant that many Cuban neighbourhoods must share facilities. These sacrifices must, of course, be balanced against the conditions of desperate need in the communities on the receiving end. Many of these countries, particularly in Africa, have watched helplessly as the majority of their health professionals emigrate to the US and Europe.70 Offhand dismissal by observers in industrialized countries of the Cuban medical aid programme, which has such a powerful impact on these marginalized communities, is a clear indication of how perilously divided the discourse over global development has become. Does Cuba’s experience have broader significance? The history of science is replete with stories of the delayed acceptance of unpopular or unfashionable ideas. The approach to improving global health taken by the donor community and academic medicine in rich countries is no exception. While criticisms of the basic approach are voiced—as in the recent assertion that the external measures of development have no meaning for the general population71,72—these critical voices have little influence on the practice of large international agencies. It is not the intent of this article, however, to summarize and make a judgment on economic assistance and progress in global public health. Instead, based on the weight of the evidence presented on the Cuban experience, we pose the following question: ‘Why has the debate on solving the most urgent challenges in public health in poor countries ignored the experience of success?’ Traditionally, whether the experience is derived from randomized trials, high survival rates in clinical series, or favourable trends in vital statistics, biomedicine embraces the winner and seeks to imitate it. Precisely the opposite has happened in this instance. There is, of course, no shortage of historical and ideological reasons why a debate on the ‘Cuban question’ has never reached maturity. Blind optimism is thought to have discredited the sympathetic scholarship about the Soviet Union, and to a lesser extent China, in an earlier era.73–75 Some observers are too concerned about putative restraints on civil liberties and the independent character of its foreign policy to develop any enthusiasm for the objectively more successful aspects of Cuban society. None of these concerns, however, undermine the force of the question, why have we ignored what works? Before recommending components of the Cuban model for use in other settings, a thorough and balanced assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of those components would be required. That assessment would require a very different study of the health system’s organization, capacity, and services. Our intent here is to demonstrate that sufficient cause exists to undertake that assessment. For an objective evaluation of the Cuban experience to succeed, an acceptance of certain ground rules would be required. First, this evaluation cannot be undertaken with the goal of winning a political argument. Although the trajectory of social development in Cuba over the past 50 years is both complex and controversial, as in all other countries, the public health experience should be subjected to judgment on the basis of the usual rules of science. Second, this judgment cannot be permanently postponed by skepticism about the validity of the data or concern over unrelated broader social questions. Ongoing, careful scrutiny of Cuban public health data is justified and to be welcomed; however, sufficient data now exist in several key areas to demonstrate that skepticism can no longer be the basis for a refusal to engage the question. Likewise, many societies embrace domestic and foreign policies that are questioned and even condemned by broad segments of the world community, yet the attempt to evaluate progress in improving the health of their populations is not thereby condemned as illegitimate or unnecessary. Third, the apparent successes recorded by Cuba should be seen as consequences of a well-defined strategy; the value of these underlying principles, not the accumulation of better numbers, is what holds implications for other poor countries, and not a few well-resourced societies. Two aspects of the Cuban experience serve as reasonable demonstrations of the value of that strategic approach. In the area of infectious disease, for example, the operative principles are particularly straightforward: once a safe and effective vaccine becomes available the entire at-risk population is immunized; if a vaccine is not available, the susceptible population is screened and treated; where an arthropod vector can be identified, the transmission pathway is disrupted by mobilizing the local community which in turn requires effective neighbourhood organization and universal primary health care. The joint effect of these strategic activities will result in the elimination or control of virtually all serious epidemic infectious conditions. In terms of child survival, a ‘continuum of care’ that provides for the pre-conceptional health of women, prenatal care, skilled birth attendants, and a comprehensive well-baby programme can quickly reduce infant mortality to levels approaching the biological minimum. Many observers will regard these propositions as reasonable, yet hopelessly too ambitious for the poorer nations of the world. It must be recognized, however, that these principles have been successfully implemented in Cuba at a cost well within the reach of most middle-income countries. Although other aspects of society, such as education and housing obviously make independent contributions to the success of public health campaigns, the Cuban strategy outlined here serves as a model that should be thoroughly evaluated. Needless to say, its implementation would face many challenges specific to the geography and politics of a region. Other models that dictate public health strategies face the same gamut of uncertainties and challenges, however, and none can be said to have met with similar success.76 The World Health Organization, for example, promulgated a set of principles in the Alma Ata ‘Health for All’ Declaration of 1978, many of which were incorporated into the Cuban approach.77 In recent years, however, international agencies have favoured privatization and reduction in state support for health systems.78 The record of achievement with privatized systems in poor countries has often been very limited.79 A debate which can use as a point of departure extensive empirical evidence of progress would provide a healthy reorientation in a discipline distracted by controversy and divided over political aims. The health professions have little opportunity to intervene directly on historical events. However, in the conduct of our science we have both choice and responsibility. Challenging the acquiescence of the scientific community to ostracism of some of its members in an earlier era, Einstein remarked, ‘Political considerations, advanced with much solemnity, prevent... the purely objective ways of thinking without which our great aims must necessarily be frustrated’ [Ref. (80) p. 80]. If the accomplishments of Cuba could be reproduced across a broad range of poor and middle-income countries **the health of the world’s population would be transformed**. This fact creates an obligation for health scientists. We should debate the merits of the principles embedded in the Cuban attempts to improve the health of populations.

#### Global pandemics are coming and direct US intervention fails

Weber 06 – Steven Weber is a Professor of Political Science at UC-Berkeley and Director of the Institute of International Studies. (“How Globalization Went Bad”, Foreign Policy, December 27, 2006, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2006/12/27/how\_globalization\_went\_bad?page=0,2)

The same is true for global public health. Globalization is turning the world into an enormous petri dish for the incubation of infectious disease. Humans cannot outsmart disease, because it just evolves too quickly. Bacteria can reproduce a new generation in less than 30 minutes, while it takes us decades to come up with a new generation of antibiotics. Solutions are only possible when and where we get the upper hand. Poor countries where humans live in close proximity to farm animals are the best place to breed extremely dangerous zoonotic disease. These are often the same countries, perhaps not entirely coincidentally, that feel threatened by American power. Establishing an early warning system for these diseases -- exactly what we lacked in the case of SARS a few years ago and exactly what we lack for avian flu today -- will require a significant level of intervention into the very places that don't want it. That will be true as long as international intervention means American interference. The most likely sources of the next ebola or HIV-like pandemic are the countries that simply won't let U.S. or other Western agencies in, including the World Health Organization. Yet the threat is too arcane and not immediate enough for the West to force the issue. What's needed is another great power to take over a piece of the work, a power that has more immediate interests in the countries where diseases incubate and one that is seen as less of a threat. As long as the United States remains the world's lone superpower, we're not likely to get any help. Even after HIV, SARS, and several years of mounting hysteria about avian flu, the world is still not ready for a viral pandemic in Southeast Asia or sub-Saharan Africa. America can't change that alone.

#### Zoonotic diseases specifically lead to extinction

Casadevall 12 – Prof @ Department of Microbiology and Immunology and the Division of Infectious Diseases of the Albert Einstein College of Medicine Arturo. (“The future of biological warfare,” Microbial Biotechnology, p. 584-5)

In considering the importance of biological warfare as a subject for concern it is worthwhile to review the known existential threats. At this time this writer can identify at three major existential threats to humanity: (i) large-scale thermonuclear war followed by a nuclear winter, (ii) a planet killing asteroid impact and (iii) infectious disease. To this trio might be added climate change making the planet uninhabitable. Of the three existential threats the first is deduced from the inferred cataclysmic effects of nuclear war. For the second there is geological evidence for the association of asteroid impacts with massive extinction (Alvarez, 1987). As to an existential threat from microbes recent decades have provided **unequivocal evidence** for the ability of certain pathogens to cause the extinction of entire species. Although infectious disease has traditionally not been associated with extinction this view has changed by the finding that a single chytrid fungus was responsible for the extinction of numerous amphibian species (Daszak et al., 1999; Mendelson et al., 2006). Previously, the view that infectious diseases were not a cause of extinction was predicated on the notion that many pathogens required their hosts and that some proportion of the host population was naturally resistant. However, that calculation does not apply to microbes that are acquired directly from the environment and **have no need for a host**, such as the majority of fungal pathogens. For those types of host–microbe interactions it is possible for the pathogen to kill off every last member of a species without harm to itself, since it would return to its natural habitat upon killing its last host. Hence, from the viewpoint of existential threats environmental microbes could potentially pose a much greater threat to humanity than the known pathogenic microbes, which number somewhere near 1500 species (Cleaveland et al., 2001; Tayloret al., 2001), especially if some of these species acquired the capacity for pathogenicity as a consequence of natural evolution or bioengineering.

### 1AC—Agriculture

#### CONTENTION 2 IS SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE:

#### Cuban agriculture sustainability is failing—foreign investment is key

King 12 – M. Dawn King is a Visiting Assistant Professor at Brown University’s Center for Environmental Studies. She earned her Ph.D. in Environmental Politics at Colorado State University and worked as a policy analyst for the U.S. Geological Survey – conducting research on environmental decision-making models and internal governance of watershed management councils. (“Cuban Sustainability: The Effects of Economic Isolation on Agriculture and Energy”, March 21, 2012, <http://wpsa.research.pdx.edu/meet/2012/kingmdawn.pdf>)

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

#### The plan provides foreign capital to Cuba and allows its model to be exported globally

Shkolnick 12 – JD Candidate, Drake University Law School. (“SIN EMBARGO: THE CUBAN AGRICULTURAL REVOLUTION AND WHAT IT MEANS FOR THE UNITED STATES”, 17 Drake J. Agric. L. 683, Fall, http://students.law.drake.edu/aglawjournal/docs/agVol17No3-Shkolnick.pdf)

Cuba today is experiencing the most rapid shifts towards privatization and reform since the revolution more than sixty years ago. Though truly open trade with Cuba will remain out of reach until the embargo is relaxed or a new trade agreement is reached, it is worth the time of agricultural and business entities in the United States to consider how they may approach doing business in Cuba. Given the extent of pre-embargo trade between the United States and Cuba it is no stretch to imagine the enormous possibilities once that partnership is reestablished. Though reforms over the past decade have made significant progress towards this end, they only scratch the surface on what Cuba has to offer. The two economic areas where Cuba shows perhaps the most promise and have the greatest potential for international trade and investment are tourism and agriculture. Tourism shows great promise simply for the fact that for more than half a century the country has been entirely cut off from open trade and travel by U.S. citizens, citizens who will likely flock to the country once access is restored. Agriculture in Cuba also presents numerous unique opportunities, and since the collapse of the Soviet Union the country has developed novel agricultural production techniques that could help serve a growing demand for natural, organic foods in the United States. While tourism may increase economic opportunity for existing businesses and industries, Cuba’s agricultural model, on the other hand, presents unique opportunities to both existing and entirely new busi-ness opportunities in the United States. A. Cuba as a Tourist Destination Prior to the embargo, Cuba was a travel destination for as many as 300,000 American tourists per year.91 Tourists from various Soviet Bloc nations never came close to making up this loss in travel, reaching no more than 30,000tourists per year.92 Since the demise of the Soviet Union, however, tourism to the island has continued to increase dramatically. As of July 2012, Cuba is the sec-ond most popular tourist destination in the Caribbean region, trailing only the Dominican Republic.93 Slightly more than two million tourists per year now visit the island as of 2011, representing growth of 7.3% over the last year alone.94 Asof 2005, Cuba’s service sector accounted for 67.8% of the nation’s annual gross domestic product, eclipsing traditional Cuban exports such as nickel and sugar.95Tourist infrastructure in Cuba, however, has strained to accommodate the rapid surge in visitors, with hotels, resorts, restaurants, and other accommodations showing their age after decades of relatively little improvement or investment.96Depending on the precise means through which the travel and economic embargos are lifted, estimates of the number of U.S. visitors expected to visit Cuba within the first year range from six hundred thousand to more than one million, with up to five million visitors per year by the fifth year of open travel.97 There is the potential for modest yet not insignificant job growth in response to new travel opportunities, with potentially over twelve thousand new service sector and trav-el jobs in the United States within five years.98B. Agricultural Trade with Cuba It is the agricultural sector, however, that provides some of the most substantial and intriguing opportunities for both trade with Cuba and the creation of entirely new businesses in the United States. In fact, agricultural products were the very first items traded between the United States and Cuba since the embargo in December of 2001, when two ships loaded with chicken and corn arrived inHavana.99 The potential for the U.S. agricultural sector is abundantly clear when the sheer volume of Cuba’s agricultural imports are taken into account. In 2008,Cuba imported approximately $1.8 billion in agricultural goods.100 Only approximately 40% of imported agricultural goods were from the United States, leaving over $1 billion of trade going to other countries.101Cuba itself is very much in favor of increased agricultural trade with the United States simply for the logistical simplicity and cost-savings it would pro-vide.102 Import costs account for as much as 35% of the goods Cuba currently imports from its trading partners.103 Because Cuba is less than one hundred miles from the coast of the United States, the country is naturally eager to enter into trade relationships that lead to lower transportation costs.104 Cuban officials cite rice as just one example of an agricultural product that they would be inter-ested in obtaining from the United States.106 Rice is a staple food for Cuban citizens, and they enjoy it with almost every meal.107 Presently, the bulk of their rice must be imported from Eastern Asia, meaning a long voyage by sea and the expenses that go along with shipping tons of goods across the Pacific Ocean.108Rice exports alone present an enormous opportunity for U.S. producers. The United States is a major exporter of both processed and unprocessed rice, accounting for 10% of all international trade in rice each year.109 Half of annual U.S. rice sales come from the export market, and the United States is considered a reliable supplier of a quality product on the international market.110 The USDA estimates that if the current restrictions on trade were removed, Cuba could potentially exceed Mexico and Japan as the biggest importer of rice grown in the United States.111 As of September 2005, Cuba estimated that they could purchase more than one million metric tons of rice annually, but restrictions make it unlikely that import from the United States will go much beyond current levels of 712,000 metric tons.112 A key obstacle, according to Cuba, is the requirement that all shipments of agricultural products from the United States be paid for in cash before they leave port.113 This resulted in a reduction in rice ex-ports to Cuba by nearly 50% from 2004 to 2005, according to the USA Rice Fed-eration.114 For the foreseeable future, any effort by agricultural groups in the United States to take advantage of trade opportunities with Cuba will have to operate within the guidelines and policy directives of Cuba as well as the United States. One risk that any organization that wishes to trade with Cuba might encounter is that their proposals and business plans will run into red tape not only through regulations in the United States, but through conflict with the Communist Party of Cuba, which still holds tremendous sway over policy and business decisions on the island. Cuban officials are, of course, aware of the tremendous opportunity that trade with the United States might bring to their country, and for the most part remain eager to pursue closer ties with whom they see as their closest, most natu-ral trading partner.115 Roy Ramón Philippón, a leading official with the Cuban Society of Agrarian Law, indicated that the country recognizes that changes are necessary in order to properly compete with and participate in an open globalmarket.116 Long gone are the days when Cuba could count on highly subsidized exports to the Soviet Bloc as a stable source of income.117 For the first forty years of Cuba’s “socialist experiment” following their revolution, the first priority for the Cuban government was to provide the maximum amount of social services and benefit to the population regardless of the cost; something that they could achieve through trade with the Soviet Bloc prior to its collapse.118The process of reform in Cuba is necessarily dependent upon the approv-al of the national Communist Party. All of the reforms that have been put in place must be considered by and ultimately recommended by the Communist Party operating under their internal guidelines.119 By its nature this is intended to be a slow, deliberative process, the intent of which is to allow all interested gov-ernment officials, business representatives, and interested citizens to voice their opinions and for the Party’s guidelines to take each group’s concerns into ac-count.120Cuba has continued to introduce new programs to assist local producers in becoming more productive while also promoting ecological restoration andpreservation.121 In a shift away from the large state-run farms that characterized Cuban agriculture for much of the twentieth century, Cuba is now focused on diversifying agricultural production through a variety of both privately run and some state-controlled enterprises.122Cuban officials responsible for investigating and recommending addi-tional improvements to the Cuban agricultural system echo this call for reform and increased efficiency and productivity.123 Cuban officials point to the two primary goals that Cuba is pursuing in its efforts to improve its agricultural out-put and modernize their agricultural system; eco-restoration and preservation and urban and suburban agriculture.124 In addition, while the country is desirous of increasing its agricultural exports as a source of income, enough of the goods produced must be funneled into an official state-controlled market that can con-trol prices and ensure that food is affordable even to those with low incomes.125The first priority before any additional exports can be considered is to increase production for local consumption to the point where the country could conceiva-bly become self-sustaining for the majority of its food production needs.126 Once they are producing enough food for local consumption, then priorities may shift towards producing additional crops for export; coffee in particular is one locally produced crop that Cuba is particularly interested in increasing production for both local consumption and export.127Government officials recognize that the Cuban economy is in a relatively underdeveloped state, and future policies will need to be responsive to the state’s economic needs as well as their agricultural ones.128 If, for example, the price of corn were to skyrocket on the world market, Cuban officials indicate that if it made economic sense, they “would cover this island with corn.”129 Similar to the practices of the former Soviet Bloc, the Cuban economy is still very much orga-nized and planned by the state, and the current agricultural plan in Cuba is de-signed to cover the next five years of anticipated growth.130As for direct investment by foreign investors and producers, current poli-cies in Cuba will make that somewhat difficult for the foreseeable future, as all direct business relationships with foreign entities are currently organized and controlled by a number of governmental bodies.131 Cuban officials indicate that future reforms could conceivably open the door to direct investment and transac-tions between Cuban agricultural producers and foreign buyers.132 Understanding this future opportunity first requires a digression into the organizational structure employed in Cuba to manage and direct the agricultural system in Cuba. V. NEW REFORMS The current agricultural system has gone through a period of significant readjustment since the collapse of the Soviet Union. Beginning in 1993, Cuba started to move away from enormous state-run facilities and fully embraced a model of cooperative ownership that it had first introduced in the 1970s with the cooperativa de producción agropecuaria, or CPA.133 The new model, the basic unit of cooperative production, or UBPC, was introduced in September of 1993,and by 1995 there were 2855 UBPCs in operation.134 The UBPC differs from the CPA in that a UBPC operates on land that continues to be owned by the state but is provided to farmers in the form of a usufruct agreement, while a CPA is made up of lands that groups of farmers already had in their possession.135 By the endof 2007, the UBPC had far exceeded the CPA in the amount of land being farmed, with more than 2.8 million hectares of land organized under the UBPC system, compared to just under 700,000 hectares in CPAs.136 The majority of farmland in Cuba remained under state control as of the end of 2007, with more than 6 million hectares of farmland overseen by the state.137Both the UBPCs and the CPAs operate under an arrangement whereby the state provides assistance in the form of access to credit and a market for the goods produced, and in exchange the production cooperatives provide a certain quota of goods for sale and distribution by the state.138 One of the key objectives in the legislation itself is that the farms shall “be owners of the means of produc-tion and of the crop,” while still retaining ownership of the land in state hands.139Goals of this new organization were to improve efficiency and encourage more productive use of land. The goals of the Cuban Revolution continue to be em-bodied in the legislation that created these entities.140In 2008, Cuba passed what is perhaps the most substantial piece of agri-cultural legislation in decades. Named simply “Law 259,” it provides a means for almost any Cuban citizen, existing farm, or authorized agency to acquire un-used state lands and put them to better use as farmland.141 This is a substantial departure from the earlier CPA and UBCP systems that for the most part only transferred existing agricultural land controlled by the state into quasi-privatecooperatives.142 Law 259 continues the usufruct method of land distribution pio-neered by the UBPC system and allows for any interested, qualified party to ap-ply for an initial tract of a maximum of 13.42 hectares (33.16 acres), with their ownership potentially increasing to up to 40.26 hectares (99.48 acres) in the fu-ture.143 Continued operation of farmland granted under this program is contin-gent upon the land being used in a productive, sustainable manner with appropri-ate environmental conservation measures.144Even with the new reforms, the land is still technically tied to the state, and individuals who take possession of land under this program are not permitted to sell or rent the land to others, though the state will compensate landowners for the improvements they have made to the land during their term of tenancy.145The CPA, UBPC, and now Law 259 reforms Cuba put in place, along with reforms the Cuban government is discussing for the future, mean that opportunities for further U.S. involvement in Cuban agriculture are numerous. Presently, foreign companies that wish to enter into business relation-ships with Cuban counterparts must do so almost entirely via official government channels.146 Government agencies such as the Ministry of Sugar or the Ministry of Agriculture are responsible for managing trade for their respective indus-tries.147 All imports of food and other agricultural products must first enter the country via Alimport, a state-run agency that handles the entire sales process from securing contracts and arranging for payment to managing the distributionprocess.148 For the time being, the sole agency that U.S. companies wishing to engage in agricultural trade in Cuba can work with is Alimport.149 Rarely will there be any contact directly between U.S. companies and end-users in Cuba.150The process in the United States can be similarly convoluted. The U.S. Department of Commerce’s Bureau of Industry and Security oversees all busi-ness negotiations with Cuban companies, and notifications of sales must be sub-mitted through them before a license will be granted.151 Since U.S. policy still prohibits the extension of credit to any Cuban banks, all payments either have tobe paid for in cash prior to shipment or a confirmed letter-of-credit can be com-pleted with a bank located in a third country.152 In an unusual and unfortunate overlap in U.S. policy directives, goods that are paid for in cash prior to shipment are legally Cuban property though still in the United States, and potentially sub-ject to seizure on behalf of Cuban exiles within the United States who have out-standing legal and monetary claims against the Cuban government.153 Ships with goods meant for Cuba, however, may leave port as soon as payment is either received in cash or confirmed deposited in a foreign bank, a clarification made by the Department of Treasury Office of Foreign Asset Control in July 2005 in an attempt to reduce anxiety over this possibility.154José Garea Alonso, an official with the Cuban Ministry of Agriculture, indicated that recent legislation such as Law 259 is the start of what may eventu-ally lead to more direct commercial ties between Cuban organizations and foreign buyers or investors.155 At the moment, Cuba’s agricultural cooperatives are relatively small and continue to rely on the state for the bulk of their marketingopportunities.156 In the future, these cooperatives may be allowed to join together to form larger groups of linked agricultural cooperatives working together to manage their own affairs, and may include the ability to directly negotiate with foreign buyers rather than requiring an intervening hand from Alimport or anoth-er appropriate ministry.157Foreign investment in Cuban businesses has only been possible in a lim-ited form since the early 1980s, when the Cuban government introduced legisla-tion allowing for foreign entities to create a joint venture with the Cuban gov-ernment for investment purposes.158 Ultimately, the goal of this legislation was to provide an easier means for Cuba to acquire additional foreign currency to inject into its economy.159 Even with the new law, regulations prohibited any foreign participant in a joint enterprise from controlling more than 49%, though such a restriction was not in place for a partnership.160VI. NEW OPPORTUNITIES While investment in Cuban businesses and sales or purchases of Cuban products must still move through official channels under the joint venture law or other Cuban programs, the time is ripe for organizations in the United States to begin laying groundwork for closer ties with Cuban agricultural entities. Recent regulatory changes implemented by the U.S. government provide a means for individuals and businesses to begin forming the relationships with their Cuban counterparts that will lead to future trade opportunities.161As previously mentioned, recent changes in U.S. policy now allow for any individual in the United States, not simply relatives, to donate money to Cu-ban citizens, though not to exceed $500 for any three month consecutive period, with the only restriction being that the recipient is not an official in the Cuban government or the Communist Party.162 Specifically written into these new regu-lations is the idea that these remittances may be spent “to support the develop-ment of private businesses.”163 A five hundred dollar infusion of capital to sup-port a fledging business or farm can be enormously beneficial when the average monthly salary is only 448 pesos, or approximately twenty dollars.164Additional capital will enable small Cuban farms to expand operations by hiring additional help or perhaps purchasing additional farm animals. While purchasing a tractor may seem like an obvious choice for a growing farm, Medardo Naranjo Valdes of the Organoponico Vivero Alamar, a UBPC just out-side of Havana, indicated that farm animals such as oxen would remain the pre-ferred choice for the foreseeable future on the small and midsized farms that make up the majority of the newer agricultural cooperatives.165 Not only do farm animals not require gasoline or incur maintenance costs beyond perhaps an occa-sional veterinarian charge, their waste can be used as fertilizer. Apart from additional labor, funds provided to agricultural cooperatives could be put to use in developing innovative pest control techniques that do not require the use of expensive pesticides or other chemicals. The Vivero Alamar is currently experimenting with a variety of natural pest control techniques such as introducing plants that serve as natural repellents to insects and the introduction of other insects that feed on harmful pests without harming the crops.166Investment in agricultural cooperatives done in this manner will likely fail to see much return on the investment for their foreseeable future, until poli-cies in both the United States and Cuba are changed.167 For a relatively small sum, American investors will get not only the benefit of a close relationship with a Cuban farm that will become a new source of both import and export business in the future, but potentially gain access to innovative agricultural techniques that could be used in the United States immediately.168 Because the logistical structure needed to transport goods from large ru-ral farms into city markets remains underdeveloped, urban and suburban agricul-ture makes up a growing portion of the food produced and consumed in Cuba.169 As in other countries, the population trends in Cuba have continued to shift away from rural areas to more concentrated urban and suburban areas, with about three-fourths of Cubans living in cities.170 With this shift in population has also come a shift in the country’s agricultural system. As of 2007, about 15% of all agriculture in Cuba could be classified as urban agriculture.171 Not only have agricultural practices changed, but eating habits have as well. Without the Soviet Union to provide a ready source of income and the machinery needed to engage in large-scale livestock production, vegetable consumption has increased dramat-ically.172 Nearly every urban area has direct access to a wide variety of locally grown, organic produce.173 Many of the urban farms in Cuba, including the Vivero Alamar, make use of organoponics, a system where crops are produced in raised beds of soil on land that would otherwise be incapable of supporting intensive agricultural pro-duction.174 Many of these raised beds can be constructed in a concentrated area to support a wide variety of produce, with the typical organoponic garden covering anywhere from one half to several hectares in size.175 The rise of the organoponic production method was a shift away from the earlier centralized production mod-el employed by the state. It has been supported through intensive research and development by a variety of state agencies, such as the National Institute of Agri-cultural Science, and continued development has been guided through intensive training and educational programs.176 The organoponic system is not limited in its application to Cuban urban farms, but **maintains potential to be applied worldwide**, including in the United States. Urban agriculture in Cuba revitalized and put to use previously aban-doned and unused land. A similar approach could be applied to the United States as a means to restore blighted areas.177 Applying Cuban-derived organoponics in U.S. cities could potentially open up an enormous amount of land that was previ-ously unusable. From a business perspective, investing in an organoponic agri-cultural program in the United States is also a sound decision since the demand for local produce reached $4.8 billion in 2008 and is only expected to grow fur-ther, potentially reaching $7 billion in 2012. In an American city beset with high unemployment such as Detroit, Michigan, for example, investing in urban agriculture could potentially generate as many as five thousand new jobs.179 By utilizing Cuba’s system of organopon-ics, the need to use expensive and complex farm machinery could be significantly reduced. Already companies in the United States, such as Farmscape Gardens in southern California, recognize what Cuba’s organoponic system could achieve and have integrated it into their business practices.180 Rachel Bailin, a partner in the company, indicated that it was Cuba’s organic farming practices that helped inspire them to start a company devoted to urban agriculture.181 They have al-ready used Cuba’s organoponic farming methods to produce more than 50,000 pounds of produce since the spring of 2009.182 **The potential for future growth in this industry is huge**, as Farmscape Gardens’ current levels of production make it the largest urban agriculture company in the state of California.183Cuba not only offers attractive prospects for trading in the future, but methods of agriculture pioneered out of necessity have broad prospects if applied to agriculture in the United States. As the demand for locally grown produce continues to increase, a cost-effective and proven agricultural model like Cuba’s organoponic system may be just what is needed to allow for urban agriculture to flourish. VII. CONCLUSIONS The United States and Cuba have a long, complicated history that years of animosity and finger pointing have certainly done little to improve. For more than fifty years now, the United States has shunned one of its closest neighbors, but recent actions by the Obama administration indicate change is certainly a possibility. In conclusion, the future of trade relations with Cuba can be summed up as follows: First, truly open trade with Cuba is not likely to occur for many years. The political and foreign policy practices that have supported the embargo will not disappear overnight. What is more likely, though, is a continued and gradual relaxation of certain trade policies that will ultimately benefit a number of U.S. industries, agriculture included. While trade in agricultural products is currently possible on a limited scale, agricultural entities in the United States interested in trading with Cuba on a larger scale should begin their preparations now by forg-ing relationships with their Cuban counterparts. Opening the door to further trade will not happen without a concentrated and prolonged push by various in-terest groups in the United States. Second, certain companies that wish to do business in Cuba today are able to do so and should begin familiarizing themselves with the Cuban govern-mental entities such as Alimport. Barring a complete reorganization of the Cu-ban government, agencies such as Alimport will likely continue to oversee for-eign trade for the foreseeable future. Forming business relationships with Cuban companies in the short-term under existing regulations will help support broader trade opportunities in the future. Finally, what Cuba has accomplished in the field of cooperative and ur-ban agricultural products is remarkable, and should serve as an inspiration to farmers and businesses in the United States as well. The Cuban organoponic system of production has great potential for a variety of urban and suburban farming activities in the United States, particularly as demand for local and or-ganic produce continues to rise. As relations between Cuba and the United States continue to thaw in the coming years, organizations that began their preparations today will be best equipped to meet the challenges and opportunities posed by this new and grow-ing market. Political animosities will eventually crumble in the face of the eco-nomic opportunities that closer trade relations could bring to both nations. One of the United States’ closest neighbors has been its enemy for far too long. Cuba presents a unique opportunity American business and agricultural enterprises cannot afford to overlook.

#### Access to the US market is critical to *sustainability* and *emulation*

Kost 04 – William is part of the Economic Research Service for the USDA. (“CUBAN AGRICULTURE: TO BE OR NOT TO BE ORGANIC?” 2004, http://www.ascecuba.org/publications/proceedings/volume14/pdfs/kost.pdf)

MARKETS MAY BE CRITICAL FOR AN ORGANIC CUBA In addition to the above European markets, the successful expansion and viability of Cuba’s organic production may also depend on access to geographically close, high-income foreign markets, namely the United States and Canada. Currently, Cuban produce is not certified-organic in either of these markets. Only after Cuban products are certified for these countries could Cuba legally export produce labeled organic to these markets. Given that many technical production practices currently followed by Cuban producers are potentially compatible with U.S. certification standards and given Cuba’s prior experience in becoming Swiss-certified, Cuba could be well positioned to meet U.S. certification standards. For the U.S. organic market, in addition to a lifting of the U.S. embargo, Cuba would have to be certified by a USDA-accredited certification program that assures U.S. markets that Cuban products labeled organic meet all National Organic Program standards and regulations under the U.S. Organic Foods Production Act of 1990. If the U.S. embargo on Cuba were lifted, Cuban exports, once certified, could play a significant role in the U.S. organic market. In this current U.S. niche market, production costs are high. Opening the U.S. market would enable Cuba to exploit its significant **comparative advantage** in this area. This market could become a quick foreign exchange earner for Cuba. The largest barrier Cuba faces in expanding into the U.S. organic market will be meeting U.S. requirements for organic certification. Tapping the U.S. market may create sufficient price incentives for Cuban producers to take the necessary steps to meet the organic standards of other importing countries. Cuba could then expand production of organic produce geared to these specialty export markets. With sufficiently high prices for organic produce, urban labor may remain active in an organic urban gardening sector. Most likely, the viability of a vibrant organic produce production and processing sector in Cuba will depend on Cuba’s gaining access to the large, nearby U.S. market. Without such access, organic-oriented production of horticultural products in Cuba will likely remain a necessity-driven way to produce food for domestic consumption in an environment where other production approaches are just not available. The U.S. market is large and diverse. The demand for organic produce is only one portion of that market. How Cuba’s horticultural industry responds to restored U.S. trade will be a function of the relative price and cost incentives of the organic and non-organic market segments. If the organic price premiums are sufficient, Cuba has the climate, land resources, low-cost labor, and history of organicoriented production to allow it to develop and grow its horticultural sector in that direction. If the market incentives are not sufficiently large to pursue the organic produce market, Cuba will return to a chemical- and technology-driven, yield-maximizing, and labor-minimizing commercial production as rapidly as they can afford to do so. Cuba will have some incentive to increase domestic food production as rapidly as possible to feed the domestic population, rather than importing food for domestic consumption. Cuba could then use a larger share of its scarce foreign exchange to import energy, technology, and other inputs to support growth in other sectors of the Cuban economy.

#### Continued reliance on industrial mechanized ag results in *catastrophic warming* and *biodiversity loss*

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.

**Ecosystem collapse causes extinction**

**WATSON 2006** (Captain Paul, Founder and President of Sea Shepherd Conservation Society, has a show on Animal Planet, Last Mod 9-17, http://www.eco-action.org/dt/beerswil.html)

The facts are clear. More plant and animal species will go through extinction within our generation than have been lost thorough natural causes over the past two hundred million years. Our single human generation, that is, all people born between 1930 and 2010 will witness the complete obliteration of one third to one half of all the Earth's life forms, each and every one of them the product of more than two billion years of evolution. This is biological meltdown, and what this really means is the end to vertebrate evolution on planet Earth. Nature is under siege on a global scale. Biotopes, i.e., environmentally distinct regions, from tropical and temperate rainforests to coral reefs and coastal estuaries, are disintegrating in the wake of human onslaught. The destruction of forests and the proliferation of human activity will remove more than 20 percent of all terrestrial plant species over the next fifty years. Because plants form the foundation for entire biotic communities, their demise will carry with it the extinction of an exponentially greater number of animal species -- perhaps ten times as many faunal species for each type of plant eliminated. Sixty-five million years ago, a natural cataclysmic event resulted in extinction of the dinosaurs. Even with a plant foundation intact, it took more than 100,000 years for faunal biological diversity to re-establish itself. More importantly, the resurrection of biological diversity assumes an intact zone of tropical forests to provide for new speciation after extinction. Today, the tropical rain forests are disappearing more rapidly than any other bio-region, ensuring that after the age of humans, the Earth will remain a **biological**, if not a literal **desert** for eons to come. The present course of civilization points to ecocide -- the death of nature. Like a run-a-way train, civilization is speeding along tracks of our own manufacture towards the stone wall of extinction. The human passengers sitting comfortably in their seats, laughing, partying, and choosing to not look out the window. Environmentalists are those perceptive few who have their faces pressed against the glass, watching the hurling bodies of plants and animals go screaming by. Environmental activists are those even fewer people who are trying desperately to break into the fortified engine of greed that propels this destructive specicidal juggernaut. Others are desperately throwing out anchors in an attempt to slow the monster down while all the while, the authorities, blind to their own impending destruction, are clubbing, shooting and jailing those who would save us all. SHORT MEMORIES Civilized humans have for ten thousand years been marching across the face of the Earth leaving deserts in their footprints. Because we have such short memories, we forgot the wonder and splendor of a virgin nature. We revise history and make it fit into our present perceptions. For instance, are you aware that only two thousand years ago, the coast of North Africa was a mighty forest? The Phoenicians and the Carthaginians built powerful ships from the strong timbers of the region. Rome was a major exporter of timber to Europe. The temple of Jerusalem was built with titanic cedar logs, one image of which adorns the flag of Lebanon today. Jesus Christ did not live in a desert, he was a man of the forest. The Sumerians were renowned for clearing the forests of Mesopotamia for agriculture. But the destruction of the coastal swath of the North African forest stopped the rain from advancing into the interior. Without the rain, the trees died and thus was born the mighty Sahara, sired by man and continued to grow southward at a rate of ten miles per year, advancing down the length of the continent of Africa. And so will go Brazil. The precipitation off the Atlantic strikes the coastal rain forest and is absorbed and sent skyward again by the trees, falling further into the interior. Twelve times the moisture falls and twelve times it is returned to the sky -- all the way to the Andes mountains. Destroy the coastal swath and desertify Amazonia -- it is as simple as that. Create a swath anywhere between the coast and the mountains and the rains will be stopped. We did it before while relatively primitive. We learned nothing. We forgot. So too, have we forgotten that walrus once mated and bred along the coast of Nova Scotia, that sixty million bison once roamed the North American plains. One hundred years ago, the white bear once roamed the forests of New England and the Canadian Maritime provinces. Now it is called the polar bear because that is where it now makes its last stand. EXTINCTION IS DIFFICULT TO APPRECIATE Gone forever are the European elephant, lion and tiger. The Labrador duck, gint auk, Carolina parakeet will never again grace this planet of ours. Lost for all time are the Atlantic grey whales, the Biscayan right whales and the Stellar sea cow. Our children will never look upon the California condor in the wild or watch the Palos Verde blue butterfly dart from flower to flower. Extinction is a difficult concept to fully appreciate. What has been is no more and never shall be again. It would take another creation and billions of years to recreate the passenger pigeon. It is the loss of billions of years of evolutionary programming. It is the destruction of beauty, the obliteration of truth, the removal of uniqueness, the scarring of the sacred web of life To be responsible for an extinction is to commit blasphemy against the divine. It is the greatest of all possible crimes, more evil than murder, more appalling than genocide, more monstrous than even the apparent unlimited perversities of the human mind. To be responsible for the complete and utter destruction of a unique and sacred life form is arrogance that seethes with evil, for the very opposite of evil is live. It is no accident that these two words spell out each other in reverse. And yet, a reporter in California recently told me that "all the redwoods in California are not worth the life on one human being." What incredible arrogance. The rights a species, any species, must take precedence over the life of an individual or another species. This is a basic ecological law. It is not to be tampered with by primates who have molded themselves into divine legends in their own mind. For each and every one of the thirty million plus species that grace this beautiful planet are essential for the continued well-being of which we are all a part, the planet Earth -- the divine entity which brought us forth from the fertility of her sacred womb. As a sea-captain I like to compare the structural integrity of the biosphere to that of a ship's hull. Each species is a rivet that keeps the hull intact. If I were to go into my engine room and find my engineers busily popping rivets from the hull, I would be upset and naturally I would ask them what they were doing. If they told me that they discovered that they could make a dollar each from the rivets, I could do one of three things. I could ignore them. I could ask them to cut me in for a share of the profits, or I could kick their asses out of the engine room and off my ship. If I was a responsible captain, I would do the latter. If I did not, I would soon find the ocean pouring through the holes left by the stolen rivets and very shortly after, my ship, my crew and myself would disappear beneath the waves. And that is the state of the world today. The political leaders, i.e., the captains at the helms of their nation states, are ignoring the rivet poppers or they are cutting themselves in for the profits. There are very few asses being kicked out of the engine room of spaceship Earth. With the rivet poppers in command, it will not be long until the biospheric integrity of the Earth collapses under the weight of ecological strain and tides of death come pouring in. And that will be the price of progress -- ecological collapse, the death of nature, and with it the horrendous and mind numbing specter of massive human destruction.

#### A move towards organic ag mitigates future emissions and prevents warming

Scialabba 10 – Nadia is from the Natural Resources Management and Environment Department, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). (“Organic agriculture and climate change”, February 2, 2010, Renewable Agriculture and Food Systems 25.2, <http://www.fao.org/docs/eims/upload/275960/al185e.pdf>)

Organic agricultural systems have an inherent potential to both reduce GHG emissions and to enhance carbon sequestration in the soil (Table 1). An important potential contribution of organically managed systems is the careful management of nutrients, and hence the reduction of N2 O emissions from soils, which are the most relevant single source of direct GHG emissions from agriculture. More research is needed to quantify and improve the effects of organic paddy rice production and to develop strategies to reduce methane emissions from enteric fermentation (e.g., by promoting double-use breeds). Indirect GHG emissions are reduced in organic systems by avoidance of mineral fertilizers. With the current organic consumers’ demand, further emission reductions are expected when organic standards include speciﬁc climate standards that consider, inter alia, reduced energy consumption in the organic food chain (e.g., limitations on greenhouse heating/cooling, processing and packaging, food miles combined with life cycle assessment). The advantage of organic systems is that they are driven by aware consumers and that they already carry a guarantee system of veriﬁcation and labeling which is consonant with climate labeling113 . The highest mitigation potential of organic agriculture lies in carbon sequestration in soils and in reduced clearing of primary ecosystems. The total amount of mitigation is difﬁcult to quantify, because it is highly dependent on local environmental conditions and management practices. Should all agricultural systems be managed organically, the omission of mineral fertilizer production and application is estimated to reduce the agricultural GHG emissions by about 20% — 10% caused by reduced N2 O emissions and about 10% by lower energy demand. These avoided emissions are supplemented by an emission compensation potential through carbon sequestration in croplands and grasslands of about 40–72% of the current annual agricultural GHG emissions76. However, further research is needed to conﬁrm these ﬁgures, as long-term scientiﬁc studies are limited and do not apply to different kinds of soils, climates and practices. To date, most of the research on the mitigation potential of agricultural practices has been carried out in developed countries; dedicated investigations are needed to assess and understand the mitigation potential in tropical and subtropical areas and under the predominant management practices of developing countries. More importantly, the adaptation aspects of organic agricultural practices must be the focus of public policies and research. One of the main effects of climate change is an increase of uncertainties, both for weather events and global food markets. Organic agriculture has a strong potential for building resilience in the face of climate variability (Table 2). The total abstention from synthetic inputs in organic agriculture has been a strong incentive to develop agricultural management practices that optimize the natural production potential of speciﬁc agro-ecosystems, based on traditional knowledge and modern research. These strategies can be used to enhance agricultural communities that have no access to purchased inputs, which is the case of the majority of the rural poor. The main organic strategies are diversiﬁcation and an increase of soil organic matter, which both could enhance resilience against extreme weather events and are recommended by the IPCC. These strategies have, in particular, a high potential to enhance the productivity of degraded soils, especially in marginal areas, while enhancing soil carbon sequestration. The adaptive approach inherent to organic agriculture offers simultaneous climate mitigation beneﬁts. Finally, certiﬁed organic products cater for higher income options for producers and hence a market-based incentive for environmental stewardship. The scaling-up of organic agriculture would promote and support climatefriendly farming practices worldwide. However, investments in research and development of organic agriculture are needed to better unlock its potential and application on a large scale.

#### Warming causes extinction and the threshold is soon

**Roberts 13** – citing the World Bank Review’s compilation of climate studies - 4 degree projected warming, can’t adapt - heat wave related deaths, forest fires, crop production, water wars, ocean acidity, sea level rise, climate migrants, biodiversity loss. ("If you aren’t alarmed about climate, you aren’t paying attention", January 10, 2013, [http://grist.org/climate-energy/climate-alarmism-the-idea-is-surreal](http://grist.org/climate-energy/climate-alarmism-the-idea-is-surreal/~~))

We know we’ve raised global average temperatures around 0.8 degrees C so far. We know that 2 degrees C is where most scientists predict catastrophic and irreversible impacts. And we know that we are currently on a trajectory that will push temperatures up 4 degrees or more by the end of the century. What would 4 degrees look like? A recent [World Bank review of the science](http://climatechange.worldbank.org/) reminds us. First, it’ll get hot: Projections for a 4°C world show a dramatic increase in the intensity and frequency of high-temperature extremes. Recent extreme heat waves such as in Russia in 2010 are likely to become the new normal summer in a 4°C world. Tropical South America, central Africa, and all tropical islands in the Pacific are likely to regularly experience heat waves of unprecedented magnitude and duration. In this new high-temperature climate regime, the coolest months are likely to be substantially warmer than the warmest months at the end of the 20th century. In regions such as the Mediterranean, North Africa, the Middle East, and the Tibetan plateau, almost all summer months are likely to be warmer than the most extreme heat waves presently experienced. For example, the warmest July in the Mediterranean region could be 9°C warmer than today’s warmest July. Extreme heat waves in recent years have had severe impacts, causing heat-related deaths, forest fires, and harvest losses. The impacts of the extreme heat waves projected for a 4°C world have not been evaluated, but they could be expected to vastly exceed the consequences experienced to date and potentially **exceed the adaptive capacities of many societies and natural systems**. [my emphasis] Warming to 4 degrees would also lead to “an increase of about 150 percent in acidity of the ocean,” leading to levels of acidity “unparalleled in Earth’s history.” That’s bad news for, say, coral reefs: The combination of thermally induced bleaching events, ocean acidification, and sea-level rise threatens large fractions of coral reefs even at 1.5°C global warming. The regional extinction of entire coral reef ecosystems, which could occur well before 4°C is reached, would have profound consequences for their dependent species and for the people who depend on them for food, income, tourism, and shoreline protection. It will also “likely lead to a sea-level rise of 0.5 to 1 meter, and possibly more, by 2100, with several meters more to be realized in the coming centuries.” That rise won’t be spread evenly, even within regions and countries — regions close to the equator will see even higher seas. There are also indications that it would “significantly exacerbate existing water scarcity in many regions, particularly northern and eastern Africa, the Middle East, and South Asia, while additional countries in Africa would be newly confronted with water scarcity on a national scale due to population growth.” Also, more extreme weather events: Ecosystems will be affected by more frequent extreme weather events, such as forest loss due to droughts and wildfire exacerbated by land use and agricultural expansion. In Amazonia, forest fires could as much as double by 2050 with warming of approximately 1.5°C to 2°C above preindustrial levels. Changes would be expected to be even more severe in a 4°C world. Also loss of biodiversity and ecosystem services: In a 4°C world, climate change seems likely to become the dominant driver of ecosystem shifts, surpassing habitat destruction as the greatest threat to biodiversity. Recent research suggests that large-scale loss of biodiversity is likely to occur in a 4°C world, with climate change and high CO2 concentration driving a transition of the Earth’s ecosystems into a state unknown in human experience. Ecosystem damage would be expected to dramatically reduce the provision of ecosystem services on which society depends (for example, fisheries and protection of coastline afforded by coral reefs and mangroves.) New research also indicates a “rapidly rising risk of crop yield reductions as the world warms.” So food will be tough. All this will add up to “large-scale displacement of populations and have adverse consequences for human security and economic and trade systems.” Given the uncertainties and long-tail risks involved, “there is no certainty that adaptation to a 4°C world is possible.” There’s a small but non-trivial chance of advanced civilization breaking down entirely. Now ponder the fact that some scenarios show us going up to 6degrees by the end of the century, a level of devastation we have not studied and barely know how to conceive. Ponder the fact that somewhere along the line, though we don’t know exactly where, enough self-reinforcing feedback loops will be running to make climate change unstoppable and irreversible for centuries to come. That would mean handing our grandchildren and their grandchildren not only a **burned, chaotic, denuded world**, but a world that is inexorably more inhospitable with every passing decade.

#### Warming is *real* and *anthropogenic*

Prothero 12 – Donald R. Prothero is a Professor of Geology at Occidental College and Lecturer in Geobiology at the California Institute of Technology. (“How We Know Global Warming is Real and Human Caused”, 3/1/2012, http://www.skeptic.com/eskeptic/12-02-08/)

How do we know that global warming is real and primarily human caused? There are numerous lines of evidence that converge to this conclusion. Carbon Dioxide Increase. Carbon dioxide in our atmosphere has increased at an unprecedented rate in the past 200 years. Not one data set collected over a long enough span of time shows otherwise. Mann et al. (1999) compiled the past 900 years’ worth of temperature data from tree rings, ice cores, corals, and direct measurements of the past few centuries, and the sudden increase of temperature of the past century stands out like a sore thumb. This famous graph (see Figure 1 above) is now known as the “hockey stick” because it is long and straight through most of its length, then bends sharply upward at the end like the blade of a hockey stick. Other graphs show that climate was very stable within a narrow range of variation through the past 1000, 2000, or even 10,000 years since the end of the last Ice Age. There were minor warming events during the Climatic Optimum about 7000 years ago, the Medieval Warm Period, and the slight cooling of the Little Ice Age from the 1700s and 1800s. But the magnitude and rapidity of the warming represented by the last 200 years is simply unmatched in all of human history. More revealing, the timing of this warming coincides with the Industrial Revolution, when humans first began massive deforestation and released carbon dioxide by burning coal, gas, and oil.

Melting Polar Ice Caps. The polar icecaps are thinning and breaking up at an alarming rate. In 2000, my former graduate advisor Malcolm McKenna was one of the first humans to fly over the North Pole in summer time and see no ice, just open water. The Arctic ice cap has been frozen solid for at least the past 3 million years and maybe longer3, but now the entire ice sheet is breaking up so fast that by 2030 (and possibly sooner) less than half of the Arctic will be ice covered in the summer.4 As one can see from watching the news, this is an ecological disaster for everything that lives up there, from the polar bears to the seals and walruses to the animals they feed upon, to the 4 million people whose world is melting beneath their feet. The Antarctic is thawing even faster. In February–March 2002, the Larsen B ice shelf—over 3000 square km (the size of Rhode Island) and 220 m (700 feet) thick—broke up in just a few months, a story typical of nearly all the ice shelves in Antarctica. The Larsen B shelf had survived all the previous ice ages and interglacial warming episodes for the past 3 million years, and even the warmest periods of the last 10,000 years—yet it and nearly all the other thick ice sheets on the Arctic, Greenland, and Antarctic are vanishing at a rate never before seen in geologic history.

Melting Glaciers. Glaciers are all retreating at the highest rates ever documented. Many of those glaciers, especially in the Himalayas, Andes, Alps, and Sierras, provide most of the freshwater that the populations below the mountains depend upon—yet this fresh water supply is vanishing. Just think about the percentage of world’s population in southern Asia (especially India) that depend on Himalayan snowmelt for their fresh water. The implications are staggering. The permafrost that once remained solidly frozen even in the summer has now thawed, damaging the Inuit villages on the Arctic coast and threatening all our pipelines to the North Slope of Alaska. This is catastrophic not only for life on the permafrost, but as it thaws, the permafrost releases huge amounts of greenhouse gases and is one of the major contributors to global warming. Not only is the ice vanishing, but we have seen record heat waves over and over again, killing thousands of people, as each year joins the list of the hottest years on record. (2010 just topped that list as the hottest year, surpassing the previous record in 2009, and we shall know about 2011 soon enough). Natural animal and plant populations are being devastated all over the globe as their environment changes.5 Many animals respond by moving their ranges to formerly cold climates, so now places that once did not have to worry about disease-bearing mosquitoes are infested as the climate warms and allows them to breed further north.

Sea Level Rise. All that melted ice eventually ends up in the ocean, causing sea level to rise, as it has many times in the geologic past. At present, sea level is rising about 3–4 mm per year, more than ten times the rate of 0.1–0.2 mm/year that has occurred over the past 3000 years. Geological data show that sea level was virtually unchanged over the past 10,000 years since the present interglacial began. A few millimeters here or there doesn’t impress people, until you consider that the rate is accelerating and that most scientists predict sea level will rise 80–130 cm in just the next century. A sea level rise of 1.3 m (almost 4 feet) would drown many of the world’s low-elevation cities, such as Venice and New Orleans, and low-lying countries such as the Netherlands or Bangladesh. A number of tiny island nations such as Vanuatu and the Maldives, which barely poke out above the ocean now, are already vanishing beneath the waves. Eventually their entire population will have to move someplace else.6 Even a small sea level rise might not drown all these areas, but they are much more vulnerable to the large waves of a storm surge (as happened with Hurricane Katrina), which could do much more damage than sea level rise alone. If sea level rose by 6 m (20 feet), most of the world’s coastal plains and low-lying areas (such as the Louisiana bayous, Florida, and most of the world’s river deltas) would be drowned.

Most of the world’s population lives in coastal cities such as New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington, D.C., Miami, Shanghai, and London. All of those cities would be partially or completely under water with such a sea level rise. If all the glacial ice caps melted completely (as they have several times before during past greenhouse episodes in the geologic past), sea level would rise by 65 m (215 feet)! The entire Mississippi Valley would flood, so you could dock your boat in Cairo, Illinois. Such a sea level rise would drown nearly every coastal region under hundreds of feet of water, and inundate New York City, London and Paris. All that would remain would be the tall landmarks, such as the Empire State Building, Big Ben, and the Eiffel Tower. You could tie your boats to these pinnacles, but the rest of these drowned cities would be deep under water.

Climate Deniers’ Arguments and Scientists’ Rebuttals

Despite the overwhelming evidence there are many people who remain skeptical. One reason is that they have been fed lies, distortions, and misstatements by the global warming denialists who want to cloud or confuse the issue. Let’s examine some of these claims in detail:

“It’s just natural climatic variability.” No, it is not. As I detailed in my 2009 book, Greenhouse of the Dinosaurs, geologists and paleoclimatologists know a lot about past greenhouse worlds, and the icehouse planet that has existed for the past 33 million years. We have a good understanding of how and why the Antarctic ice sheet first appeared at that time, and how the Arctic froze over about 3.5 million years ago, beginning the 24 glacial and interglacial episodes of the “Ice Ages” that have occurred since then. We know how variations in the earth’s orbit (the Milankovitch cycles) controls the amount of solar radiation the earth receives, triggering the shifts between glacial and interglacial periods. Our current warm interglacial has already lasted 10,000 years, the duration of most previous interglacials, so if it were not for global warming, we would be headed into the next glacial in the next 1000 years or so. Instead, our pumping greenhouse gases into our atmosphere after they were long trapped in the earth’s crust has pushed the planet into a “super-interglacial,” already warmer than any previous warming period. We can see the “big picture” of climate variability most clearly in the EPICA cores from Antarctica (see Figure 2 below), which show the details of the last 650,000 years of glacial-interglacial cycles. At no time during any previous interglacial did the carbon dioxide levels exceed 300 ppm, even at their very warmest. Our atmospheric carbon dioxide levels are already close to 400 ppm today. The atmosphere is headed to 600 ppm within a few decades, even if we stopped releasing greenhouse gases immediately. This is decidedly not within the normal range of “climatic variability,” but clearly unprecedented in human history. Anyone who says this is “normal variability” has never seen the huge amount of paleoclimatic data that show otherwise. “It’s just another warming episode, like the Mediaeval Warm Period, or the Holocene Climatic Optimum” or the end of the Little Ice Age.” Untrue. There were numerous small fluctuations of warming and cooling over the last 10,000 years of the Holocene. But in the case of the Mediaeval Warm Period (about 950–1250 A.D.), the temperatures increased by only 1°C, much less than we have seen in the current episode of global warming (see Figure 1). This episode was also only a local warming in the North Atlantic and northern Europe. Global temperatures over this interval did not warm at all, and actually cooled by more than 1°C. Likewise, the warmest period of the last 10,000 years was the Holocene Climatic Optimum (5000–9000 B.C.) when warmer and wetter conditions in Eurasia caused the rise of the first great civilizations in Egypt, Mesopotamia, the Indus Valley, and China. This was largely a Northern Hemisphere-Eurasian phenomenon, with 2–3°C warming in the Arctic and northern Europe. But there was almost no warming in the tropics, and cooling or no change in the Southern Hemisphere.7 To the Eurocentric world, these warming events seemed important, but on a global scale the effect is negligible. In addition, neither of these warming episodes is related to increasing greenhouse gases. The Holocene Climatic Optimum, in fact, is predicted by the Milankovitch cycles, since at that time the axial tilt of the earth was 24°, its steepest value, meaning the Northern Hemisphere got more solar radiation than normal—but the Southern Hemisphere less, so the two balanced. By contrast, not only is the warming observed in the last 200 years much greater than during these previous episodes, but it is also global and bipolar, so it is not a purely local effect. The warming that ended the Little Ice Age (from the mid-1700s to the late 1800s) was due to increased solar radiation prior to 1940. Since 1940, however, the amount of solar radiation has been dropping, so the only candidate for the post-1940 warming has to be carbon dioxide.8

“It’s just the sun, or cosmic rays, or volcanic activity or methane.” **Nope**, sorry. The amount of heat that the sun provides has been decreasing since 19409, just the opposite of the denialists’ claims. There is no evidence (see Figure 3 below) of increase in cosmic radiation during the past century.10 Nor is there any clear evidence that large-scale volcanic events (such as the 1815 eruption of Tambora in Indonesia, which changed global climate for about a year) have any long-term effect that would explain 200 years of warming and carbon dioxide increase. Volcanoes erupt only 0.3 billion tonnes of carbon dioxide each year, but humans emit over 29 billion tonnes a year11, roughly 100 times as much. Clearly, we have a bigger effect. Methane is a more powerful greenhouse gas, but there is 200 times more carbon dioxide than methane, so carbon dioxide is still the most important agent.12 Every other alternative has been looked at, but the only clear-cut relationship is between human-caused carbon dioxide increase and global warming. “The climate records since 1995 (or 1998) show cooling.” That’s a deliberate deception. People who throw this argument out are cherry-picking the data.13 Over the short term, there was a slight cooling trend from 1998–2000 (see Figure 4 below), because 1998 was a record-breaking El Niño year, so the next few years look cooler by comparison. But since 2002, the overall long-term trend of warming is unequivocal. This statement is a clear-cut case of using out-of-context data in an attempt to deny reality. All of the 16 hottest years ever recorded on a global scale have occurred in the last 20 years. They are (in order of hottest first): 2010, 2009, 1998, 2005, 2003, 2002, 2004, 2006, 2007, 2001, 1997, 2008, 1995, 1999, 1990, and 2000.14 In other words, every year since 2000 has been in the Top Ten hottest years list, and the rest of the list includes 1995, 1997, 1998, 1999, and 2000. Only 1996 failed to make the list (because of the short-term cooling mentioned already).

“We had record snows in the winters of 2009–2010, and in 2010–2011.” So what? This is nothing more than the difference between weather (short-term seasonal changes) and climate (the long-term average of weather over decades and centuries and longer). Our local weather tells us nothing about another continent, or the global average; it is only a local effect, determined by short-term atmospheric and oceanographic conditions.15 In fact, warmer global temperatures mean more moisture in the atmosphere, which increases the intensity of normal winter snowstorms. In this particular case, the climate denialists forget that the early winter of November–December 2009 was actually very mild and warm, and then only later in January and February did it get cold and snow heavily. That warm spell in early winter helped bring more moisture into the system, so that when cold weather occurred, the snows were worse. In addition, the snows were unusually heavy only in North America; the rest of the world had different weather, and the global climate was warmer than average. And the summer of 2010 was the hottest on record, breaking the previous record set in 2009.

“Carbon dioxide is good for plants, so the world will be better off.” Who do they think they’re kidding? The people who promote this idea clearly don’t know much global geochemistry, or are trying to cynically take advantage of the fact that most people are ignorant of science. The Competitive Enterprise Institute (funded by oil and coal companies and conservative foundations16) has run a series of shockingly stupid ads concluding with the tag line “Carbon dioxide: they call it pollution, we call it life.” Anyone who knows the basic science of earth’s atmosphere can spot the deceptions in this ad.17 Sure, plants take in carbon dioxide that animals exhale, as they have for millions of years. But the whole point of the global warming evidence (as shown from ice cores) is that the delicate natural balance of carbon dioxide has been thrown out of whack by our production of too much of it, way in excess of what plants or the oceans can handle. As a consequence, the oceans are warming18 and absorbing excess carbon dioxide making them more acidic. Already we are seeing a shocking decline in coral reefs (“bleaching”) and extinctions in many marine ecosystems that can’t handle too much of a good thing. Meanwhile, humans are busy cutting down huge areas of temperate and tropical forests, which not only means there are fewer plants to absorb the gas, but the slash and burn practices are releasing more carbon dioxide than plants can keep up with. There is much debate as to whether increased carbon dioxide might help agriculture in some parts of the world, but that has to be measured against the fact that other traditional “breadbasket” regions (such as the American Great Plains) are expected to get too hot to be as productive as they are today. The latest research19 actually shows that increased carbon dioxide inhibits the absorption of nitrogen into plants, so plants (at least those that we depend upon today) are not going to flourish in a greenhouse world. Anyone who tells you otherwise is ignorant of basic atmospheric science.

“I agree that climate is changing, but I’m skeptical that humans are the main cause, so we shouldn’t do anything.” This is just fence sitting. A lot of reasonable skeptics deplore the “climate denialism” of the right wing, but still want to be skeptical about the cause. If they want proof, they can examine the huge array of data that directly points to humans causing global warming.20 We can directly measure the amount of carbon dioxide humans are producing, and it tracks exactly with the amount of increase in atmospheric carbon dioxide. Through carbon isotope analysis, we can show that this carbon dioxide in the atmosphere is coming directly from our burning of fossil fuels, not from natural sources. We can also measure oxygen levels that drop as we produce more carbon that then combines with oxygen to produce carbon dioxide. We have satellites in space that are measuring the heat released from the planet and can actually see the atmosphere get warmer. The most crucial proof emerged only in the past few years: climate models of the greenhouse effect predict that there should be cooling in the stratosphere (the upper layer of the atmosphere above 10 km (6 miles) in elevation, but warming in the troposphere (the bottom layer of the atmosphere below 10 km (6 miles), and that’s exactly what our space probes have measured. Finally, we can rule out any other culprits (see above): solar heat is decreasing since 1940, not increasing, and there are no measurable increases in cosmic radiation, methane, volcanic gases, or any other potential cause. Face it—it’s our problem.

Why Do People Deny Climate Change? Thanks to all the noise and confusion over the debate, the general public has only a vague idea of what the debate is really about, and only about half of Americans think global warming is real or that we are to blame.21 As in the debate over evolution and creationism, the scientific community is virtually unanimous on what the data demonstrate about anthropogenic global warming. This has been true for over a decade. When science historian Naomi Oreskes surveyed all peer-reviewed papers on climate change published between 1993 and 2003 in the world’s leading scientific journal, Science, she found that there were 980 supporting the idea of human-induced global warming and none opposing it. In 2009, Doran and Kendall Zimmerman23 surveyed all the climate scientists who were familiar with the data. They found that 95–99% agreed that global warming is real and that humans are the reason. In 2010, the prestigious Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences published a study that showed that 98% of the scientists who actually do research in climate change are in agreement with anthropogenic global warming.24 Every major scientific organization in the world has endorsed the conclusion of anthropogenic climate change as well. This is a rare degree of agreement within such an independent and cantankerous group as the world’s top scientists. This is the same degree of scientific consensus that scientists have achieved over most major ideas, including gravity, evolution, and relativity. These and only a few other topics in science can claim this degree of agreement among nearly all the world’s leading scientists, especially among everyone who is close to the scientific data and knows the problem intimately. If it were not such a controversial topic politically, there would be almost no interest in debating it, since the evidence is so clear-cut. If the climate science community speaks with one voice (as in the 2007 IPCC report, and every report since then), why is there still any debate at all? The answer has been revealed by a number of investigations by diligent reporters who got past the PR machinery denying global warming, and uncovered the money trail. Originally, there was no real “dissenters” to the idea of global warming by scientists who are actually involved with climate research. Instead, the forces with vested interests in denying global climate change (the energy companies, and the “free-market” advocates) followed the strategy of tobacco companies: create a smokescreen of confusion and prevent the American public from recognizing scientific consensus. As the famous memo25 from the tobacco lobbyists said “Doubt is our product.” The denialists generated an anti-science movement entirely out of thin air and PR. The evidence for this PR conspiracy has been well documented in numerous sources. For example, Oreskes and Conway revealed from memos leaked to the press that in April 1998 the right-wing Marshall Institute, SEPP (Fred Seitz’s lobby that aids tobacco companies and polluters), and ExxonMobil, met in secret at the American Petroleum Institute’s headquarters in Washington, D.C. There they planned a $20 million campaign to get “respected scientists” to cast doubt on climate change, get major PR efforts going, and lobby Congress that global warming isn’t real and is not a threat.

### 1AC—Plan Text

#### **The United States federal government should allow normal trade between the United States and Cuba.**

### 1AC—No War

#### Contention 3 is No war:

#### First, won’t happen—global institutions, interdependence, the internet, fiscal constraints and nuclear deterrence

**Robb 2012** (Doug, Lieutenant in the US Navy, “Now Hear This - Why the Age of Great-Power War Is Over” http://www.usni.org/magazines/proceedings/2012-05/now-hear-why-age-great-power-war-over)

In Proceedings’ April “Now Hear This,” Navy Lieutenant Commander Rachel Gosnell and Marine Second Lieutenant Michael Orzetti argue that “the possibility of great-power war [between the United States and China] cannot be ruled out.” However, despite China’s rise, which potentially threatens to alter international polarity, a preponderance of evidence suggests that the era of conventional large-scale war may be behind us.

For the purposes of my argument, the United States and China are defined as “great powers” because they have stable governments and large populations; influential economies and access to raw materials; professional militaries and a nuclear arsenal. Prussian war theorist Carl von Clausewitz’s “trinity,” which characterizes the interrelationship between the government (politics), people (society and the economy), and the military (in modern terms, deterrence and security), is useful to frame this debate.

The 20th century brought seismic shifts as the global political system transitioned from being multipolar during the first 40 years to bipolar during the Cold War before emerging as the American-led, unipolar international order we know today. These changes notwithstanding, major world powers have been at peace for nearly seven decades—the longest such period since the 1648 Treaty of Westphalia codified the sovereign nation-state.

Whereas in years past, when nations allied with their neighbors in ephemeral bonds of convenience, today’s global politics are tempered by permanent international organizations, regional military alliances, and formal economic partnerships. Thanks in large part to the prevalence of liberal democracies, these groups are able to moderate international disputes and provide forums for nations to air grievances, assuage security concerns, and negotiate settlements—thereby making war a distant (and distasteful) option. As a result, China (and any other global power) has much to lose by flouting international opinion, as evidenced by its advocacy of the recent Syrian uprising, which has drawn widespread condemnation.

In addition to geopolitical and diplomacy issues, globalization continues to transform the world. This interdependence has blurred the lines between economic security and physical security. Increasingly, great-power interests demand cooperation rather than conflict. To that end, maritime nations such as the United States and China desire open sea lines of communication and protected trade routes, a common security challenge that could bring these powers together, rather than drive them apart (witness China’s response to the issue of piracy in its backyard). Facing these security tasks cooperatively is both mutually advantageous and common sense.

Democratic Peace Theory—championed by Thomas Paine and international relations theorists such as New York Times columnist Thomas Friedman—presumes that great-power war will likely occur between a democratic and non-democratic state. However, as information flows freely and people find outlets for and access to new ideas, authoritarian leaders will find it harder to cultivate popular support for total war—an argument advanced by philosopher Immanuel Kant in his 1795 essay “Perpetual Peace.”

Consider, for example, China’s unceasing attempts to control Internet access. The 2011 Arab Spring demonstrated that organized opposition to unpopular despotic rule has begun to reshape the political order, a change galvanized largely by social media. Moreover, few would argue that China today is not socially more liberal, economically more capitalistic, and governmentally more inclusive than during Mao Tse-tung’s regime. As these trends continue, nations will find large-scale conflict increasingly disagreeable.

In terms of the military, ongoing fiscal constraints and socio-economic problems likely will marginalize defense issues. All the more reason why great powers will find it mutually beneficial to work together to find solutions to common security problems, such as countering drug smuggling, piracy, climate change, human trafficking, and terrorism—missions that Admiral Robert F. Willard, former Commander, U.S. Pacific Command, called “deterrence and reassurance.”

As the Cold War demonstrated, nuclear weapons are a formidable deterrent against unlimited war. They make conflict irrational; in other words, the concept of mutually assured destruction—however unpalatable—actually had a stabilizing effect on both national behaviors and nuclear policies for decades. These tools thus render great-power war infinitely less likely by guaranteeing catastrophic results for both sides. As Bob Dylan warned, “When you ain’t got nothing, you ain’t got nothing to lose.”

Great-power war is not an end in itself, but rather a way for nations to achieve their strategic aims. In the current security environment, such a war is equal parts costly, counterproductive, archaic, and improbable.

#### Second, nuclear taboo prevents use

**Perkovich 2009** (George Perkovich served as a speechwriter and foreign policy adviser to Senator Joe Biden from 1989 to 1990. Perkovich is an adviser to the International Commission on Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament and a member of the Council on Foreign Relations' Task Force on U.S. Nuclear Policy. “EXTENDED DETERRENCE ON THE WAY TO A NUCLEAR-FREE WORLD” http://icnnd.org/Documents/Perkovich\_Deterrence.pdf)

The reality today is that the taboo against using nuclear weapons has become so strong, especially in democracies, that the only threat against which it is justifiable and therefore credible to use these weapons is one where the survival of the U.S. or an ally is clearly jeopardized. Yet, with the possible exception of North Korea whose leadership could be imagined to use nuclear weapons against Japan or South Korea if its own survival were threatened, no other state poses a realistic threat to the national survival of U.S. allies in Europe or East Asia. Russia does not have the intention or capability to sustain an invasion of the new NATO states, let alone threaten their survival. Russia could destroy any state with its nuclear weapons, but because this, more than any other action, would practically guarantee nuclear retaliation, Russia would not run the risk. There is simply nothing important enough that Russia would want in any of the NATO states to merit such risk taking. China has no interest and inadequate capabilities to take mainland Japanese territory or otherwise threaten it militarily. It might pose military threats to Japanese positions regarding southern islands, but the U.S. and China are not going to wage nuclear war over such islands, and Japanese officials and public cannot realistically expect nuclear deterrence to operate here. Beijing does continue to increase its capabilities to deter Taiwan from declaring independence and the U.S. from defending Taiwan in such a scenario, but the surety of U.S. security assurances to Taiwan would be greater, not less, if neither China nor the U.S. possessed nuclear weapons. For the foreseeable future China would be highly unlikely to use nuclear weapons on Taiwanese targets, as the Chinese goal is to integrate Taiwanese into China, not to kill them. China would wish to deter U.S. intervention by threatening the American fleet, perhaps with nuclear weapons, and then deterring U.S. escalation against the Chinese homeland, by holding U.S. cities at risk. But the trigger of nuclear use in these scenarios would be a move by Taiwan to achieve independence. The U.S. has no obligation to fight for Taiwanese independence if China has not committed aggression against Taiwan first.

#### Third, it doesn’t cause extinction

**ROBOCK 2010** (Alan, Department of Environmental Sciences, Rutgers University, “Nuclear Winter,” WIREs Climate Change, May/June, Wiley Online Library via University of Michigan Libraries)

While it is important to point out the consequences of nuclear winter, it is also important to point out what will **not** be the consequences. Although extinction of our species was not ruled out in initial studies by biologists, it **now seems** that this **would not take place**. Especially in Australia and New Zealand, humans would have a better chance to survive. Also, Earth will not be plunged into an ice age. Ice sheets, which covered North America and Europe only 18,000 years ago and were more than 3-km thick, take many thousands of years to build up from annual snow layers, and the climatic disruptions would not last long enough to produce them. The oxygen consumption by the fires would be inconsequential, as would the effect on the atmospheric greenhouse by carbon dioxide production. The consequences of nuclear winter are extreme enough without these additional effects, however.

## 2AC

### 2AC—Gov-to-Gov

#### We meet—normal trade is necessarily gov-to-gov

French 09 – Anya is editor of and a frequent contributor to The Havana Note. She has led more than two dozen research trips to Cuba. (“Options for Engagement: A Resource Guide for Reforming U.S. Policy toward Cuba”, April 2009, http://www.lexingtoninstitute.org/library/resources/documents/Cuba/USPolicy/options-for-engagement.pdf)

The path to “normal” trade relations If the United States were to lift its trade embargo against Cuba, this would not automatically confer “normal” status to the bilateral trade relationship. It would mean that the United States and Cuba have the opportunity to begin trading in more goods and services than they have in the last fifty years. Whether much expanded trade actually occurs depends on whether the United States were to take additional steps beyond lifting the embargo: the most important of which is the provision of Normal Trade Relations (NTR). NTR is a technical term which refers to the provision of nondiscriminatory treatment toward trading partners. Cuba and North Korea are the only two countries to which the United States continues to deny “normal trade relations.” All other countries either have permanent normal trade relations or temporary, renewable normal trade relations with the United States.161 Assuming that the Cuba-specific trade sanctions contained in the Cuban Assets Control Regulations (the continuity of which was codified by the 1996 Helms-Burton Act) were to be eliminated, achieving normal trade relations between Cuba and the United States would not be a simple matter. A first stumbling block could be the 1974 Trade Act provision dubbed “Jackson-Vanik,” which prohibits non-market economy countries from receiving normal tariff treatment, entering into a bilateral commercial agreement, or receiving any U.S. government credits or loan guarantees, until the President has reported to Congress that such a country does not: 1) deny its citizens the right to emigrate, 2) impose an unreasonable tax or fine for emigrating, and 3) impose more than a “nominal tax, levy, fine, fee or other charge on any citizen as a consequence of the desire of such citizen to emigrate to the country of his choice.”162 Thus, Cuba’s restrictions on its citizens’ emigration rights pose an obstacle to normalization of bilateral trade. Only once the requirements set forth by the Jackson-Vanik amendment have been met, (and absent any other Cuba-specific sanctions, such as the Export Administration Act controls on countries found to be supporting international terrorism), could the United States begin negotiations of a bilateral commercial agreement with Cuba. To begin to extend normal trade relations to Cuba, the United States would need to enter into a reciprocal trade agreement with Cuba (not equivalent to a “free trade agreement”) that would provide a balance of trade benefits and protections to U.S. exports and commercial entities doing business with Cuba, at the same time it would provide such benefits to Cuba. Such an agreement would need to include protection for U.S. patents and trademarks and for “industrial rights and processes,” include a safeguard mechanism to prevent market disruptions due to trade, and provide that the agreement, and its continuation, be subject to the national security interests of both parties.163 Assuming bilateral relations had reached the appropriate milestones to begin discussing two-way trade, negotiating such an agreement could potentially take years, as both countries would need to adopt statutory and regulatory changes.

#### C/I—positive incentives—here’s a case list

**Haass and O’Sullivan, 2k** – \*Vice President and Director of Foreign Policy Studies at the Brookings Institution AND \*\*a Fellow with the Foreign Policy Studies Program at the Brookings Institution (Richard and Meghan, “Terms of Engagement: Alternatives to Punitive Policies” Survival,, vol. 42, no. 2, Summer 2000, <http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/articles/2000/6/summer%20haass/2000survival.pdf>

Architects of engagement strategies can choose from a wide variety of incentives. Economic engagement might offer tangible incentives such as export credits, investment insurance or promotion, access to technology, loans and economic aid.3 Other equally useful economic incentives involve the removal of penalties such as trade embargoes, investment bans or high tariffs, which have impeded economic relations between the United States and the target country. Facilitated entry into the economic global arena and the institutions that govern it rank among the most potent incentives in today’s global market. Similarly, political engagement can involve the lure of diplomatic recognition, access to regional or international institutions, the scheduling of summits between leaders – or the termination of these benefits. Military engagement could involve the extension of international military educational training in order both to strengthen respect for civilian authority and human rights among a country’s armed forces and, more feasibly, to establish relationships between Americans and young foreign military officers. While these areas of engagement are likely to involve working with state institutions, cultural or civil-society engagement entails building people-to-people contacts. Funding nongovernmental organisations, facilitating the flow of remittances and promoting the exchange of students, tourists and other non-governmental people between countries are just some of the possible incentives used in the form of engagement.

#### Our interpretation is key to predictability—Haass and O’Sullivan are fellows at Brookings writing in a scholarly journal with intent to define—it doesn’t get any better than this definition—predictability guarantees neg ground and is key to check arbitrary definitions that make being aff impossible

#### It’s also key to aff ground—the entire Cuba and Venezuela parts of the topic are about removing sanctions in place now—aff ground is key to effective topic innovation which turns ground

#### No limits explosion—our interpretation provides a clear, limiting list of topical mechanisms

#### Default to reasonability—competing interpretations create a moral hazard that incentivizes going for T to arbitrarily limit out the aff instead of making debates better

### 2AC—Neoliberalism

#### The affirmative should win if the results of the imagined plan action are good—that’s specifically true in the context of trade in Latin America

Giordano and Li 12 – \*Paolo, PhD in Economics from the Institut d'Etudes Politiques de Paris, Lead Economist @ the Integratoin and Trade Sector of the IADB, \*\*Kun, Research Fellow @ IADB (“An Updated Assessment of the Trade and Poverty Nexus in Latin America,” p. 375-377)

Despite the move towards more open trade regimes, Latin American economies are still ¶ relatively closed to international trade. Under the pressure of globalisation, it is likely that in the ¶ coming years the region will need to open further and adjust to compete in an increasingly ¶ challenging global environment. Latin America being one of the most unequal regions of the ¶ world, the assessment of the trade and poverty nexus is crucial to devise policies aiming at ¶ better distributing the gains from trade. Latin America-specific research on this topic will ¶ provide policymakers and stakeholders with evidence necessary to underpin a debate which ¶ seems to be nurtured more by anxiety than rigorous knowledge. ¶ In this light, it is useful to refer to a few conclusions with the aim of building up a solid base ¶ for policy debates and future research.¶ There is a gap in the availability of methodologies to explore the link between macro policy ¶ reforms like trade liberalisation and micro-economic determinants of welfare and poverty. It is ¶ therefore crucial to invest in the generation of data and research techniques, to adapt the ¶ research agenda to the specificity of Latin America and to consider qualitative issues that are ¶ difficult to measure. Meanwhile, normative statements referring to the trade policy nexus should ¶ cautiously consider the limitations of current positive knowledge.¶ Trade openness, inequality and poverty are wide multidimensional concepts. Measuring and ¶ attributing causal relations among these variables without carefully qualifying the specific ¶ dimensions explored or the particular transmission mechanisms at play may be misleading. It is ¶ important to disentangle the specific dimension of the trade and poverty nexus from the wider ¶ debate on globalisation and financial integration, the competing concepts of relative and ¶ absolute inequality and the objective and subjective dimension of poverty and deprivation.¶ Despite the impossibility to rigorously and unambiguously assert that trade openness is ¶ conducive to growth and poverty reduction, the preponderance of evidence supports this ¶ conclusion. However, the majority of empirical macro studies also show that the impact of trade ¶ on growth and poverty is also generally small and that the causes of indigence are to be found ¶ elsewhere. But it is in fact extremely arduous to find evidence that supports the notion that trade ¶ protection is good for the poor. The question is therefore how to make trade and growth more ¶ pro-poor and not how to devise improbable alternatives to trade integration aiming at improving ¶ the livelihood of the poor.¶ Specific evidence on Latin America reveals that deductive generalisations of the neoclassical ¶ trade theory and global cross-country empirical studies may be of little help in 0-0-understanding ¶ the trade and poverty nexus in the region. Several factors may explain why the integration of ¶ Latin America into the global economy may not necessarily bring about rising wages of ¶ unskilled workers and poverty reduction. The most compelling arguments are related to the ¶ existence of rigidities in the labour markets, the historical pattern of protection that created rents ¶ in unskilled intensive sectors, the emergence of low wage countries such as China and India that ¶ shifts the comparative advantage of Latin American economies, and institutional factors that ¶ protract the effects of an initial unequal distribution of factor endowments against the poor.¶ Trade liberalisation may in fact be associated with rising inequality. But country case studies ¶ present contrasting indications. Although there is some evidence of rising inequality in the ¶ aftermath of trade opening, such as in the case of Mexico, Colombia, Argentina and Chile, it ¶ seems that the specific effects of trade liberalisation are small or indirect. Skill-biased technical ¶ change, often directly related with the increase of foreign direct investment or with capital ¶ account liberalisation, seems to have a stronger explanatory power than trade liberalisation. ¶ There is also little evidence that trade opening has generated more informality. On the other ¶ hand, the case of Brazil, where trade liberalisation seems to have contributed to the reduction of ¶ wage inequality, is illustrative of the conditions under which trade reforms may have ¶ progressive distributive effects¶ The empirical analysis addressing the direct effect of trade integration on poverty reveals a ¶ similar landscape. Trade integration seems to be good for the poor but the effects are small. ¶ Generalisations should be taken with a great deal of caution because this is a domain where data ¶ may present considerable shortcomings. In any event it seems that foreign trade reforms are ¶ more important for poverty reduction than unilateral ones or than the national component of ¶ reciprocal trade reforms. The countries of the region may therefore expect further contributions ¶ of trade integration to poverty reduction, particularly from the liberalisation of the agriculture ¶ sector where the greatest pockets of residual protectionism are still concentrated. However, ¶ predicting ex ante the pro-poor effects of trade reforms is an extremely sensitive task highly¶ dependent on the quality of the data and the correct specification of the simulation instruments. ¶ It is hard to overstate the importance of strengthening the capacity of policymaking in this area.

#### conddo

#### The alt doesn’t solve anything—tragedy of the commons means small actions don’t spill over because each person has a negligible effect on broader structures

#### A total shift is impossible—working at the intersection of economics and environmental sustainability is critical

Barry 07 – Dr. John Barry is Director of the Institute of Governance, Public Policy and Social Research and Co-Director of the Centre for Sustainability and Environmental Governance at Queen’s University Belfast. His areas of research include the normative aspects of environmental policy, politics and sustainable development; environmental governance; the governance of science and innovation; the link between academic knowledge and policy making; trust, legitimacy and public policy; citizenship, public policy and governance; theories and practices of reconciliation in Northern Ireland. (“Towards a model of green political economy: from ecological modernisation to economic security”, Int. J. Green Economics, Vol. 1, Nos. 3/4, 2007, http://www.inderscience.com/storage/f614812932511107.pdf)

1 Introduction Economic analysis has been one of the weakest and least developed areas of broadly green/sustainable development thinking. For example, whatever analysis there is within the green political canon is largely utopian – usually based on an argument for the complete transformation of modern society and economy as the only way to deal with ecological catastrophe, an often linked to a critique of the socioeconomic failings of capitalism that echoed a broadly radical Marxist/socialist or anarchist analysis; or underdeveloped – due, in part, to the need to outline and develop other aspects of green political theory. However, this gap within green thinking has recently been filled by a number of scholars, activists, think tanks, and environmental NGOs who have outlined various models of green political economy to underpin sustainable development political aims, principles and objectives. The aim of this article is to offer a draft of a realistic, but critical, version of green political economy to underpin the economic dimensions of radical views about sustainable development. It is written explicitly with a view to encouraging others to think through this aspect of sustainable development in a collaborative manner. Combined realism and radicalism marks this article, which starts with the point that we cannot build or seek to create a sustainable economy ab nihlo, but must begin from where we are, with the structures, institutions, modes of production, laws and regulations that we already have. Of course, this does not mean simply accepting these as immutable or set in stone; after all, some of the current institutions, principles and structures underpinning the dominant economic model are the very causes of unsustainable development. We do need to recognise, however, that we must work with (and ‘through’ – in the terms of the original German Green Party’s slogan of ‘marching through the institutions’) these existing structures, as well as change and reform and in some cases, abandon them as either unnecessary or positively harmful to the creation and maintenance of a sustainable economy and society. Equally, this article also recognises that an alternative economy and society must be based in the reality that most people (in the West) will not democratically vote for a completely different type of society and economy. That reality must also accept that a ‘green economy’ is one that is recognisable to most people and that indeed safeguards and guarantees not just their basic needs but also aspirations(within limits). The realistic character of the thinking behind this article accepts that consumption and materialistic lifestyles are here to stay (so long as they do not transgress any of the critical thresholds of the triple bottom line) and indeed there is little to be gained by proposing alternative economic systems, which start from a complete rejection of consumption and materialism. The appeal to realism is in part an attempt to correct the common misperception (and self-perception) of green politics and economics requiring an excessive degree of self-denial and a puritanical asceticism (Goodin, 1992, p.18; Allison, 1991, p.170–178). While rejecting the claim that green political theory calls for the complete disavowal of materialistic lifestyles, it is true that green politics does require the collective reassessment of such lifestyles, and does require a degree of shared sacrifice. It does not mean, however, that we necessarily require the complete and across-the-board rejection of materialistic lifestyles. There must be room and tolerance in a green economy for people to live ‘ungreen lives’ so long as they do not ‘harm’ others, threaten long-term ecological sustainability or create unjust levels of socioeconomic inequalities. Thus, realism in this context is in part another name for the acceptance of a broadly ‘liberal’ or ‘post-liberal’ (but certainly not anti-liberal) green perspective.1 At the same time, while critical of the ‘abstract’ and ‘unrealistic’ utopianism that peppers green and radical thinking in this area, I do not intend to reject utopianism. Indeed, I agree with Oscar Wilde that a map of the world that does not have utopia on it, is not worth looking at. The spirit in which this article is written is more in keeping with framing green and sustainability concerns within a ‘concrete utopian’ perspective (Hayward, 1995) or what the Marxist geographer Harvey (1996) calls a ‘utopianism of process’, to be distinguished from ‘closed’, blueprint-like and abstract utopian visions. Accordingly, the model of green political economy outlined here is in keeping with Lukes’ (1984, p.158) suggestion that a concrete utopianism depends on the ‘knowledge of a self-transforming present, not an ideal future’. It accepts the current dominance of one particular model of green political economy – namely, ‘Ecological Modernisation’ (EM) – as the preferred ‘political economy’ underpinning contemporary state and market forms of sustainable development, and further accepts the necessity for green politics to positively engage in the debates and policies around EM from a strategic (as well as a normative) point of view. However, it is also conscious of the limits and problems with ecological modernisation, particularly in terms of its technocratic, supply-side and reformist ‘business as usual’ approach, and seeks to explore the potential to radicalise EM or use it as a ‘jumping off’ point for more radical views of greening the economy. The article begins by outlining EM in theory and practice, specifically in relation to the British state’s ‘sustainable development’ policy agenda under New Labour. It maintains that EM, as currently practised by the British state, is ‘weak’ and largely turns on the centrality of ‘innovation’ and ‘eco-efficiency’; it then goes on to investigate in more detail the role of the market within current conceptualisations of EM and other models of green political economy. In particular, a potentially powerful distinction (both in conceptual and in policy debates) between ‘the market’ and ‘capitalism’ has yet to be sufficiently explored and exploited as a starting point for the development of radical, viable and attractive conceptions of green political economy as alternatives to both EM and the orthodox economic paradigm. In particular, the role of the market in innovation and as part of the ‘governance’ for sustainable development in which eco-efficiency and EM of the economy is linked to non-ecological demands of green politics and sustainable development, such as social and global justice, egalitarianism, democratic regulation of the market and the conceptual (and policy) expansion of the ‘economy’ to include social, informal and non-cash economic activity and a progressive role for the state (especially at the local/municipal level). Here, the argument is that the ‘environmental’ argument or basis of green political economy in terms of the need for the economy to become more resource efficient, minimise pollution and waste and so on, has largely been won. What that means is that no one is disputing the need for greater resource productivity, energy and eco-efficiency. Both state and corporate/business actors have accepted the environmental ‘bottom line’ (often rhetorically, but nonetheless important) as a conditioning factor in the pursuit of the economic ‘bottom line’. However, what has been less remarked upon is the social ‘bottom line’ and the centrality of this non-environmental set of principles and policy objectives to green political economy. In particular, the argument for lessening socioeconomic inequality and re-distributive policies to do this have not been as prominent within the green political economy and models of sustainable development as they perhaps should be. One of the reasons for focusing on the ‘social bottom line’ is to suggest that the distinctiveness and critical relevance of a distinctly ‘green’ (as opposed to ‘environmental’ or ‘ecological’) political economy will increasingly depend on developing a political agenda around these non-environmental/resource policy areas as states, businesses and other political parties converge around the EM agenda of reconciling the environmental and economic bottom lines, through an almost exclusive focus on the environmental bottom line. It is in developing a radical political and economic agenda around the social and economic bottom lines that the green political economy needs to focus on. It is for this reason that the final part of the paper looks at the long-standing green commitment to re-orientate the economy towards enhancing and being judged by ‘quality of life’ and ‘well-being’. The more recent discourse around ‘economic security’ is then discussed as building upon and related to the quality of life perspective, and is viewed as a potentially important driver and policy objective for green political economy in practice, in succinctly presenting the green economic case for a new type of economy, in which redistribution and reducing socioeconomic inequality are central. The model of green political economy presented here is defined in part by its commitment to ‘economic security’, which has the strategic political advantage of presenting a positive and attractive discourse for sustainable development arguments, unlike the (still prevalent) negative and often disempowering discourse of ‘limits to growth’, which does not of course mean denying the reality of limits (which are not just ecological, but also include social, cultural and psychological and biological dimensions). The point is that using the language and analysis of economic security is a more attractive and compelling way of arguing and presenting the case for a less growth-orientated economy and consumption-orientated society and one that aims for putting quality of life at the heart of economic thinking and policy. 2 Ecological modernisation in theory and practice in Britain The New Labour government is clearly committed to an EM approach to sustainable development. In a speech on sustainable development Blair (2003) stated that, “tackling climate change or other environmental challenges need not limit greater economic opportunity…economic development, social justice and environmental modernisation must go hand in hand”. This ‘win-win’ logic has also been echoed by the deputy Prime Minister Prescott (2003), who, in a speech to the Fabian Society held that: “There is a widespread view that environmental damage is the price we have to pay for economic progress…Modern environmentalism recognises that…an efficient, clean economy will mean more, not less economic growth and prosperity…Treating the environment with respect will not impede economic progress, it will help identify areas of inefficiency and waste and so unleash whole new forces of innovation.” Like the EM discourse, New Labour sustainable development policy rhetoric adopts the language of business and orthodox economic growth, emphasising the business case for sustainability by linking environmental management with greater resource efficiency, cost reduction and enhanced competitiveness. Typical of this is the Department for Trade and Industry, which notes that, “The environment is a business opportunity...there are economic benefits in reducing waste, avoiding pollution and using resources more efficiently…Reducing pollution through better technology will almost always lower costs or raise product value/differentiation” (DTI, 2000, p.7). This business case for rendering orthodox neo-classical economic growth compatible with environmental considerations can also be found outside Westminster in the devolved administrations. In Scotland, the Scottish Executive’s Enterprise Minister Jim Wallace has recently announce a ‘Green Jobs Strategy’, stating that: “Economic growth and job creation can and should go hand in hand with promoting Scotland's natural environment and, through exports, sustaining good environmental practice overseas. A Green Jobs Strategy will focus our efforts on delivering sustainable growth, which will generate employment while improving our environment and raising living standards across the country. As well as creating new business opportunities, better waste management and more efficient use of resources benefits the bottom line – raising productivity and making a big contribution to environmental targets.” (Scottish Executive, 2005) The notion that orthodox economic growth, employment and investment patterns and the cross-sectoral goals of sustainable development might be in serious tension is excluded from the government’s rhetoric on the environment and the ‘greening of the economy’; it is certainly not presented as a possibly problematic issue for industrial production processes or for global capitalism or the new orthodoxy of export-led growth. Instead, environmental protection and economic growth are portrayed as a positive-sum game, a ‘business opportunity’, suggesting that EM is the basis upon which current debates on environmental and sustainable development policy in the UK are founded (Barry and Paterson, 2004).

**Permutation do the plan and create space for alternatives to neoliberal engagement.**

#### Absolute rejection is unnecessary and cooption isn’t true

**Ferguson 10** – Professor of Anthropology @ Stanford. (James, “The Uses of Neoliberalism,” Antipode, 41.1, 10.1111/j.1467-8330.2009.00721.x)

Let me emphasize that to say that certain political initiatives and programs borrow from the neoliberal bag of tricks **doesn’t mean** that these political projects are **in league with** the **ideological project** of neoliberalism (in David Harvey’s sense)—only that they appropriate certain characteristic neoliberal “moves” (and I think of these discursive and programmatic moves as analogous to the moves one might make in a game). These moves are recognizable enough to look “neoliberal”, but they can, I suggest, be used for **quite different purposes** than that term usually implies. In this connection, one might think of statistical techniques for calculating the probabilities of workplace injuries. These were originally developed in the nineteenth century by large employers to control costs (Ewald 1986), but they eventually became the technical basis for social insurance, and ultimately for the welfare state (which brought unprecedented gains to the working class across much of the world). Techniques, that is to say, can “migrate” across strategic camps, and devices of government that were invented to serve one purpose have often enough ended up, though history’s irony, being harnessed to another. Might we see a similar re-appropriation of “market” techniques of government (which were, like workplace statistics, undoubtedly conservative in their original uses) for different, and more progressive sorts of ends? Maybe not—one should **remain genuinely open-minded** about this—but it is perhaps worth at least considering. Let me present two empirical examples from southern Africa as a way of making this proposition perhaps a bit more plausible.

#### Extinction outweighs any value to life or structural violence impact—the quality of someone’s life is subjective but life is a pererquisite to anything

#### Our advantages are based on exporting Cuban industries...solves the link

### 2AC—Condition CP

#### Perm do the CP—the counterplan is an example of the implementation of the affirmative

#### Economic engagement can be conditional

Delury 9 [10/2009, John Delury is the associate director of the CCenter on US China Relations, Asia Society. Charles Kartman is the former director of the Korean Peninsular Energy Development Organization. Susan Shirk is the director in the institute on global conflict and cooperation. “North Korea Inside Out: The Case for Economic Engagement,” http://www.slideshare.net/hbroadman/quotnorth-korea-inside-out-the-case-for-economic-engagementquot]

**Our report is focused on the** **economic side of engagement**, **and** **particularly on** **forms of economic engagement** that can and should proceed now as first steps in a process of phased engagement. **While some** **engagement** **should continue to be conditioned** on progress on the nuclear and other fronts, **many forms of engagement should proceed with** **no conditions attached**. We do not claim that economicengagement will resolve the nuclear issue, particularly in the near term. But, in thelong run, the mechanisms of engagement we recommend would have a positiveinfluence on the environment in which Pyongyang makes its nuclear securitycalculations—including its weighing of the costs and benefits of its nuclear weapons. 6

#### Perm do both

#### Permutation do the process of the counterplan and the plan no matter what

#### No latin American democracy

**Dibbert 11** [t aylor Dibbert earned a BA in political science from the University of Georgia and a Master of International Affairs degree from Columbia University’s School of International and Public Affairs (SIPA) “Democratic Speed Bumps in Latin America” <http://fpif.org/democratic_speed_bumps_in_latin_america/> Dec 9 2011]//BMitch

After a decade of growing popularity, democracy has hit a slump in Latin America. A [recent Latinobarómetro poll](http://www.economist.com/node/21534798) cited by The Economist in late October underscores this point. In all but three Latin American countries, fewer people than last year believe that democracy is preferable to any other type of government. In the cases of Guatemala, Honduras, and Mexico, the drop in support for democracy is significant. The 2009 removal of democratically elected Manuel Zelaya and the [post-coup human rights abuses](http://www.hrw.org/world-report-2011/honduras) of the government of Porfirio Lobo are obvious indicators that Honduras is on the wrong track. [Dozens of political murders](http://www.jofr.org/2011/11/19/honduras-americas-great-foreign-policy-disgrace/) have taken place in Honduras, and there has been little outrage from Washington. Additionally, November’s presidential elections in Nicaragua and Guatemala (and recent polling on Mexico’s 2012 election) reinforce the notion that many in the region have grown skeptical about democratic governance. Reasons to be Skeptical Many reasons could explain this change in perceptions. Increased crime — particularly around the flow of illegal drugs — is perhaps the most obvious factor. Latin Americans want law and order and are willing to overlook an administration’s democratic lapses to achieve domestic security. As people get wealthier, the Latinobarómetro poll suggests, they expect more and better government services. This craving is understandable, although the highly inefficient tax regimes in the region make this difficult to achieve. Large informal economies and numerous loopholes or exemptions to current tax collection systems pose challenges that most politicians have been unwilling to address. For example, Mexico’s rate of tax collection is the worst of any country in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). But Guatemala’s is [even worse](http://globaledge.msu.edu/Countries/Guatemala/economy); it was only 10.5 percent of GDP last year. The average rate in Latin America is about 14 percent of GDP. Legislative inertia is also a factor. Since the end of military dictatorships in Latin America, many countries have been plagued by frustrating legislative gridlock. “The truth is that people in Latin America care very little about parties and congresses, and expect even less from them,” according to a [Brookings Institution analysis](http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2011/0202_latin_america_casaszamora.aspx). Global financial crises have also not helped. In terms of economic prosperity, Latin America remains [the most unequal region in the world](http://www.globalpost.com/dispatches/globalpost-blogs/que-pasa/the-worlds-most-unequal-countries). During these crises, the poor and lower-middle classes prioritize meeting their daily needs. If their ability to make ends meet declines, they tend to blame the ruling parties and give in to the temptation to simply “throw the bums out” and bring in new leaders, regardless of their stances on human rights, transparency, good governance, or the rule of law. At a time when electorates view their leaders as weak and ineffectual, those who promise a “strong hand” become more attractive. Backward Steps in Nicaragua, Guatemala During his campaign for a third term as president of Nicaragua, Daniel Ortega repeatedly reassured voters that he was a strong, experienced leader who knew how to get things done. To a certain extent, he is right: Nicaragua has a history of economic volatility, but the situation has remained relatively stable under Ortega’s recent stewardship. His anti-poverty programs and subsidies, partly a result of generous Venezuelan loans, also [helped persuade](http://www.americasquarterly.org/taxonomy/term/1182) voters. Nevertheless, from banished term limits to alleged corruption, and from a judiciary stacked with Ortega loyalists to convincing evidence of electoral fraud (which was not even [necessary](http://www.stabroeknews.com/2011/opinion/editorial/11/18/the-nicaraguan-elections/)), Ortega is already well on his way to bringing Nicaragua back to the authoritarianism that the country is all too familiar with. In 2006, Ortega was instrumental in changing Nicaraguan electoral law to lower the threshold for a first-round presidential victory from 45 percent to either 40 percent of votes cast or 35 percent, as long as there is at least a five-point difference between the first- and second-place candidates. In the 2006 presidential election, Daniel Ortega captured 38 percent of the vote, thereby precluding a run-off that many analysts believe[he would have lost](http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/87361.pdf). Ortega accepted electoral defeat back in 1990, although Nicaragua has remained, at best, a fledgling democracy since then. Nicaraguans were again reminded of Ortega’s perennial presence on the Nicaraguan political scene in 1999 with the implementation ofel Pacto, or “the Pact,” an agreement reached between Ortega and then-President Arnoldo Alemán of the Partido Liberal Constitutional. Although the two leaders were not close at the time, their two parties held almost all the power in the country’s National Assembly. This “pact” shielded both leaders from criminal prosecution and consolidated power in the judiciary and the Supreme Electoral Council. (This agreement is still in place, even though it has now become clear that Ortega has gotten more out of the deal than Alemán.) Alemán still did get a [20-year prison sentence](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/3299289.stm) for numerous charges of corruption in 2003. In 2009, Nicaragua’s Supreme Court exonerated Alemán; his conviction was conveniently overturned. Transparency International recently honored Alemán in their list of “[The World’s Ten Most Corrupt Leaders](http://www.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,1616952,00.html)” in recent history. The 2009 Nicaraguan Supreme Court ruling that exempted Ortega from only serving two presidential terms sent a strong message that good governance in Nicaragua was waning. Under the Nicaraguan constitution, presidents are not allowed to run for consecutive terms and are supposed to respect a two-term limit. But because Mr. Ortega essentially controlled the Supreme Court, its judges ruled that the previous laws constituted human rights violations and [should not apply to him](http://topics.nytimes.com/topics/reference/timestopics/people/o/daniel_ortega/index.html). Legally speaking, Ortega could be president for the [rest of his life](http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2009/oct/20/nicaragua-ortega-sandinista-reelection). Nicaragua’s institutions were never particularly strong, but as its extremely politicized court makes clear, they are undoubtedly weakening under Ortega’s watch. Due to rampant fraud committed by Ortega’s Sandinista party in 2008 municipal elections, the EU and the United States[suspended aid](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/3299289.stm). In Guatemala, meanwhile, the incoming administration of Otto Peréz promises to be a[step backwards](http://themorningsidepost.com/2011/11/old-habits-die-hard-what-the-election-of-otto-perez-means-for-guatemala/) in terms of human rights. Peréz held a number of high positions in the Guatemalan military during Latin America’s bloodiest civil war. Many voters were too young to remember the massacres in the country’s western highlands, most of which occurred during the early 1980s. Crime statistics in Guatemala are atrocious, and security was voters’ foremost concern throughout the campaign. Guatemala has one of the world’s highest homicide rates. In 2010, there were more than 40 murders per 100,000 inhabitants, rising to an astounding 110 per 100,000 in the capital. To put this in perspective, the homicide rate in the United States is less than five per 100,000. Guatemala’s neighbor Mexico, which is in the throes of a bloody drug war, has a homicide rate of about 14 per 100,000. With a pitiful prosecution rate hovering around 2 or 3 percent, Guatemalan voters are desperate for a solution to what they consider their most pressing problem. Peréz’s campaign slogan of mano dura — or “the strong hand” — promised to crack down on violent crime and pursue offenders relentlessly. Security concerns dominated the presidential campaign, as runner-up [Manuel Baldizón](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Manuel_Baldiz%C3%B3n) also put an anti-crime message at the top of his agenda. Once in office, Peréz will likely involve the military in police matters, reversing a trend toward civilian control. Feckless Governance in Mexico Mexicans, meanwhile, have grown tired of the feckless governance the country has experienced since its “democratic breakthrough” in 2000. Nowhere is the lack of compromise or legitimate negotiation more obvious than in Mexico’s federal legislature. Under Partido Acción Nacional (PAN) leadership, legislative gridlock has plagued Mexican political life for the past decade. President Felipe Calderón has fared slightly better than former President Vicente Fox, although frustration among the Mexican citizenry remains. Voters have finally gotten a taste of multiparty democracy and discovered how bittersweet it is. A recent [report published by Human Rights Watch](http://www.hrw.org/news/2011/11/09/mexico-widespread-rights-abuses-war-drugs), which documents widespread abuses by state security personnel and even judicial actors, has shown how damaging President Calderón’s misguided “war on drugs” has been for ordinary Mexican citizens. Calderón’s egregious mismanagement of Mexican security policy has exacerbated citizens’ growing exasperation, and rightfully so. Systematic and widespread abuses by state security personnel under the auspices of PAN “democracy” would make anyone question whether democracy has developed in Mexico over the past decade. Certainly, the media environment has improved since 2000, and the country’s judicial system is more relevant and unbiased than it was under the rule of the long-serving Partido Revolucionario Institucional (PRI). Nevertheless, much of the political power in Mexico has moved from the federal executive to the country’s various governorships and, perhaps most tellingly, to Congress and key players within Mexico’s three big political parties. During the 70 years of PRI authoritarianism, political actors from disparate groups [did not need](http://www.cfr.org/mexico/mexico-development-democracy-crossroads/p24089) to work together. Mexican politicians are still learning how to accomplish this. Calderon’s drug war has undoubtedly failed, but more fundamentally, Mexican citizens simply [do not trust the country’s existing institutions](http://www.clas.berkeley.edu/Publications/Review/Spring2011/pdf/BRLAS-Fall2011-Aguayo.pdf), of which political parties would probably top the list. For next year’s presidential election, the PRI candidate [Enrique Peña Nieto](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Enrique_Pe%C3%B1a_Nieto), a former governor of the state of Mexico, is the current frontrunner. As in Guatemala, many voters[are too young](http://www.nytimes.com/2011/07/03/world/americas/03mexico.html?_r=1&pagewanted=all) to remember the authoritarian past and the PRI’s connection to it. In a 2010 Latinóbarometro survey that included 18 Latin American nations, Mexicans were [more apathetic about democracy](http://www.cfr.org/mexico/mexico-development-democracy-crossroads/p24089) than anyone else. Nothing would indicate that things have changed since then. A recent [UN study](http://mazmessenger.com/2011/11/01/mexican-perception-of-crime-grows/) revealed that 36 percent of households were victims of crime last year, a year that witnessed around 22 million “common crimes.” This is not entirely drug-related violence; criminal activities are more pervasive than that. There is no evidence to suggest that these statistics will improve between now and next July’s presidential election. Mexico, Nicaragua, Honduras, and Guatemala may be bellwethers for a regional shift away from democracy, or they may simply be exceptions. The counter-examples of Chile, Uruguay, Costa Rica, and Panama suggest that democracy is not completely on the decline in the region. Nevertheless, challenges from crime to legislative gridlock are likely to persist in the region, and these challenges will put pressure on what are still fragile democracies. U.S. Foreign Policy vis-à-vis Latin America There was a real and not unfounded hope that the administration of George W. Bush would make a concerted effort to engage with Latin America’s political leaders. But after 9/11, the region fell to the bottom of U.S. foreign policy priorities. The Obama administration has not done much better. Plan Colombia and the Mérida initiative, which deal largely with security issues and fighting an unwinnable drug war, do not constitute a coherent grand strategy. More recently, U.S. policymakers have again been reminded of the tight links between energy security and national security. This provides [another reason](http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/03/17/think_again_latin_america?page=0,0) to strengthen U.S.-Latin American ties, especially since China’s influence in Latin America will only grow over the coming decades. In 2009, China became Brazil’s biggest [trading partner](http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/03/17/think_again_latin_america?page=0,0). Placing a greater emphasis on human rights and respect for civil liberties is crucial. Washington’s lackluster response to post-coup violence in Honduras only encourages further democratic backsliding elsewhere. Revisiting comprehensive immigration reform would be another good place to start. The devastating effects of the 40-year war on drugs are related to current violence in Central America. And yet, there is little to suggest that anyone in Washington is willing to reexamine U.S. drug policy. As the United States shifts its focus to East Asia, reengagement with Latin America will probably be a gradual process. U.S. policymakers must approach the region with more nuanced strategies. Latin America is not a monolithic entity, where a certain set of policy goals in one country will be relevant or entirely applicable to another. In spite of many similarities, Mexico is not Guatemala. Andean nations should not just be lumped together in the same policy category. Although there are no easy answers, appreciating the specific context of each country will be essential. Strengthening relationships must go beyond military or security-related bonds. Right now, American foreign policy in the region is unacceptable, counterproductive, and will likely presage a continued rise in authoritarianism. Latin America is not the Cold War hot spot it once was, but it is a region that still merits attention. Diplomacy on the cheap usually produces undesirable outcomes. The perpetuation of current U.S. policy will be no exception.

#### The internal link to the impact is a joke—Russia and China won’t change their autocratic systems because of Latin America

#### Latin American countries will say no

Nikandrov 12 (Nil, Journalist and political analyst for the Strategic Culture Foundation, “The U.S. and Latin America drift apart over Cuba,” http://progreso-weekly.com/ini/index.php/home/neighbors-to-the-south/3195-the-us-and-latin-america-drift-apart-over-cuba)

As before, Washington made sure that no invitation on the occasion was sent to Havana. US President Obama, Vice President J. Biden, and Secretary of State H. Clinton rolled out a standard grievances list - the suppression of free speech and public protests, the communist party's dictate, and the imprisonment of dissenters in Cuba - to justify shutting the country out of the summit, while a number of US congressmen threatened to boycott it in case Raul Castro shows up. Thus, the US diplomacy made a thinly disguised attempt to intimidate the ALBA leaders who felt very strong about their Cuban peer joining them at the forum.¶ Last February, Venezuelan president Hugo Chavez expressed resolute opposition to the policy of isolating Havana and, citing the CELAC [Community of Latin American & Caribbean States] summit which condemned the inhumane US blockade of Cuba, warned that the US position prompted outrage across Latin America. In fact, the US pressure led ALBA [Bolivarian Alternative for the Americas] countries to consider shunning the forum in response. For example, Bolivian president Evo Morales said the US conduct was undemocratic, discriminatory, and even racist as Cuba drives progressive change in the region and just one country - the US - should not be allowed to impose its approaches on the whole Latin America.¶ Colombian president Juan Manuel Santos faced an uphill task of preventing a diplomatic escalation, and at the highest point of the mission, on March 7 he paid a visit to Havana to apologize for so awkwardly conforming to the US demand. The move was widely seen as a sign of profound transformation in the international relations - in the past epoch, the countries politically trailing the U.S used to ignore Cuba and displayed no sense of embarrassment. Formally, Santos went to Havana, where Chavez is getting medical treatment at the moment, to pen a package of trade agreements with Venezuela, but it was an easy guess that the Venezuelan leader agreed to hold the signing ceremony in Cuba to facilitate an informal contact between Santos and Raul Castro. The meeting opened up an opportunity to break the stalemate: the Cuban leader made it clear that he understood Santos' concerns and a priori did not plan to attend the summit, but still remarked that the situation which the Colombian president described as lack of consensus was owed entirely to the US unilateralism.¶ In return, Santos promised to Raul Castro that accommodating Cuba in the future forums would be given a line on the agenda in Cartagena de Indias and thanked him for helping Colombia and the summit route around a serious problem. Cuban foreign minister Bruno Eduardo Rodriguez said in a reference to the «Latin American consensus» on debarring Cuba from the forums held by the countries of the US-dominated continent that Cuba's involvement in the upcoming summit «in a remote mode" would nevertheless be impossible to overlook. He also mentioned that April 14-15 are the dates when Cubans celebrate the anniversary of the collapse of the Playa Giron intervention organized by the CIA, the point being that Cuba neither was nor is a country to ever crack under pressure. There is confidence in Havana that not only the ALBA countries but also the UNASUR [Unión de Naciones Suramericanas] and CELAC members will throw their support behind it in Cartagena de Indias. In contrast, Washington can realistically expect to be backed exclusively by Canada, a disciplined minor partner of the US whose partaking in subversive operations against Cuba is an open secret.¶ Visiting the Cartagena de Indias forum, the US president will have to realize - by no means for the first time - that the majority of his Latin American colleagues are on Cuba's side. The positions of Argentina's Cristina Fernandez de Kirchner and Brazil's Dilma Rousseff will draw heightened attention, and it should be borne in mind in the context that the foreign ministers of the two countries Hector Timerman and Antonio Patriota voiced a shared the view at a March 14 media conference in San Paulo - the forum in Colombia must become the last one from which Cuba is absent, since the mismatch between the title of the gathering and its actual capacity is becoming impossible to explain away. There is ample evidence, on the other hand, that US diplomats are working closely with Washington's regional allies - Mexico, Honduras, Guatemala, Salvador, Costa Rica, Panama, and Chile - to draw them into Washington's camp over Cuba and to coerce them into urging the country to hastily launch democratic and free-market reforms, which Havana is instead implementing in line with its own carefully calculated schedule.¶ The US will be confronted at the summit with an array of pro-Cuban demands upheld by the ALBA, CELAC, and UNASUR countries and with calls to lift the blockade as required by U.N. resolutions. The theme will no doubt feature prominently at the social forum which will parallel the presidential part of the meeting. Activists from public, trade-union, student, and native-American groups from across Latin America will flock to Colombia to air their perspectives on global developments, the US-enforced globalization, the CIA conspiracies aimed at toppling the continent's populist regimes, and the deployment of US military bases in the region. Unsure that Morales would choose to visit the summit, Santos invited him to give a concluding talk at the social forum, and Morales accepted the invitation. The Bolivian leader stated during his recent tour of Austria that his country was in the process of building socialism and therefore could, like Cuba, face US efforts to isolate it. Morales maintained that the rise of Marxist regimes was a steady Latin American trend and said his country should opt out of the Organization of American States since Cuba's membership in it had been suspended as a punishment for socialism. Anti-imperialist countries are being falsely accused of terrorism, authoritarian rule, and drug trafficking, said Morales, adding that history is repeating itself.¶ Ecuadoran president Rafael Correa announced that he would skip the VI and all further summits if the US policy of isolating Cuba remains untamed. Correa criticized the Latin American forums for failing to bring into the spotlight the bulk of the continent's real problems such as the economic blockade of Cuba or the British occupation of the Falklands, charging that the exclusion of a Latin American country from Latin American summits makes no sense and that the outpourings of pro-democracy rhetoric in their framework appear completely unrelated to reality. Correa's strongly worded statement resonated as a warning issued in concert by the populist regimes against the policy of sidelining Cuba.¶ Unless extraordinary circumstances arise, Summits of the Americas take place every three years. The next one is due in 2015, and the current impression is that Washington is determined to go on keeping Cuba under pressure at any cost. The defiant Freedom Island, though, managed to survive half a century of US aggression, terrorism, and conspiracies. The Castro brothers who have long deserved a place in the Cuban history boast enviable health and energy and must be credited with the ability to plan long ahead and to increasingly outplay Cuba's geopolitical opponents, at times causing Washington to sink into downright hysteria. The future is always a mystery but both Castro brothers will always be remembered as the leaders who defeated the Empire, and Latin American politicians, regardless of their views, are switching to Havana's side in the US-Cuban conflict.

#### Links to politics—still appeases cuba and makes the gop annoyed—they don’t get a qpq from cuba

### 2AC—Brazil DA

#### Not zero-sum—Brazil is producing sugar in Cuba

McAuliff 12 – Director of the Fund for Reconciliation and Development. (“Brazilian Investment in Cuban Sugar Production”, January 31, 2012, <http://internalreform.blogspot.com/2012/03/brazilian-investment-in-cuban-sugar.html>, cross-posted from Reuters)

(Reuters).—**The Brazilian giant Odebrecht plans to produce sugar in Cuba**, the company reported Monday in the first injection of foreign capital in a sector so far closed in the communist-ruled island. Odebrecht Group signed with the state of Cuban Sugar Business Administration a “productive management contract” to wit “September 5″ in the central province of Cienfuegos. “The agreement for a period of 10 years is to increase sugar production and milling capacity and help the revitalization” of the industry, Odebrecht said in an email sent to Reuters through his press office. The project would open to foreign capital, the underfunded Cuba’s sugar industry, whose production has plummeted from about 8.0 million tons in the 1970s to just 1.2 million tonnes in the last harvest. In addition, it will deepen Brazil’s role in modernizing the dilapidated productive infrastructure of the island. Odebrecht did not elaborate. But a Brazilian sugar industry executive told Reuters that the contract could be signed this week during a visit to Cuba, Brazilian President Dilma Rousseff. Cuba allowed more than a decade, the inflow of foreign capital to develop other strategic industries such as tourism and oil recently, where a consortium led by Repsol-YPF this year will begin to explore Cuban waters in the Gulf of Mexico. Private companies from other countries have spent years negotiating its entry into the sugar industry in Cuba, nationalized shortly after Fidel Castro’s revolution in 1959. The opening comes after a major restructuring of the industry in late 2011 as part of the efforts of President Raul Castro to modernize the island’s socialist economy.

#### The impact evidence is an internal link turn to itself

#### Allowing exports and creating demand doesn’t do anyhing – Cuba’s sugar-ethanol industry is non-existent and they can’t export *what they don’t have*

Specht 13

[Jonathan-J.D. Wash. U St. Louis, Legal Advisor, “Raising Cane: Cuban Sugarcane Ethanol’s Economic and Environmental Effects on the United States,” Environmental Law & Policy Journal, Univ. of California Davis, Vol. 36:2, [**http://environs.law.ucdavis.edu/issues/36/2/specht.pdf**](http://environs.law.ucdavis.edu/issues/36/2/specht.pdf)]

¶ The ideal domestic policy scenario for the creation of a robust Cuban sugarcane ethanol industry would be a situation in which the U.S. trade embargo on Cuba is ended, U.S. tariff barriers have been removed (in the case of sugar) or not revived (in the case of ethanol), and the Renewable Fuel Standard requiring that a certain percentage of U.S. fuel come from ethanol remain in place. Of course, changes in United States policy alone, even those that ensure a steady source of demand for Cuban sugarcane-based ethanol, would not be enough to create an ethanol industry from scratch. The country will need to decide that fostering the industry is to be a key goal of the post-Castro era, and will need to shape its domestic policies to encourage the growth of such an industry. ¶ Given that the Cuban sugar industry lived and died by its ties with specific foreign powers for most of the Twentieth Century, Cuba will likely be quite wary of investing too much in the creation of a sugarcane ethanol industry that it perceives as being largely a creature of U.S. energy and agricultural policy. Therefore, the creation of a significant sugarcane ethanol industry in Cuba will require a large increase in domestic demand for ethanol. One way that Cuba could encourage domestic demand for ethanol would be to follow the Brazilian model of encouraging the purchase of Flex Fuel vehicles, which can run on any blend of fuel between 100% gasoline and 100% ethanol.[[1]](#footnote-1) Because Cuba has so many old automobiles,[[2]](#footnote-2) expecting new vehicles to provide a source of demand for ethanol may be an extremely unrealistic prospect. On the other hand, the fact that there is so much pent-up demand for new automobiles in Cuba could mean that, with sufficient and well-directed government incentives, Flex Fuel vehicles could be adopted in Cuba at faster rates than in other countries. Like all new capitalist industries to emerge in the post-Castro era, whatever ethanol industry arises will have to deal with the painful transition from socialism to capitalism. The Cuban sugarcane ethanol industry will face similar challenges to other private sector industries that arise in the post-Fidel era. One of these challenges will be simply a lack of people with skills necessary for any industry. According to Edward Gonzalez and Kevin McCarthy of the RAND Corporation, “[A]s a result of 40-plus years of communism, the labor force lacks the kinds of trained managers, accountants, auditors, bankers, insurers, etc., that a robust market economy requires.”[[3]](#footnote-3) While these challenges will not be unique to Cuba’s ethanol industry, they will put the country at a competitive disadvantage vis-à-vis existing ethanol exporters such as Brazil, especially if there is a significant lag time between the expiration of the ethanol tariff barriers at the end of 2011 and the eventual removal of the United States trade embargo against Cuba. Additionally, because it is currently almost non-existent, Cuba’s ethanol industry will need a great deal of foreign expertise and investment to get started. However, such investments are unlikely to be made unless Cuba makes fundamental changes in its business climate. In the words of Gonzalez and McCarthy, “Similarly, capital investment, which Cuba’s economy desperately needs and which is most likely to be supplied by foreign investors, will be difficult to attract without enforceable contracts, access to neutral adjudication of disputes, and a degree of predictability that has heretofore been lacking.”[[4]](#footnote-4) While any post-Castro government will likely begin to make such changes to increase the appeal of the island nation to foreign investment, implementing them will take time and trial and error, which will slow the creation of a sugarcane-based ethanol industry.

#### The impact is empirically denied—the recession obviously should have triggered the impact

### 2AC—CIR (Michigan)

#### Won’t pass

Francis 10/31, David Francis is national correspondent for The Fiscal Times and is based in Washington, D.C. In addition to reporting for The Fiscal Times, he has written for The Christian Science Monitor, Financial Times Deutschland, andDeutsche Welle and has also contributed to World Politics Review, SportsIllustrated.com, and The Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, among others(David, "Illegal Immigration Debate Splits the GOP Yet Again" 10/31/13, The Fiscal Times, http://www.thefiscaltimes.com/Articles/2013/10/31/Illegal-Immigration-Debate-Splits-GOP-Yet-Again#sthash.S0jHhzZn.dpuf)//ADravid

¶ Immigration reform has been Marco Rubio’s (R-FL) pet issue since he entered the Senate. He was one of the Gang of 8 that drafted a comprehensive immigration reform bill that included a path to citizenship. Many expected Rubio to ride the immigration issue to the 2016 Republican presidential nomination. Late last week, however, Rubio pulled an about-face. He no longer supports the bill be once championed.¶ ¶ “At this point, the most realistic way to make progress on immigration would be through a series of individual bills,” Rubio spokesman Alex Conant told Breitbart News last Saturday. Any effort to use a limited bill as a ruse to trigger a conference that would then produce a comprehensive bill would be counterproductive.”¶ ¶ ¶ According to experts on both sides of the issue, the real reason for Rubio’s flip-flop was tea party opposition to the path to citizenship contained in the Senate bill. The most conservative faction of the GOP views this path as a de facto gift of U.S. citizenship to people who entered the country illegally.¶ ¶ “It seems like Republicans are being held hostage by a minority of conservative members of Congress,” said Kica Matos, spokesperson for the Fair Immigration Reform Movement (FIRM) said Wednesday. “The tea party seems to be what’s holding them back.” ¶ ¶ ¶ ¶ As a whole, the Republican Party is not against finding a way to legitimize the more than 11 million illegal immigrants in the country. Moderate Republicans, libertarians, the party’s business wing, and stalwarts such as Grover Norquist all support immigration reform.¶ ¶ However, the most conservative members have made it clear they will not support any bill that provides a pathway to citizenship for those who came to the United States illegally. They insist they would only support piecemeal bills that address immigration reform, not a comprehensive package.¶ ¶ “I care about the sovereignty of the United States of America and what it stands for, and not an open-door policy,” Rep. Ted Yoho (R-FL) said recently.¶ ¶ Now, with lobbyists on each side of the issue flooding Capitol Hill to make their case, the fault lines within the GOP have been exposed. The path they choose to take will go a long way toward determining the future direction of the party. They can either alienate illegal immigrants – a direct refutation of recommendations made in the wake of the 2012 presidential election, or they could extend an olive branch to the Latinos while pleasing the business wing of the party. ¶ ¶ SHOWDOWN ON THE HILL¶ ¶ Business leaders arrived on Capitol Hill earlier this week to push for comprehensive reform. Some 600 leaders from 40 states plan to meet with GOP lawmakers throughout the week. They believe immigration reform would ultimately provide an economic benefit to the country, along with cheap labor for a generation.¶ ¶ "It’s time for members of both parties to tackle this issue and pass bipartisan immigration legislation that will strengthen our economy, create jobs, and keep America’s future bright. Our country cannot afford to wait any longer for smart reform,” John Feinblatt, chief policy advisor to Michael R. Bloomberg and Chairman of the Partnership for a New American Economy, said in a statement released by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. The Chamber backs comprehensive reform.¶ ¶ RELATED: TWO IMMIGRATION PLANS, TWO WORLDS APART¶ ¶ Unlikely allies, including a group of evangelical ministers who arrived this week to lobby for reform, have joined business leaders. At the same time, pro immigration groups are pushing House lawmakers to take up a comprehensive bill.¶ ¶ "Traditional pillars of the Republican Party, such as business leaders and Evangelicals, are working to pressure House Republicans to take up immigration reform and, in fact, they are doing so aggressively,” said Elizabeth Durden, an assistant professor of sociology at Bucknell University.¶ ¶ “They, along with many others, are also arguing the ethical reasons for reform: we have more than 11 million undocumented immigrants living in the shadows in the United States. They're the parents of American citizens, and they need to be made part of our social fabric.”¶ ¶ ¶ ¶ Bob Dane, communications director at the right-leaning Federation for American Immigration Reform, says the lingering wounds of the Republicans’ debt ceiling miscalculation loom large in this debate.¶ ¶ “The recent government shutdown ended badly for the Republicans and emboldened the Democrats to push hard and fast for reform,” he said. ¶ ¶ He said it remains unclear whether the House will take up comprehensive reform or take the piecemeal approach. But the choice Republicans make will go a long way toward determining the party’s direction in the future. ¶ ¶ “Immigration is probably the last issue that [House Speaker John] Boehner has a chance to make amends with conservative voters,” he said. “The GOP is committing party suicide with amnesty, and they’re starting to realize it.”

#### Obama doesn’t push the plan—the embargo is codified which means Congress can remove it independent of the president

#### Winners win—shutdown proves

Milbank 10/15 [Dana. Politics for the Washington Post. “Dana Milbank: Now, lead from the front” Washington Post, 10/15/13 <http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/dana-milbank-now-lead-from-the-front/2013/10/18/56c1fd42-37fe-11e3-8a0e-4e2cf80831fc_story.html> //GBS-JV]

But the last use of the phrase I could find in the Congressional Record was on Oct. 2, at the start of the shutdown, when Sen. John Barrasso (R-Wyo.) said Obama had been “once again attempting to lead from behind in a crisis.”¶ They aren’t saying that now.¶ Obama got out in front of the shutdown and debt-ceiling standoff. He took a firm position — no negotiating — and he made his case to the country vigorously and repeatedly. Republicans miscalculated, assuming he would again give in. The result was the sort of decisive victory rarely seen in Washington skirmishes.¶ On Wednesday, Republicans surrendered. They opened the government and extended the debt limit with virtually no conditions. On Thursday, Obama rubbed their noses in it.¶ “You don’t like a particular policy or a particular president? Then argue for your position. Go out there and win an election,” Obama taunted from the State Dining Room. “Push to change it, but don’t break it. Don’t break what our predecessors spent over two centuries building.”¶ Obama said “there are no winners” after the two-week standoff, but his opponents, particularly his tea party foes, clearly lost the most; seven in 10 Americans thought Republicans put party ahead of country. These “extremes” who “don’t like the word ‘compromise’ ” were the obvious target of Obama’s demand that we all “stop focusing on the lobbyists and the bloggers and the talking heads on radio and the professional activists who profit from conflict.” (He did not mention newspaper columnists, so you are free to continue reading.)¶ The gloating was a bit unseemly, but the president is entitled to savor a victory lap. The more important thing is that Obama now maintain the forceful leadership that won him the budget and debt fights. In that sense, the rest of Obama’s speech had some worrisome indications that he was returning to his familiar position in the rear.¶ The agreement ending the shutdown requires Congress to come up with a budget by Dec. 13 . It’s a chance — perhaps Obama’s last chance — to tackle big issues such as tax reform and restructuring Medicare. The relative strength he gained over congressional Republicans during the shutdown left him in a dominant negotiating position. If he doesn’t use his power now to push through more of his agenda, he’ll lose his advantage. George W. Bush adviser Karl Rove called it the “perishability” of political capital.

#### Passing immigration reform isn’t an opportunity cost to the plan since the judge has agential ambit to do both—you should only consider real-world opportunity costs because that’s critical training for real-world decisionmaking

#### Oil lobbies solve the link

Sadowski 11 – Richard Sadowski 11, J.D., Hofstra University School of Law, Fall 2011, “IN THIS ISSUE: NATURAL RESOURCE CONFLICT: CUBAN OFFSHORE DRILLING: PREPARATION AND PREVENTION WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE UNITED STATES' EMBARGO,” Sustainable Development Law & Policy, 12 Sustainable Dev. L. & Pol'y 37, p. lexis

A U.S. Geological Survey estimates that Cuba's offshore oil fields hold at least four and a half billion barrels of recoverable oil and ten trillion cubic feet of natural gas. n29 Cupet, the state-owned Cuban energy company, insists that actual reserves are double that of the U.S. estimate. n30 One estimate indicates that Cuba could be producing 525,000 barrels of oil per day. n31 Given this vast resource, Cuba has already leased offshore oil exploration blocks to operators from Spain, Norway, and India. n32 Offshore oil discoveries in Cuba are placing increasing pressure for the United States to end the embargo. First, U.S. energy companies are eager to compete for access to Cuban oil reserves. n33 [\*38] Secondly, fears of a Cuban oil spill are argued to warrant U.S. investment and technology. n34 Finally, the concern over Cuban offshore drilling renews cries that the embargo is largely a failure and harms human rights.¶ ECONOMICS: U.S. COMPANIES WANT IN¶ For U.S. companies, the embargo creates concern that they will lose out on an opportunity to develop a nearby resource. n35 Oil companies have a long history of utilizing political pressure for self-serving purposes. n36 American politicians, ever fearful of high energy costs, are especially susceptible to oil-lobby pressures. n37 This dynamic was exemplified in 2008, when then-Vice President Dick Cheney told the board of directors of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce that "oil is being drilled right now sixty miles off the coast of Florida. But we're not doing it, the Chinese are, in cooperation with the Cuban government. Even the communists have figured out that a good answer to high prices is more supply" n38¶ This pressure for U.S. investment in oil is exacerbated by America's expected increase in consumption rates. n39 Oil company stocks are valued in large part on access to reserves. n40 Thus, more leases, including those in Cuban waters, equal higher stock valuation. n41 "The last thing that American energy companies want is to be trapped on the sidelines by sanctions while European, Canadian and Latin American rivals are free to develop new oil resources on the doorstep of the United States." n42

### 2AC—a/t: econ

#### CIR doesn’t solve the economy

Rector ‘7 [Robert. Senior Research Fellow in Domestic Policy Studies at Heritage. And Christine Kim. “Executive Summary: The Fiscal Cost of Low-Skill Immigrants to the US Taxpayer” Heritage Special Report #14, 5/22/7 <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2007/05/the-fiscal-cost-of-low-skill-immigrants-to-the-us-taxpayer> //GBS-JV]

In FY 2004, low-skill immigrant households received $30,160 per household in immediate benefits and services (direct benefits, means-tested benefits, education, and population-based services). In general, low-skill immigrant households received about $10,000 more in government benefits than did the average U.S. household, largely because of the higher level of means-tested welfare benefits received by low-skill immigrant households.¶ In contrast, low-skill immigrant households pay less in taxes than do other households. On average, low-skill immigrant households paid only $10,573 in taxes in FY 2004. Thus, low-skill immigrant households received nearly three dollars in immediate benefits and services for each dollar in taxes paid.¶ A household's net fiscal deficit equals the cost of benefits and services received minus taxes paid. When the costs of direct and means-tested benefits, education, and population-based services are counted, the average low-skill household had a fiscal deficit of $19,588 (expenditures of $30,160 minus $10,573 in taxes).¶ At $19,588, the average annual fiscal deficit for low-skill immigrant households was nearly twice the amount of taxes paid. In order for the average low-skill household to be fiscally solvent (taxes paid equaling immediate benefits received), it would be necessary to eliminate Social Security and Medicare, all means-tested welfare, and to cut expenditures on public education roughly in half.¶ American families often are net tax payers during working age and net tax takers (benefits exceeding taxes) dur­ing retirement. This is not the case for low-skill immigrant households; in these households benefits substantially exceed taxes at every age level. Consequently, low-skill immigrant households impose substantial long-term costs on the U.S. taxpayer. Assuming an average adult life span of 60 years for each head of household, the average lifetime costs to the taxpayer will be nearly $1.2 million for each low-skill household for immediate benefits received minus all taxes paid.¶ As noted, in 2004, there were 4.5 million low-skill immigrant households. With an average net fiscal deficit of $19,588 per household, the total annual fiscal deficit for all of these households together equaled $89.1 billion (the deficit of $19,588 per household times 4.54 million low-skill immigrant households). Over the next ten years, the net cost (benefits minus taxes) to the taxpayer of low-skill immigrant households will approach $1 trillion.¶ Current immigrants (both legal and illegal) have very low education levels relative to the non-immigrant U.S. population. At least 50 percent and perhaps 60 percent of illegal immigrant adults lack a high school degree.[1] Among legal immigrants the situation is better, but a quarter still lack a high school diploma. Overall, a third of immigrant households are headed by individuals without a high school degree. By contrast, only 9 percent of non-immigrant adults lack a high school degree. The current immigrant population thus contains a disproportionate share of poorly educated individuals. These individuals will tend to have low wages, pay little in taxes, and receive above average levels of government benefits and services.¶ Recent waves of immigrants are disproportionately low skilled because of two factors. For years, the U.S. has had a permissive policy concerning illegal immigration: the 2,000-mile border with Mexico has remained porous and the law prohibiting the hiring of illegal immigrants has not been enforced. This encourages a disproportionate inflow of low-skill immigrants because few college-educated workers are likely to be willing to undertake the risks and hard­ships associated with crossing the southwest U.S. deserts illegally. Second, the legal immigration system gives pri­ority to "family reunification" and kinship ties rather than skills; this focus also significantly contributes to the inflow of low-skill immigrants into the U.S.¶ Understanding of the fiscal consequences of low-skill immigration is impeded by a lack of understanding of the scope of government financial redistribution within U.S. society. It is a common misperception that the only indi­viduals who are fiscally dependent (receiving more in benefits than they pay in taxes) are welfare recipients who per­form little or no work, and that as long as an individual works regularly he must be a net tax producer (paying more in taxes than his family receives in benefits).¶ In reality, the present welfare system is designed primarily to provide financial support to low-income working families. Moreover, welfare is only a modest part of the overall system of financial redistribution operated by the gov­ernment. Current government policies provide extensive free or heavily subsidized aid to low-skill families (both immigrant and non-immigrant) through welfare, Social Security, Medicare, public education, and many other ser­vices. At the same time, government requires these families to pay little in taxes. This very expensive assistance to the least advantaged American families has become accepted as our mutual responsibility for one another, but it is fis­cally unsustainable to apply this system of lavish income redistribution to an inflow of millions of poorly educated immigrants.¶ Finally, it is sometimes argued that since higher-skill immigrants are a net fiscal plus for the U.S. taxpayers, while low-skill immigrants are a net loss, the two cancel each other out and therefore no problem exists. This is like a stockbroker advising a client to buy two stocks, one that will make money and another that will lose money. Obvi­ously, it would be better to purchase only the stock that will be profitable and avoid the money-losing stock entirely. Similarly, low-skill immigrants increase poverty in the U.S. and impose a burden on taxpayers that should be avoided.¶ U.S. immigration policy should encourage high-skill immigration and strictly limit low-skill immigration. In general, government policy should limit immigration to those who will be net fiscal contributors, avoiding those who will increase poverty and impose new costs on overburdened U.S. taxpayers.

#### No impact to economic decline

Daniel W. Drezner 12, Professor, The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University, October 2012, “The Irony of Global Economic Governance: The System Worked,” <http://www.globaleconomicgovernance.org/wp-content/uploads/IR-Colloquium-MT12-Week-5_The-Irony-of-Global-Economic-Governance.pdf>

The final outcome addresses a dog that hasn’t barked: the effect of the Great Recession on cross-border conflict and violence. During the initial stages of the crisis, multiple analysts asserted that the financial crisis would lead states to increase their use of force as a tool for staying in power.37 Whether through greater internal repression, diversionary wars, arms races, or a ratcheting up of great power conflict, there were genuine concerns that the global economic downturn would lead to an increase in conflict. Violence in the Middle East, border disputes in the South China Sea, and even the disruptions of the Occupy movement fuel impressions of surge in global public disorder.

The aggregate data suggests otherwise, however. The Institute for Economics and Peace has constructed a “Global Peace Index” annually since 2007. A key conclusion they draw from the 2012 report is that “The average level of peacefulness in 2012 is approximately the same as it was in 2007.”38 Interstate violence in particular has declined since the start of the financial crisis – as have military expenditures in most sampled countries. Other studies confirm that the Great Recession has not triggered any increase in violent conflict; the secular decline in violence that started with the end of the Cold War has not been reversed.39 Rogers Brubaker concludes, “the crisis has not to date generated the surge in protectionist nationalism or ethnic exclusion that might have been expected.”40

None of these data suggest that the global economy is operating swimmingly. Growth remains unbalanced and fragile, and has clearly slowed in 2012. Transnational capital flows remain depressed compared to pre-crisis levels, primarily due to a drying up of cross-border interbank lending in Europe. Currency volatility remains an ongoing concern. Compared to the aftermath of other postwar recessions, growth in output, investment, and employment in the developed world have all lagged behind. But the Great Recession is not like other postwar recessions in either scope or kind; expecting a standard “V”-shaped recovery was unreasonable. One financial analyst characterized the post-2008 global economy as in a state of “contained depression.”41 The key word is “contained,” however. Given the severity, reach and depth of the 2008 financial crisis, the proper comparison is with Great Depression. And by that standard, the outcome variables look impressive. As Carmen Reinhart and Kenneth Rogoff concluded in This Time is Different: “that its macroeconomic outcome has been only the most severe global recession since World War II – and not even worse – must be regarded as fortunate.”42

## 1AR

### Winners win

#### **Specifically true for Cuba**

Leogrande 13 [4/11/13, William M. LeoGrande was the Dean of the American University School of Public Affairs and frequent publisher and expert on Latin America, “The Cuba Lobby”, <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2013/04/11/the_cuba_lobby_jay_z?print=yes&hidecomments=yes&page=full>]

The irrationality of U.S. policy does not stem just from concerns about electoral politics in Florida. The Cuban-American community has evolved to the point that a majority now favors engagement with Cuba, as both opinion polls and Obama's electoral success in 2008 and 2012 demonstrate. Today, the larger problem is the climate of fear in the government bureaucracy, where even honest reporting about Cuba -- let alone advocating a more sensible policy -- can endanger one's career. Democratic presidents, who ought to know better, have tolerated this distortion of the policy process and at times have reinforced it by allowing the Cuba lobby to extort concessions from them. But the cost is high -- the gradual and insidious erosion of the government's ability to make sound policy based on fact rather than fantasy. Through bullying and character assassination, the China Lobby blocked a sensible U.S. policy toward Beijing for a quarter-century, with tragic results. When Richard Nixon finally defied the China Lobby by going to Beijing in 1972, the earth did not tremble, civilization did not collapse, and U.S. security did not suffer. If anything, U.S. allies around the world applauded the adoption -- finally -- of a rational policy. At home, the punditocracy was surprised to discover that Nixon's bold stroke was politically popular. The China Lobby proved to be a paper tiger; the Red Scare fever of the 1950s had subsided, robbing the movement of its political base. Likewise, the Cuba Lobby has blocked a sensible policy toward Cuba for half a century, with growing damage to U.S. relations with Latin America. When a courageous U.S. president finally decides to defy the Cuba Lobby with a stroke as bold as Nixon's trip to China, she or he will discover that so too the Cuba Lobby no longer has the political clout it once had. The strategic importance of repairing the United States' frayed relations with Latin America has come to outweigh the political risk of reconciliation with Havana. Nixon went to China, and history records it as the highlight of his checkered legacy. Will Barack Obama have the courage to go to Havana?
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