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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](http://ije.oxfordjournals.org/content/35/4/817.full.pdf%2Bhtml))

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.

#### 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—IL Turn

#### Cuban agriculture is resilient but the plan is key to wider adoption

**Zunes 2k** – associate professor of politics and chair of the Peace & Justice Studies Program at the University of San Francisco (Stephen, “Cuba’s New Revolution” Design/Builder, August <http://stephenzunes.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/09/Cubas-New-Revolution.pdf>)

Most of Cuba's ecological innovations were made more out of necessity than by design. However, the Cubans believe that many of these changes are here to stay, even if the availability of fossil fuels and chemical agents improve. “We will never go back,” one farmer told me “I'm sorry it took us so long to figure this out” Indeed, as a number of Cuban scientists pointed out, sooner or later all countries will have to make the transition to a more environmentally sustainable economy. “The revolution and the U S. embargo freed us from having to follow the U 8. model of development,“ says Raoul Guiterrez, who works for a tour agency. “Unfortunately, we ended up following the Soviet model, which didn’t work either. Now, we have been forced to do what we should have done from the beginning - find a Cuban model, sensitive to our country‘s cultural, economic, and environmental needs.” Environmental education is taught in every grade at every level of education There are prime-time radio and television shows on environmental themes. There is a major cleanup of Havana Harbor, thanks to a grant from Scandinavian countries. There is a major recycling program focusing on glass, aluminum, card-- board, and paper collected from every urban neighborhood and many smaller towns as well. High school students are recruited, with the incentive of cash donations for their schools, to collect recyclable materials. There is a growing emphasis on natural medical practices, including homeopathy, Eastern traditions, and traditional Cuban medicines. Green pharmacies are in most towns and neighborhoods, and alternative medicine is a recognized specialization in Cuban medical schools. The greening of Cuba would allow for an unprecedented degree of opportunities for environmental architects, appropriate-technology specialists, organic farming consultants, and others from the United States, yet such assistance is deemed illegal by the Clinton Administration, which has threatened those willing to provide such aid with fines and jail terms. It is ironic that pressure against Cuba has increased as it has moved away from the old rigid Communist development strategies to embracing Green development strategies. Yet perhaps a Green Cuba actually is a bigger threat than a Red Cuba. The Communist model was clearly unsustainable on many levels. Yet a Green model actually serves as a viable alternative to the foreign-investment driven, capital-intensive model promoted by the United States, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and the World Trade Organization. Indeed, Cuba may constitute the threat of a good example, which is perhaps the biggest threat of all.

### 2AC—T Appeasement

#### counterinterpretation—positive incentives—here’s a case list

**Haass and O’Sullivan, 2k** - \*Vice President andDirector of Foreign Policy Studies at the Brookings Institution AND \*\*a Fellow with the Foreign Policy StudiesProgram at the Brookings Institution (Richard and Meghan, “Terms of Engagement:Alternatives to PunitivePolicies” 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.

#### Their interpretation uses the ends instead of the means to define engagement—that wrecks coherent policymaking and topic education

Resnick 1 – Dr. Evan Resnick, Ph.D. in Political Science from Columbia University, Assistant Professor of Political Science at Yeshiva University, “Defining Engagement”, Journal of International Affairs, Spring, 54(2), Ebsco

Some scholars have excessively narrowed the definition of engagement by defining it according to the ends sought rather than the means employed. For example, Schweller and Wohlforth assert that if any distinction can be drawn between engagement and appeasement, "it is that the goal of engagement is not simply tension-reduction and the avoidance of war but also an attempt to socialize [a] dissatisfied power into acceptance of the established order."(n17) Such ends-based definitions hinder the study of engagement in two ways. First, because the act of policymaking consists of selecting from a variety of alternative means in the pursuit of a given end(s), it stands to reason that policy instruments are more effectively conceptualized in terms of means rather than ends. When defined as different means, policies can be more easily compared with one another across a whole spectrum of discrete ends, in order to gauge more accurately the circumstances under which each policy is relatively more or less effective.(n18)

Second, scholars who define engagement as the end of peaceful socialization inevitably create a bias for future empirical research on engagement outcomes. This is because it is difficult to imagine a more ambitious foreign policy objective than the peaceable transformation of a revisionist state that rejects the dominant norms and practices of the international system into a status-quo state that embodies those same norms and practices. The equation of engagement with socialization alone forecloses the possibility that engagement could be employed to accomplish more modest goals such as tension-reduction. Therefore, all else being equal, scholars using this loaded definition will be predisposed to conclude from examination only of the hardest cases of attempted socialization that the policy is ineffective.(n19) Considering engagement as a set of means would enable analysts to more fairly assess the effectiveness of engagement relative to other policies in achieving an array of ends.

### 2AC—Diplo CP

#### Total removal key to soft power

Vivanco 6 – LLM from Harvard Law School, Americas director of Humans Rights Watch. (Jose Miguel, “Restraint, not force, will bring change to Cuba”, humans rights watch, 12/22/06, <http://www.hrw.org/news/2006/12/21/restraint-not-force-will-bring-change-cuba>, google scholar)

This reluctance would be understandable but misguided. Most Cubans do want change. If they do not call for it after Mr Castro's death, it will be largely for the same reason they did not during his lifetime: the country's repressive machinery, which ruined countless lives, remains intact today.¶ If the international community misreads this silence, it will miss a historic opportunity. Immediately after Mr Castro's death, the Cuban government will be more vulnerable to pressure for change than ever before. Raúl Castro, who has already taken over the reigns of power, may wield the same old instruments of repression. But he will not enjoy his brother's revolutionary stature, which at times has been as vital as the repression for perpetuating the regime. This window of opportunity is unlikely to last. Raul Castro may never match his brother's unique combination of personal charisma and political cunning; yet, he could easily acquire the other trait that Fidel exploited so effectively: the heroic image of the Latin American David confronting the US Goliath.¶ Whether Raúl Castro can claim the "David" role will depend largely on Washington. He will be virtually guaranteed the part if the Bush administration stays the 40–year course of unilateral embargo and unconditional ultimatum. It is hard to think of a policy that has a longer track record of failure. Cuba is no more open now than when the embargo was first imposed four decades ago. If anything, the policy consolidated Mr Castro's hold by giving his government an excuse for its problems and a pretext for its abuses. Moreover, because the policy was imposed in such heavy–handed fashion, it enabled Mr Castro to garner sympathy abroad, neutralising international pressure rather than increasing it. While other governments may have been concerned about political repression in Cuba, they were unwilling to be seen as siding with a bully.¶ To its credit, the Bush administration responded to news of Mr Castro's decline in August with surprising restraint, with President George W. Bush saying Cuba's citizens should determine their future. But if Washington hopes for influence in Cuba, it must do much more. First, it will need to lift the embargo. Nothing short of this will work, not even the "calibrated response" espoused by the Clinton administration, in which the US would ease the embargo in response to Cuban reforms. Why would the Cuban government make concessions when the embargo helps keep it in power?¶ Yet, it would be naïve to think the embargo's end would prompt the Cuban government to change its ways. Instead, a more measured and multilateral approach is needed, in which other governments in the region take the lead in pressing Cuba to respect political freedoms. Finding allies willing to assume this role will not be easy. But it may be the only hope for real change. By making the effort, the US could begin to reverse the dynamic that helped keep Mr Castro in power. Only when the US stops acting like Goliath will Cuba stop looking like David.

#### Solves extinction and solves the impact to the politics DA

**Jervis 09** (professor of international politics at Columbia University. (Robert, Unipolarity: A Structural Perspective, World Politics Volume 61, Number 1, January 2009)

To say that the system is unipolar is not to argue that the unipole can get everything it wants or that it has no need for others. American power is very great, but it is still subject to two familiar limitations: it is harder to build than to destroy, and success usually depends on others’ decisions. This is particularly true of the current system because of what the U.S. wants. If Hitler had won World War II, he might have been able to maintain his system for some period of time with little cooperation from others because “all” he wanted was to establish the supremacy of the Aryan race. The U.S. wants not only to prevent the rise of a peer competitor but also to stamp out terrorism, maintain an open international economic system, spread democracy throughout the world, and establish a high degree of cooperation among countries that remain juridically equal. Even in the military arena, the U.S. cannot act completely alone. Bases and overflight rights are always needed, and support from allies, especially Great Britain, is important to validate military action in the eyes of the American public. When one matches American forces, not against those of an adversary but against the tasks at hand, they often fall short.54 Against terrorism, force is ineffective without excellent intelligence. Given the international nature of the threat and the difficulties of gaining information about it, international cooperation is the only route to success. The maintenance of international prosperity also requires joint efforts, even leaving aside the danger that other countries could trigger a run on the dollar by cashing in their holdings. Despite its lack of political unity, Europe is in many respects an economic unit, and one with a greater gdp than that of the U.S. Especially because of the growing Chinese economy, economic power is spread around the world much more equally than is military power, and the open economic system could easily disintegrate despite continued unipolarity. In parallel, on a whole host of problems such as aids, poverty, and international crime (even leaving aside climate change), the unipole can lead and exert pressure but cannot dictate. Joint actions may be necessary to apply sanctions to various unpleasant and recalcitrant regimes; proliferation can be stopped only if all the major states (and many minor ones) work to this end; unipolarity did not automatically enable the U.S. to maintain the coalition against Iraq after the first Gulf War; close ties within the West are needed to reduce the ability of China, Russia, and other states to play one Western country off against the others. But in comparison with the cold war era, there are fewer incentives today for allies to cooperate with the U.S. During the earlier period unity and close coordination not only permitted military efficiencies but, more importantly, gave credibility to the American nuclear umbrella that protected the allies. Serious splits were dangerous because they entailed the risk that the Soviet Union would be emboldened. This reason for avoiding squabbles disappeared along with the USSR, and the point is likely to generalize to other unipolar systems if they involve a decrease of threats that call for maintaining good relations with the superpower. This does not mean that even in this particular unipolar system the superpower is like Gulliver tied down by the Lilliputians. In some areas opposition can be self-defeating. Thus for any country to undermine American leadership of the international economy would be to put its own economy at risk, even if the U.S. did not retaliate, and for a country to sell a large proportion of its dollar holding would be to depress the value of the dollar, thereby diminishing the worth of the country’s remaining stock of this currency. Furthermore, cooperation often follows strong and essentially unilateral action. Without the war in Iraq it is not likely that we would have seen the degree of cooperation that the U.S. obtained from Europe in combating the Iranian nuclear program and from Japan and the PRC in containing North Korea. Nevertheless, many of the American goals depend on persuading others, not coercing them. Although incentives and even force are not irrelevant to spreading democracy and the free market, at bottom this requires people to embrace a set of institutions and values. Building the world that the U.S. seeks is a political, social, and even psychological task for which unilateral measures are likely to be unsuited and for which American military and economic strength can at best play a supporting role. Success requires that others share the American vision and believe that its leadership is benign.

### 2AC—Politics

#### PC isn’t quantifiable—means zero risk of a DA

Hirsh 13 – Michael, chief correspondent for National Journal; citing Ornstein, a political scientist and scholar at the American Enterprise Institute and Bensel, gov’t prof at Cornell. ("There's No Such Thing as Political Capital", 2/7/2013, [www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207](http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207))

But the abrupt emergence of the immigration and gun-control issues illustrates how suddenly shifts in mood can occur and how political interests can align in new ways just as suddenly. Indeed, the pseudo-concept of political capital masks a larger truth about Washington that is kindergarten simple: You just don’t know what you can do until you try. Or as Ornstein himself once wrote years ago, “Winning wins.” In theory, and in practice, depending on Obama’s handling of any particular issue, even in a polarized time, he could still deliver on a lot of his second-term goals, depending on his skill and the breaks. Unforeseen catalysts can appear, like Newtown. Epiphanies can dawn, such as when many Republican Party leaders suddenly woke up in panic to the huge disparity in the Hispanic vote.¶ Some political scientists who study the elusive calculus of how to pass legislation and run successful presidencies say that political capital is, at best, an empty concept, and that almost nothing in the academic literature successfully quantifies or even defines it. “It can refer to a very abstract thing, like a president’s popularity, but there’s no mechanism there. That makes it kind of useless,” says Richard Bensel, a government professor at Cornell University. Even Ornstein concedes that the calculus is far more complex than the term suggests. Winning on one issue often changes the calculation for the next issue; there is never any known amount of capital. “The idea here is, if an issue comes up where the conventional wisdom is that president is not going to get what he wants, and he gets it, then each time that happens, it changes the calculus of the other actors” Ornstein says. “If they think he’s going to win, they may change positions to get on the winning side. It’s a bandwagon effect.”

#### Budget fight’s inevitable and *time pressure* forces it to the top of the docket

Alberta 11/25 [Timothy. Politics for the National Journal. “Congressional Vacation Set to Create Another Fiscal Crisis” 11/25/13 <http://www.nationaljournal.com/daily/congressional-vacation-set-to-create-another-fiscal-crisis-20131125> //GBS-JV]

Congress will soon be forced to debate yet another short-term, stopgap bill to keep the government open, not because a budget deal can't be reached, but because lawmakers haven't left enough time to reach one.¶ The House and Senate have already left town for Thanksgiving. And once they return, both chambers are in session concurrently for just four days—Dec. 10 through Dec. 13—before Congress adjourns again for the holiday recess.¶ Simply put, there won't be enough time for budget negotiators to solidify the details of an agreement that sets spending levels for the rest of fiscal 2014 and fiscal 2015 – much less sell it to their respective caucuses – before a Dec. 13 deadline.¶ But that's not the only deadline being threatened by Congress's vacation schedule. Funding for the federal government expires Jan. 15. So if House Budget Chairman Paul Ryan, R-Wis., and Senate Budget Chairwoman Patty Murray, D-Wash., fail, as expected, to reach agreement by Dec. 13, lawmakers will return to Washington the week of Jan. 6 staring down another government shutdown, with only about a week to do something about it.¶ All told, the two chambers of Congress have scheduled just 10 days in session together between Nov. 22 and Jan. 15, out of a possible 51 days, not counting Thanksgiving, Christmas, and New Year's Day.

#### Pc’s bad

**Klein 3-19**, Ezra, a columnist at the Washington Post, as well as a contributor to MSNBC and Bloomberg, editor of Wonkblog. Citing Frances Lee, a professor at the University of Maryland, at Texas A. & M. University [“The Unpersuaded: Who listens to a President?” <http://www.newyorker.com/reporting/2012/03/19/120319fa_fact_klein?currentPage=all>] HURWITZ

The experience helped to crystallize something that Lee had been thinking about. “Most of the work on the relationship between the President and Congress was about the President as the agenda setter,” she says. “I was coming at it from the perspective of the increase in partisanship, and so I looked at Presidents not as legislative leaders but as party leaders.” That changes things dramatically. As Lee writes in her book “Beyond Ideology” (2009), there are “inherent zero-sum conflicts between the two parties’ political interests as they seek to win elections.” Put more simply, the President’s party can’t win unless the other party loses. And both parties know it. This, Lee decided, is the true nature of our political system. To test her theory, she created a database of eighty-six hundred Senate votes between 1981 and 2004. She found that a President’s powers of persuasion were strong, but only within his own party. **Nearly four thousand** of the **votes** were of the mission-to-Mars variety—they **should have found support among both Democrats and Republicans. Absent a President’s involvement, these votes fell along party lines just a third of the time, but when a President took a stand that number rose to more than half**. The same thing happened with votes on more partisan issues, such as bills that raised taxes; they typically split along party lines, but when a President intervened the divide was even sharper. One way of interpreting this is that party members let their opinion of the President influence their evaluation of the issues. That’s not entirely unreasonable. A Democrat might have supported an intervention in Iraq but questioned George W. Bush’s ability to manage it effectively. Another interpretation is that party members let their political incentives influence how they evaluate policy. “Whatever people think about raw policy issues, they’re aware that Presidential successes will help the President’s party and hurt the opposing party,” Lee says. “It’s not to say they’re entirely cynical, but the fact that success is useful to the President’s party is going to have an effect on how members respond.” Or, to paraphrase Upton Sinclair, it’s difficult to get a man to support something if his reëlection depends on his not supporting it.

#### Energy independence now—solves the impact

**Donilon 13** – National Security Advisor 2010-2013 in the Obama administration, worked as Executive Vice President for Law and Policy at Fannie Mae (Tom Donilon, “Energy and American Power”, June 15, 2013, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/139509/tom-donilon/energy-and-american-power)

Energy is a profoundly important aspect of U.S. national security and foreign policy: the availability of reliable, affordable energy is essential to economic strength at home, which is the foundation of U.S. leadership in the world. Scarce resources have driven both commerce and conflict since time immemorial -- and still do today. Energy supplies present strategic leverage and disposable income for countries that have them. The challenge of accessing affordable energy is shared by people and businesses in every country -- young democracies, emerging powers, and developing nations -- allies and adversaries alike. Disruptions in supply in one location can have global economic impacts.

Energy shapes national interests and international relations. It influences politics, development, governance, and the security and stability of the environment. For all these reasons and more, increasing global access to secure, affordable, and clean energy is a national interest of the United States and a top priority for those of us entrusted with U.S. national security. Two recent developments have changed Washington’s approach toward energy: first, the substantial increase of affordable energy resources within the United States affects the country’s economic growth, energy security, and geopolitical position. Second, climate change, driven by the world’s use of energy, presents not just a transcendent challenge for the world but a present-day national security threat to the United States. Both forces should push the United States and other countries toward cleaner, more sustainable energy solutions.

The current optimism about the U.S. energy picture is a relatively new development. Even as recently as 2008, when President Barack Obama took office, energy experts predicted that the United States would need to double its imports of liquefied natural gas (LNG) over the next five years. However, thanks to U.S. innovation and technology, nearly all of those estimates have been turned on their head. U.S. oil consumption peaked in 2005 and has been declining since and alternative energy sources are being developed. Domestic oil and natural gas production has increased every year Obama has been in office -- now at seven million barrels of oil per day, the highest level in over two decades. The International Energy Agency projects that the United States could be the world’s largest oil producer by the end of the decade. And the United States is already the top natural gas producer in the world.

Meanwhile, natural gas imports are down almost 60 percent since 2005, and the U.S. now exports more natural gas than ever to Mexico and Canada. In addition, for the first time in over 60 years, the United States is exporting more refined petroleum products than it is importing. And U.S. energy-related greenhouse gas emissions have also fallen to 1994 levels due in large part to Obama’s success over the past four years in **doubling electricity from renewables**, **switching from coal to natural gas** in power generation, and **improving energy efficiency**.

The new U.S. energy posture and outlook will **directly** strengthen the nation’s economy. As Obama has said, a country’s political and **military primacy** depends on its **economic vitality**. Strength at home is critical to strength in the world, and the **U.S. energy boom** has proven to be an important driver for the country’s economic recovery -- boosting jobs, economic activity, and government revenues. In North Dakota, for example, unemployment has dropped to near three percent, the lowest in the country, and the state has a $3.8 billion budget surplus, largely due to increased unconventional gas and oil production. IHS Cambridge Energy Research Associates estimates that the shale gas industry directly or indirectly employed 600,000 Americans in 2010, a number that could double by 2020.

Natural gas production has also sparked a **domestic manufacturing revival**. Manufacturers in energy-intensive sectors, including chemical, steel, plastics, and glass companies, have announced up to $95 billion investments across the United States to take advantage of low-cost natural gas. Furthermore, as a result of U.S. investments in clean energy, tens of thousands of Americans have jobs and the United States is now home to some of the largest wind and solar farms in the world. Domestic economic developments like these improve the country’s world standing and send a **powerful message** that the United States has the resources, as well as the **resolve**, to remain a **preeminent power** for years to come.

The United States’ new energy posture allows Washington to engage in international affairs from a **position of strength**. Increasing U.S. energy supplies acts as a **cushion** that helps **reduce the country’s vulnerability** to global supply disruptions and price shocks. It also affords Washington a stronger hand in pursuing and implementing its international security goals. For example, the United States is engaged in a dual-track strategy that marshals pressure on Iran in pursuit of constructive engagement that addresses global concerns about Iran’s nuclear program. As part of the pressure track, the United States has engaged in tireless diplomacy to persuade relevant nations to end or significantly reduce their consumption of Iranian oil while emphasizing to suppliers the importance of keeping the world oil market stable and well supplied. The substantial increase in oil production in the United States and elsewhere means that international sanctions and U.S. and allied efforts could remove one million barrels per day of Iranian oil from the market while minimizing the burden on the rest of the world. The same approach is being used in Syria today and was used in Libya in 2011.

#### Plan solves environmental leadership

Conell 09 – Christina is a Research Associate at the Council of Hemispheric Affairs. (“The U.S. and Cuba: Destined to be an Environmental Duo?” June 12, 2009, <http://www.coha.org/the-us-and-cuba-an-environmental-duo/>)

•Cuba’s abundant natural resources need to be protected with heightened vigilance •Lifting the trade embargo would open up the possibility for a constructive partnership between Cuba and the U.S. by developing compatible and sustainable environmental policies •With the support of the U.S., **Cuba could become a model for sustainable preservation and environmental protection on a global scale** Through accidents of geography and history, Cuba is a priceless ecological resource. The United States should capitalize on its proximity to this resource-rich island nation by moving to normalize relations and establishing a framework for environmental cooperation and joint initiatives throughout the Americas. Cuba is the most biologically diverse of all the Caribbean Islands. Since it lies just 90 miles south of the Florida Keys, where the Atlantic, the Caribbean and the Gulf of Mexico intersect, the U.S. could play a key role in environmental conservation as well as the region in general. However, when it comes to environmental preservation, the Obama administration is obstructing progress and hindering any meaningful cooperation with its current U.S.- Cuba policy. Climate change and environmental degradation are two of the most pressing contemporary issues. If President Obama is sincerely committed to environmental sustainability, he must forge international partnerships to implement this objective. Where better to begin than in the U.S.’s own backyard, where Cuba has a huge presence. Only then can Cuba and the United States move forward to find joint solutions to environmental challenges. Environmental Riches and Implications Cuba’s glittering white sand beaches, extensive coral reefs, endemic fauna and diverse populations of fish compose the Caribbean’s most biologically diverse island. Based on a per hectare sampling when compared to the U.S. plus Canada, Cuba has 12 times more mammal species, 29 times as many amphibian and reptile species, 39 times more bird species, and 27 times as many vascular plant species. Equally important, adjacent ocean currents and the island nation’s close proximity, carry fish larvae into U.S. waters, making protection of Cuba’s coastal ecosystems vital to replenishing the U.S.’s ailing fisheries. Therefore, preserving the marine resources of Cuba is critical to the economic health of North America’s Atlantic coastal communities. The U.S. and Cuba also share an ancient deepwater coral system that stretches up to North Carolina. The island’s 4,200 islets and keys support important commercial reef fish species such as snapper and grouper as well as other marine life including sea turtles, dolphins and manatees in both countries. Fifty percent of its flora and 41 percent of its fauna are endemic, signifying the importance of protecting the island’s resources in order to safeguard the paradisiacal vision that Christopher Columbus observed when landing on the island in 1492. Oro Negro and Dinero The recent discovery of oil and natural gas reserves in the Florida straits in Cuban waters has attracted foreign oil exploration from China and India, both eager to begin extraction. Offshore oil and gas development could threaten Cuba’s and Florida’s environmental riches. Together, Cuba and the U.S. can develop policies to combat the negative results coming from the exploitation of these resources. The increased extraction and refining of oil in Cuba could have detrimental effects on the environment. Offshore drilling is likely to increase with the discovery of petroleum deposits in the Bay of Cárdenas and related areas. Excavation increases the possibility of oil spills, which would in turn destroy the surrounding ecosystem, including fisheries and coral reef formations. The amount of pollutants released into the air from refining crude oil and the amount of wayward oil residuals would also increase with drilling and extraction. Those conversant with the very sensitive habitat issues are calling for immediate consultations aimed at anticipating what should be done. However the U.S.’s enormous oil usage and its development requirements will cultivate economic growth on the island. Washington must work with Cuba to create an ecological protection plan not only to establish an environmentally friendly public image, but to make it a reality as well. Degradation of the environment will deprive Cuba, in the long run, of one of its most important sources of present and future revenue: tourism. Consequently, it is in the mutual interests of the U.S. and Cuba to develop a cooperative relationship that will foster tourism and growth in a sustainable manner. Sustainability through Collaboration In many parts of the country communism has inadequately acted as a seal to preserve elements of Cuba’s past as the centralized government prohibited private development by not giving special permission. A number of tourist resorts already dot the island, but Cuba has been largely exempt from mass tourist exploitation due to frozen relations with the U.S. Although the island remains underdeveloped, Fidel Castro has used his unchecked power to back policies, which have been heedless to environmental considerations, thus damaging some of the island’s pristine ecosystem that once defined the island. Roughly the size of Pennsylvania, Cuba is the largest Caribbean island, and if preservation and conservation measures are planned and carried out in a cognizant manner, it could become a paradigm for sustainable development at the global level. The Obama administration’s recent easing of travel restrictions on Cuban Americans visiting relatives on the island could be of immense importance not only to Cuban families, but also to the preservation of Cuba’s unique and increasingly threatened coastal and marine environments. Such a concession on Washington’s part would mark a small, but still significant stride in U.S.-Cuba relations, yet the travel restrictions still remain inherently discriminatory. The preposterous regulations that allow only a certain category of Americans into Cuba signify only a meager shift in U.S. policy towards Cuba. The 50-year-old U.S. embargo against the island has resoundingly failed to achieve its purpose. Obama’s modifications fall short of what it will take to reestablish a constructive U.S.-Cuba relationship. Cuba’s tropical forests, soils, and maritime areas have suffered degradation as a result of harmful policies stemming from a Soviet-style economic system. Cuba’s economy could be reinvigorated through expanded tourism, development initiatives and an expansion of commodity exports, including sugarcane for ethanol. U.S. policy toward Cuba should encourage environmental factors, thereby strengthening U.S. credibility throughout the hemisphere. An environmental partnership between the U.S. and Cuba is not only possible, but could result in development models that could serve as an example for **environmental strategies throughout the Americas**. The U.S. has the economic resources necessary to aid Cuba in developing effective policy, while the island provides the space where sustainable systems can be implemented initially instead of being applied after the fact. Cuba’s extreme lack of development provides an unspoiled arena for the execution of exemplary sustainable environmental protection practices. Waste Not, Want Not Although the government of Cuba has established state-based agencies to develop sustainable environmental practices, the island’s resources are left to be used at the government’s discretion. It is estimated that throughout Cuba, about 113.5 billion gallons of water contaminated with agricultural, industrial and urban wastes are dumped into the sea annually and more than 3.27 billion gallons find their way into its rivers. As direct dumping of untreated industrial waste into rivers, aquifers, and the sea is the norm, Cuban scientists estimate that this volume of industrial liquid waste pollutes roughly 486 gallons of clean water per year. The majority of this contamination stems from four industries, all state owned and operated, nickel excavation, sugar refineries, oil refineries, and rice farms. A 1994 Cuban press release disclosed that the Soto Alba nickel plant on the Moa Bay dumped more than 3.17 billion gallons of untreated liquid waste into the sea every day. The waste contained 72 tons of aluminum, 48 tons of chromium, 15 tons of magnesium, and 30 tons of sulfuric acid. By way of comparison, the treatment standards for wastewater in the U.S. limit the concentration of chromium to a maximum of 0.32 milligrams per liter, 12 times less than the daily dumping into the Moa Bay by only one of the three nickel plants operating in the area. In the sugar industry, more than 15.85 billion gallons of liquid waste are dumped into caves by the 151 operating sugar mills on the island creating the most enduring environmental problem. These alarming figures highlight the precipitous position of Cuba’s environment. While Cuban citizens increasingly are aware of the importance of environmental conservation, the government continues to exploit the island’s resources for state use without hindrance of being environmentally sound. Environmentalists maintain that the Cuban government must take responsibility for enforcing the environmental laws it has enacted and agreements it has signed. For Cubans and foreigners alike, the beaches of Cuba constitute the principle tourist attraction in the country, but even these have not escaped wasteful government exploitation. The famous beaches east of Havana have been the victims of sand removal for use by the Cuban government in the construction industry. In addition to coastal destruction, like many of its Caribbean neighbors, Cuba faces deforestation, over-cultivation of land and compaction of soils due to the use of heavy farm machinery and strip mining. These practices have resulted in high salinity in soils and heavy land erosion. Furthermore, poor water quality in freshwater streams has affected the wildlife habitat, which is in turn influenced by runoff from agricultural practices, erosion due to deforestation, and sedimentation of freshwater streams. Cuba must act in a responsible manner to stop environmental degradation and preserve its tourist industry as an early step to salvage its inert economy. Beginning Concerns The environmental degradation that began during the colonial era has transcended time as a result of Castro’s political and economic paradigm. Only in the last 40 years, with the development of the Commission for the Protection of the Environment and the Conservation of Natural Resources (COMARNA), has Cuba begun to address growing environmental concerns. COMARNA consolidated all of the agencies with environmental responsibilities, as a step towards giving them the power to influence all environmental issues. Although COMARNA was all-inclusive, it lacked independent authority, so its activities achieved few tangible results. The sad fact was that the centralized agency only succeeded in aiding the state in squandering resources. In reality, establishing the agency was a modest concession to ease environmental concerns, but the truth lingered that Cuba’s wealth of natural resources remained under the auspices of the government. COMARNA acknowledged the appeals for conservation by the international community, yet it allowed for the misuse of natural resources by the State. By way of example, the centralized Cuban agency built thousands of miles of roads for the development of non-existent state agricultural enterprises and dams where there was hardly any water to contain. In 1981, Cuba enacted Law 33 in an attempt to legitimize their environmental laws and regulations, yet Law 33 played only a miniscule role in guiding the extraction of natural resources and the conservation of ecological life on the island. Lauded as a law ahead of its time, Law 33 purportedly covers all the regulations concerning the environment and the protection and use of Cuban national resources, even though it produced few results. The statute includes a section comparing the “wise use of natural resources by communist countries versus the indiscriminate use of natural resources by the capitalistic world.” In this regard, the document is more a piece of political propaganda than a law meant to be rigorously enforced. Moreover it palls in comparison to international environmental protection guidelines and has relatively limited significance within the country since the Cuban government is responsible for the operation of the bulk of the industries and is therefore the principal polluter and consumer of natural resources. Thus Law 33 exonerates the Cuban government from enforcing stricter conservation standards by making a system that looks efficient, but in reality may not be so. A closer analysis on Law 33 exposes its inherent lack of efficacy and applicability. Attempts to Move Forward In 1994, Cuba developed the Ministry of Science, Technology and the Environment (CITMA) in order to absorb the tasks of the unproductive COMARNA. CITMA attempts to steer the implementation of environmental policy, the rational use of natural resources, and the adoption of sustainable development programs. Law 81 developed out of the necessity to give the Ministry a more sharply defined role in the government by replacing the outdated Law 33. Law 81, the Law of the Environment, was enacted in 1997 and presents a comprehensive framework law that covers all aspects of the environment ranging from air, water and waste, to historic preservation and coastal zone management. Although it details inspections and an enforcement plan, the law is ultimately ineffective due to its overarching nature, which makes it difficult to enforce. Law 81 may replace a necessary revision of Law 33; however, it remains vague in its enforcement procedures. For example, Law 81, Article 81 states that national resources will be used in accordance with the provisions that “their rational use will be assured, for which their quantitative and qualitative continuity will be preserved, recycling and recovery systems will be developed, and the ecosystems to which they belong safeguarded.” This portion of the provision elucidates the ambiguous nature of the law, as it continues to delineate objectives without coming up with specific implementation strategies. In 1997, the Earth Summit, a conference sponsored by the United Nations aimed at aiding governments in rethinking economic development and finding ways to halt the destruction of irreplaceable natural resources and pollution of the planet was held in New York. At the Summit, Cuban officials were refreshingly blunt in acknowledging the environmental degradation present on their island. In a pamphlet distributed at the conference, the Havana government stated that “there have been mistakes and shortcomings, due mainly to insufficient environmental awareness, knowledge and education, the lack of a higher management demand, limited introduction and generalization of scientific and technological achievements, as well as the still insufficient incorporation of environmental dimensions in its policies. The authorities also pointed to the insufficient development plans and programs and the absence of a sufficiently integrative and coherent judicial system,” to enforce environmental regulations. After the Earth Summit, Cuba designed and implemented a variety of programs, administrative structures, and public awareness initiatives to promote sound environmental management and sustainable development. Although the conference spurred motivation in environmental matters, Cuba still lacked the economic resources needed to support its share of environmental protection responsibilities due to the loss of its financial ties with the former Soviet Union. The Earth Summit came after the fall of the Soviet Union and the tightening of the U.S. blockade against Cuba in 1992, which resulted in a 35% retrenchment of the Cuban GDP. The Special Period, referring to the cut off of economic subsidies that had regularly come from the former Soviet Union, witnessed a decrease in many environmentally damaging activities both by choice and by necessity. The end of aid from the Russia also resulted in many decisions aimed at resuscitating the Cuban economy. The economic crisis increased pressure to sacrifice environmental protection for economic output. Although development slowed due to economic concerns, the island’s forests were particularly overworked for firewood and finished wood exports. However, the crisis also provided the impetus for pursuing sustainable development strategies. The principle motivating such change has been a realization that if Cuba does not preserve its environment, it will, at the very least, lose its attraction to tourists. Diverging Views Unlike the U.S., which still has never ratified the Kyoto Protocol, Cuba signed the document in 1997, which calls for the stabilization of greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous interference with the global climate system. This legally binding international agreement attempts to tackle the issue of global warming and the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. The U.S., although a signatory of the Kyoto Protocol, has neither ratified nor withdrawn from the Protocol. The signature alone is merely symbolic, as the Kyoto Protocol is non-binding on the United States unless ratified. Although in 2005 the United States was the largest per capita emitter of carbon dioxide from the burning of fossil fuels, it experienced only a modest decline of 2.8 percent from 2007 to 2008. This decline demonstrates that the U.S. has the framework to reverse Cuba’s substandard environmental track record. By aiding Havana, Washington would be able to brand itself as an active conservationist. Such a label would enable the U.S. to create a valuable ecological public image in the international arena.

#### Environmental leadership solves extinction

**Khosla 09 –** Ashok**,** IUCN President, International Union for Conservation of Nature, A new President for the United States: We have a dream, 1-29-09, <http://cms.iucn.org/news_events/?uNewsID=2595>

A rejuvenated America, with a renewed purpose, commitment and energy to make its contribution once again towards a better world could well be the turning point that can reverse the current decline in the state of the global economy, the health of its life support systems and the morale of people everywhere. This extraordinary change in regime brings with it the promise of a deep change in attitudes and aspirations of Americans, a change that will lead, hopefully, to new directions in their nation’s policies and action. In particular, we can hope that from being a very reluctant partner in global discussions, especially on issues relating to environment and sustainable development, the United States will become an active leader in international efforts to address the Millennial threats now confronting civilization and even **the survival of the human species**. For the conservation of biodiversity, so essential to maintaining life on Earth, this promise of change has come not a moment too soon. It would be a mistake to put all of our hopes on the shoulder of one young man, however capable he might be. The environmental challenges the world is facing cannot be addressed by one country, let alone by one man. At the same time, an inspired US President guided by competent people, who does not shy away from exercising the true responsibilities and leadership his country is capable of, could do a lot to spur the international community into action. To paraphrase one of his illustrious predecessors, “the world asks for action and action now.” What was true in President Roosevelt’s America 77 years ago is even more appropriate today. From IUCN’s perspective, the first signals are encouraging. The US has seriously begun to discuss constructive engagement in climate change debates. With Copenhagen a mere 11 months away, this commitment is long overdue and certainly very welcome. Many governments still worry that if they set tough standards to control carbon emissions, their industry and agriculture will become uncompetitive, a fear that leads to a foot-dragging “you go first” attitude that is blocking progress. A positive intervention by the United States could **provide the vital catalyst** that moves the basis of the present negotiations beyond the narrowly defined national interests that lie at the heart of the current impasse. The logjam in international negotiations on climate change should not be difficult to break if the US were to lead the industrialized countries to agree that much of their wealth has been acquired at the expense of the environment (in this case greenhouse gases emitted over the past two hundred years) and that with the some of the benefits that this wealth has brought, comes the obligation to deal with the problems that have resulted as side-effects. With equitable entitlement to the common resources of the planet, an agreement that is fair and acceptable to all nations should be easy enough to achieve. Caps on emissions and sharing of energy efficient technologies are simply in the interest of everyone, rich or poor. And both rich and poor must now be ready to adopt less destructive technologies – based on renewables, efficiency and sustainability – both as a goal with intrinsic merit and also as an example to others. But climate is not the only critical global environmental issue that this new administration will have to deal with. Conservation of biodiversity, a crucial prerequisite for the wellbeing of all humanity, no less America, needs as much attention, and just as urgently. The United States’ self-interest in conserving living natural resources strongly converges with the global common good in every sphere: in the oceans, by arresting the precipitate decline of fish stocks and the alarming rise of acidification; on land, by regenerating the health of our soils, forests and rivers; and in the atmosphere by reducing the massive emission of pollutants from our wasteful industries, construction, agriculture and transport systems.
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#### Cuba’s healthcare system is overstretched and failing – the plan is key to revitalize it

Scheye 10 – Elaine Scheye – Global Advisory Services to Academic Medical Centers & The Biotechnology Sector. (“THE GLOBAL ECONOMIC AND FINANCIAL CRISIS AND CUBA’S HEALTHCARE AND BIOTECHNOLOGY SECTOR: PROSPECTS FOR SURVIVORSHIP AND LONGER-TERM SUSTAINABILITY”, 2010, http://www.ascecuba.org/publications/proceedings/volume20/pdfs/scheye.pdf)

DEEP FISSURES IN THE HEALTHCARE SYSTEM While the biotechnology sector has continued to grow in importance as a generator of revenue from its exports of drugs and vaccines, the Cuban healthcare system has not fared as well. Though highly praised by researchers and public health professionals, **Cuba’s healthcare system is beginning to show many deep cracks**. A developing nation, Cuba has little margin for error in managing its economy. The de-stabilized world economy as a result of the global financial crisis has further weakened Cuba’s already precarious financial condition. This has had a deleterious impact on Cuba’s healthcare system. Two years ago, the Cuban government began developing an investment plan to recover the material damage to a group of hospitals in Cuba. Saudi Arabia has extended a loan to Cuba for building and rehabilitating medical facilities The 25 year loan (for an unspecified amount) includes a five-year grace period; the work funded by these proceeds is anticipated to take three years. Planned downsizing of health staff is being implemented “to establish rational flexible staffs that respond to the real interests of the system for the good operation of its institutions,” according to Armando Guerra Vianova, National Labor Director of Economic Area of the Ministry of Health (“Cuba Government”). This downsizing is resulting in a shortage of medical personnel. Nevertheless, Cuba continues to send medical personnel to Third World countries as part of its medical diplomacy, which is an integral part of its foreign policy. An unintended consequence of sending medical personnel abroad is a **significant brain drain**, as medical personnel flee to countries like Ecuador that only require a letter of invitation and has no visa requirement. Once there, Cubans marry Ecuadorians and later emigrate to other countries, such as the United States. Medical diplomacy is extracting a very high price, both financially and reputation-wise for Cuba. Cuba’s policlínicos and hospitals continue to deteriorate as the nation is unable to repair, update or replace many of its seriously outmoded medical facilities and equipment. Nevertheless, Cuba maintains its commitment to its practice of medical diplomacy, sending medical personnel to Third World countries amid growing complaints from the host countries regarding the quality of medical personnel (including allegations that paramedical professionals are being sent, not doctors as was represented). Doctors also complain about working conditions in these countries, alleging slave-like work situations that have prompted many to defect. Several Cuban physicians who allege slave-like work conditions are plaintiffs in a lawsuit filed in Miami. While healthcare facilities in Cuba continue to deteriorate, Cuba nevertheless has committed to help rebuild health facilities in Haiti at the rate of $170 million a year during the first four years (“Cuba Pitches” 2010). Medical tourism is compounding Cuba’s healthcare system problems. It is a double-edged sword. It generates revenue, but also internal problems, such as increase in prostitution, HIV, and corruption (Spiegel et al. 2007). Cubanacán Turismo y Salud and Clínica Central Cira Garcia are used for tourists seeking knee replacements, liposuction, face lifts, and abortion seekers from other Latin American countries where abortion is illegal. These facilities are equipped with state-of-the-art equipment and fully stocked with medicines well beyond basic medicines available to typical Cubans. These facilities are restricted to use by patients with the ability to pay cash or whom their country of origin insures. Post embargo, given the rise in medical tourism, might United States citizens be sent to Cuba for insurance covered treatment? If so, the cash infused could wind up making it a “net win” for Cuba and Cuban patients as well as generating revenue. SOME DIPLOMATIC POINTS As cracks become deeper, a critical issue is whether Cuba will be able to maintain its healthcare system. Recently, the powerful Minister of Public Health, José Ramón Balaguer, M.D., 78, was replaced by Roberto Morales, M.D., 43, who reportedly has been given the charge to shift priorities back to domestic healthcare in an effort to curtail domestic budget bleeding. Another major challenge facing Cuba is its aging population, which will cause care to move from prevention to more expensive curative care, further burdening an already heavily burdened system. Cuba continues to experience critical shortages of basic medicines and equipment, in part due to the U.S. embargo that forces Cuba to purchase equipment from other countries where it is far more costly. Where the country of manufacturing the medical equipment is the United States, a broken part is often irreplaceable, rendering the equipment unusable. In Cuba, there are several classes of users of medical services: • Medical tourists who are insured or pay cash, • Cuban members of the Politburo and other high officials and related parties, • Cuban citizens who benefit from receipt of remittances, • Cuban citizens who do not receive remittances. The informal market,1 while always operative in Cuba, is growing in importance as even **basic medicine becomes increasingly scarce or sometimes unavailable**, and access to healthcare becomes more strained with longer queues and fewer doctors to treat patients. As shortages grow and demand increases, prices are also rising in the black market. (Sáenz 2010). Is this the start of a second Periodo Special? If so, will this portend the end of Socialism in Cuba? There are those who argue that the informal market is serving to erode the very socialistic principles that Cuba seeks to uphold. Can Cuba sustain its healthcare system as shortages of drugs and medical equipment continue? The answer may lie in thinking about what Cuban healthcare might look like post-embargo. Essentially, Cuba may have a system that is a hybrid private/public mix. It is not out of consideration that a for-profit company, either created by Cubans or one that is an established foreign medical care player, could take over that segment of the healthcare system that serves medical tourists. It would also result in an improvement in medical diagnostic equipment but only for those facilities that serve insured and/or cash paying medical tourists. Operating along with the informal market is widespread corruption including and involving persons at a highest level within the Cuban power structure. Esteban Morales argues corruption is more harmful that outright revolution (Morales 2010). Fidel Castro issued this same warning many years ago. Others argue that corruption is a serious impediment to Cuba’s economic growth over the longer term (DíazBriquets and Pérez-López 2006).

### Politics—Energy

#### Energy independence now

Jaffe and Morse 10/16 – Amy Myers Jaffe is the executive director for energy and sustainability at University of California, Davis. Ed Morse is global head of commodities research at Citigroup. (“The End of OPEC”, October 16, 2013, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2013/10/16/the\_end\_of\_opec\_america\_energy\_oil)

Growth in renewable energy has also been significant in recent years in the United States and beyond, and rising fossil fuel costs and strong government intervention have created new market opportunities. World biofuels production has doubled to over 1.2 m b/d since 2006, but wind power has grown in oil-equivalent terms from 1 m b/d to 2 m b/d since 2008 (and is accelerating at about a 20 percent annualized clip). Solar power, meanwhile, grew from 20,000 b/d of oil-equivalent energy in 2008 to 400,000 b/d last year.

But the impact of all this change in the energy world will go far beyond just replacing continuing Arab Spring outages. Unconventional oil and gas and the clean-tech booms are spawning a host of new, smaller oil and gas exploration companies committed to innovation and willing to take on risk.

Marked

 They have no stake in the multibillion-dollar megaproject world of the international majors and national oil companies, and as such, they have fewer concerns about sustaining high profits from giant assets found decades ago. They are enabling the United States the opportunity to take a lead in changing the way energy is bought and sold -- not just in the United States, but globally.

Energy innovation is taking many forms in the United States, creating major export opportunities and giving Washington the tools it needs to ensure that the conditions of a 1973-style oil embargo will not repeat themselves. The oil embargo was so devastating because strong economic growth throughout the 1960s had taken up the margin of spare oil-productive capacity in the United States and across the world, leaving the Middle East's oil producers with undue monopoly power. Similar razor-thin extra productive capacity left markets highly vulnerable in 2006 and 2007, when OPEC made contraseasonal cuts in output to increase prices, instead of considering the risks to global economic growth. But as oil and gas production from U.S. and Canadian shale formations rises, the ability of oil producers like Russia to use an "energy weapon" to gain extra benefits from consuming countries is diminishing.

U.S.-led innovation in alternative fuels (including natural gas-vehicle fueling technology and electric vehicles), energy-efficiency technologies, battery storage, and smart-grid solutions, working together with and complementing the supply surge in unconventional oil and gas, should also change the face of demand, giving consumers around the world more freedom of choice. And as the United States becomes an energy exporter -- at competitive prices -- that should seal the deal. By providing ready alternatives to politicized energy supplies, the United States can use its influence to democratize global energy markets, much the way smartphone and social media technologies have ended the lock on information and communications by repressive governments and large multinational or state-run corporations.

Abundant U.S. natural gas is just the first step. Booming domestic natural gas supplies have already displaced and defanged Russia's and Iran's grip on natural gas buyers. By significantly reducing American domestic requirements for imported liquefied natural gas (LNG), rising U.S. shale gas production has had the knock-on effect of increasing alternative LNG supplies to Europe, breaking down fixed pricing from entrenched monopolies. But this is just the beginning: Over the coming decade, the United States looks likely to overtake Russia and rival Qatar as a leading supplier of natural gas to international markets.

The geopolitical role of U.S. natural gas surpluses in constraining Russia's ability to use its energy as a wedge between the United States and its European and Asian allies should strengthen over time, to the extent that Barack Obama's administration stays the course with approving the construction of LNG export terminals. American unconventional oil and gas plays from Texas to Pennsylvania are also generating new surpluses of natural gas liquids, which are increasingly exported as transportation fuel or petrochemical feedstock to Europe, Asia, and elsewhere -- reducing demand growth for oil from the Middle East. And U.S. crude oil exports might also be possible some day, strengthening America's lead in market-related pricing for kingpin crude oil, much the way rising North Sea production did in the 1980s.

As an increasing number of companies and investors flock to North America to develop prolific unconventional resources, Middle East heavyweights like Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and Iran are losing their lock on remaining exploitable reserves, reducing their ability to band together and create artificial shortages. Already, Mexico and Argentina are reading the tea leaves and reversing protectionist resource nationalism policies, instead pushing through reforms to attract capital investment to their doorsteps.

Abundant U.S. natural gas is also spawning new American-designed engine and modular fueling station technologies to readily use natural gas as a fuel in trucks, trains, and ships, ending oil's monopoly in transport. Some 40 m b/d of the global 85 m b/d oil market is open for competition from natural gas -- in the form of compressed natural gas for cars and buses, and LNG for heavy-duty vehicles and marine transportation. We conservatively expect at least 2 m b/d of currently projected oil demand to cede to natural gas by 2020, further weakening perspectives on future global oil-demand growth and once again chipping away at Middle Eastern influence.

American innovation and exports of energy supply and technology will open global energy markets to competitive investments and consumer choice. But Washington needs to embrace this choice by resisting the call to continue to ban energy exports to protect vested business interests or for resource nationalistic reasons. Indeed, we need to reverse the mindset of the oil embargo years -- a mindset of supply shortages and husbanding of resources -- and move back to a more traditional promotion of free markets. The energy sector has done this in the trade of petroleum products, where the United States is simultaneously the world's largest importer and exporter. The United States is heading in this same direction for trade in natural gas, whether by pipeline to Mexico and eastern Canada or the export of LNG. And it should move in the same direction with crude oil exports as pressures mount from growing surpluses midcontinent and on the U.S. Gulf Coast.

The expanding wind and solar businesses in California and Texas are encouraging new complementary battery-storage options and smarter networks, laying the groundwork for greater consumer choice and control. The move to distributed energy, right now focused mainly on affluent customers who can afford private backup generation, may spread to broader applications. Some day soon, it will enable increased remote energy solutions for villages in sub-Saharan Africa or Southeast Asia.

The U.S. government needs to support the reform of the electricity utilities to enable this transition, which will entail more-efficient technologies, locally produced and distributed generation, time-of-day pricing and peak-demand shaving. Such reforms are critical to the integration of renewable energy whose output varies widely over the course of a day. By leading the charge to these new energy technologies, the United States can fashion a global energy world more to its liking, where petropowers can no longer hold car owners hostage or turn off the heat and lights to millions of consumers to further geopolitical ends.

Just as it was difficult to predict the impact of Apple computers on future global social trends, it may now seem hard to depict the exact time and place that America's unconventional resources and smart-grid innovation will democratize energy markets. But Apple did reset the way we think about computing and changed the world. Similarly, the dislocations currently unfolding in the energy sector are pointing to markets taking back pride of place over government control and consumer choice winning over supplier monopolies. The pace of change may be slow in coming at first, but eventually it will be no less stunning than Oct. 16, 1973, a day that sent shock waves into the global economy, the ripples of which are still visible today.

### Politics—PC key

#### Reject issue-specific internal links
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What is of more interest to me, however, is what her selection reveals about the basis of presidential power. Political scientists, like baseball writers evaluating hitters, have devised numerous means of measuring a president’s influence in Congress. I will devote a separate post to discussing these, but in brief, they often center on the creation of legislative “box scores” designed to measure how many times a president’s preferred piece of legislation, or nominee to the executive branch or the courts, is approved by Congress. That is, how many pieces of legislation that the president supports actually pass Congress? How often do members of Congress vote with the president’s preferences? How often is a president’s policy position supported by roll call outcomes? These measures, however, are a misleading gauge of presidential power – they are a better indicator of congressional power. This is because how members of Congress vote on a nominee or legislative item is rarely influenced by anything a president does. Although journalists (and political scientists) often focus on the legislative “endgame” to gauge presidential influence – will the President swing enough votes to get his preferred legislation enacted? – this mistakes an outcome with actual evidence of presidential influence. Once we control for other factors – a member of Congress’ ideological and partisan leanings, the political leanings of her constituency, whether she’s up for reelection or not – we can usually predict how she will vote without needing to know much of anything about what the president wants. (I am ignoring the importance of a president’s veto power for the moment.) Despite the much publicized and celebrated instances of presidential arm-twisting during the legislative endgame, then, most legislative outcomes don’t depend on presidential lobbying. But this is not to say that presidents lack influence. Instead, the primary means by which presidents influence what Congress does is through their ability to determine the alternatives from which Congress must choose. That is, presidential power is largely an exercise in agenda-setting – not arm-twisting. And we see this in the Sotomayer nomination. Barring a major scandal, she will almost certainly be confirmed to the Supreme Court whether Obama spends the confirmation hearings calling every Senator or instead spends the next few weeks ignoring the Senate debate in order to play Halo III on his Xbox. That is, how senators decide to vote on Sotomayor will have almost nothing to do with Obama’s lobbying from here on in (or lack thereof). His real influence has already occurred, in the decision to present Sotomayor as his nominee.

#### We have quals and studies too

Lee, institutions and political process professor, 08 [Frances Lee joined the faculty at Maryland in the Fall of 2004. She teaches courses in American government, the public policy process, legislative politics, and political institutions. She is also Director of the Government & Politics Honors Program. Her research interests focus on American governing institutions, especially the U.S. Congress. She is author of Beyond Ideology: Politics, Principles and Partisanship in the U.S. Senate (University of Chicago Press, 2009) and coauthor of Sizing Up The Senate: The Unequal Consequences of Equal Representation (University of Chicago Press 1999). She is also coauthor of a comprehensive textbook on the U.S. Congress, Congress and Its Members (CQ Press). Her research has also appeared in the American Political Science Review, American Journal of Political Science, Journal of Politics, and Legislative Studies Quarterly. Her work has received national recognition, including the American Political Science Association's E. E. Schattschneider Award for the best dissertation in American Politics in 1997, the APSA's Richard F. Fenno Award for the best book on legislative politics in 2009, and the D. B. Hardeman Award presented by the Lyndon Baines Johnson Award for the best book on a congressional topic in 1999. She received her Ph.D. in Political Science from Vanderbilt University in 1997. She was a Research Fellow at the Brookings Institution from 1997-98. From 1998-2003 she taught in the political science department at Case Western Reserve University. In 2002-2003, she worked on Capitol Hill as an American Political Science Association Congressional Fellow. “Dividers, Not Uniters: Presidential Leadership and Senate Partisanship, 1981-2004.” The Journal of Politics, Vol. 70, No. 4 (Oct., 2008), pp. 914-928. JSTOR//HK]

Two considerations make the Senate superior to the ¶ House for testing the hypothesis that presidential ¶ leadership exacerbates partisanship. First, House ¶ floor votes are manipulated by the majority party ¶ leadership to a much greater extent than those in the ¶ Senate. A wider range of issues can be considered on the Senate floor, providing a more complete picture ¶ of members' behavior on issues that are not part of ¶ the majority's agenda. Second, senators face reelec- ¶ tion only one-third as often as House members. As ¶ such, senators are probably less sensitive to the ¶ electoral stakes involved in reacting to presidential ¶ proposals, making the Senate a more rigorous test for ¶ the theory. The time range examined, 1981 to 2004, ¶ affords every permutation of divided and unified ¶ party control.4 ¶ Comparing partisan divisions on roll-call votes ¶ depending on whether issues were mentioned in the ¶ State of the Union Address provides an initial test of ¶ the hypothesis that presidential leadership exacer- ¶ bates partisan divisions. Table 1 displays the average ¶ level of party polarizations on Senate roll-call votes ¶ between 1981 and 2000 for each major topic in the ¶ Policy Agenda Project classification scheme. For 14 ¶ out of the 19 functional categories, the average party ¶ difference was higher when presidents took a stand ¶ on the issue in the immediately preceding State of the ¶ Union Address than when they did not. These higher ¶ levels of partisan division are statistically significant ¶ (p < .01) for 10 of the categories. **Presidential leader-** ¶ **ship was associated with increases in party difference** ¶ **scores of between 30% and 40% on votes in the areas** ¶ **of social welfare, health, defense, and labor/employ-** ¶ **ment/immigration.** Partisanship was between 45% ¶ and 60% higher when presidents led on education, ¶ government operations, law/crime/family issues, and ¶ community development/housing. In the areas of ¶ international affairs/foreign aid and space/science/technology, presidential position taking was associ- ¶ ated with increases in partisanship that were even ¶ greater than 65%. Meanwhile, presidential leadership ¶ was only associated with lower levels of partisanship ¶ in five policy areas, and in these categories the ¶ differences were quite small and, in all but one case, ¶ statistically insignificant. ¶ Remarkably, presidential leadership appears to ¶ bring the two parties closer together in only one area: ¶ civil rights (p < .01). In the study period, it appears ¶ that President Reagan's support for the reauthoriza- ¶ tion of the Voting Rights Act in 1982 and President ¶ George H. W. Bush's support for the Civil Rights Act ¶ of 1991-both announced in their State of the Union ¶ Addresses-may have facilitated unusual levels of ¶ bipartisan agreement on civil rights issues. ¶ Table 2 displays the average level of party division ¶ on ideological issues. Because this classification ¶ scheme was specifically designed to isolate the most ¶ divisive issues in American politics, it sets a higher ¶ bar for finding any additional effects of presidential ¶ leadership on party polarization. As one would ¶ expect, presidential involvement is not associated ¶ with increases in partisanship as substantial as those ¶ evident using the Policy Agenda Project categories. ¶ Nevertheless, in every ideological category votes on ¶ issues mentioned by the president in the State of the ¶ Union Address were more divisive along party lines ¶ than votes on issues not mentioned, though there was ¶ variation across categories in the magnitude and ¶ statistical significance of the effect. Among ideolog- ¶ ical issues, the effect of presidential leadership was ¶ greatest on issues involving regulatory policy, redis- ¶ tributive social programs, and government's share of ¶ the economy (p < .01). Presidential involvement has ¶ little influence on partisanship on votes involving the ¶ distribution of the tax burden and social issues ¶ (p = n.s.). These are clearly party-defining issues re- ¶ gardless of whether a president demands action on ¶ them. Generally speaking, taxes and abortion sparked ¶ partisan division in the Senate at approximately the ¶ same levels regardless of presidential involvement. ¶ Nevertheless, **taken as a group, votes on ideological** ¶ **issues became 13% more polarized along party lines** ¶ **when they were the focus of presidential attention** ¶ **(p < .001).**