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#### CONTENTION 1 IS LATIN AMERICA:

#### Nuclear terrorism is *feasible* and *likely*—kills the global economy

Brill and Luongo 12 – Kenneth C. Brill is a former U.S. ambassador to the I.A.E.A. Kenneth N. Luongo is president of the Partnership for Global Security. Both are members of the Fissile Material Working Group, a nonpartisan nongovernmental organization. (“Nuclear Terrorism: A Clear Danger”, March 15, 2012, http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/16/opinion/nuclear-terrorism-a-clear-danger.html?\_r=0)

Terrorists exploit gaps in security. The current global regime for protecting the nuclear materials that terrorists desire for their ultimate weapon is far from seamless. It is based largely on **unaccountable, voluntary arrangements** that are inconsistent across borders. Its weak links make it dangerous and inadequate to prevent nuclear terrorism. Later this month in Seoul, the more than 50 world leaders who will gather for the second Nuclear Security Summit need to seize the opportunity to start developing an accountable regime to prevent nuclear terrorism. There is a consensus among international leaders that the threat of nuclear terrorism is real, not a Hollywood confection. President Obama, the leaders of 46 other nations, the heads of the International Atomic Energy Agency and the United Nations, and numerous experts have called nuclear terrorism one of the most serious threats to global security and stability. It is also preventable with more aggressive action. At least four terrorist groups, including Al Qaeda, have demonstrated interest in using a nuclear device. These groups operate in or near states with histories of questionable nuclear security practices. Terrorists do not need to steal a nuclear weapon. It is quite possible to make an improvised nuclear device from highly enriched uranium or plutonium being used for civilian purposes. And there is a **black market** in such material. There have been 18 confirmed thefts or loss of weapons-usable nuclear material. In 2011, the Moldovan police broke up part of a smuggling ring attempting to sell highly enriched uranium; one member is thought to remain at large with a kilogram of this material. A terrorist nuclear explosion could kill hundreds of thousands, create billions of dollars in damages and **undermine the global economy**. Former Secretary General Kofi Annan of the United Nations said that an act of nuclear terrorism “would thrust tens of millions of people into dire poverty” and create “a second death toll throughout the developing world.” Surely after such an event, global leaders would produce a strong global system to ensure nuclear security. There is no reason to wait for a catastrophe to build such a system.

#### Economic decline causes war

Royal 10 – Director of CTR Jedediah, Director of Cooperative Threat Reduction – U.S. Department of Defense, “Economic Integration, Economic Signaling and the Problem of Economic Crises”, Economics of War and Peace: Economic, Legal and Political Perspectives, Ed. Goldsmith and Brauer, p. 213-215

Less intuitive is how periods of economic decline may increase the likelihood of external conflict. Political science literature has contributed a moderate degree of attention to the impact of economic decline and the security and defence behaviour of interdependent states. Research in this vein has been considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow. First, on the systemic level, Pollins (2008) advances Modelski and Thompson's (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, finding that rhythms in the global economy are associated with the rise and fall of a pre-eminent power and the often bloody transition from one pre-eminent leader to the next. As such, exogenous shocks such as economic crises could usher in a redistribution of relative power (see also Gilpin. 1981) that leads to uncertainty about power balances, increasing the risk of miscalculation (Feaver, 1995). Alternatively, even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflict as a rising power may seek to challenge a declining power (Werner. 1999). Separately, Pollins (1996) also shows that global economic cycles combined with parallel leadership cycles impact the likelihood of conflict among major, medium and small powers, although he suggests that the causes and connections between global economic conditions and security conditions remain unknown. Second, on a dyadic level, Copeland's (1996, 2000) theory of trade expectations suggests that 'future expectation of trade' is a significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behaviour of states. He argues that interdependent states are likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations. However, if the expectations of future trade decline, particularly for difficult to replace items such as energy resources, the likelihood for conflict increases, as states will be inclined to use force to gain access to those resources. Crises could potentially be the trigger for decreased trade expectations either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states.4 Third, others have considered the link between economic decline and external armed conflict at a national level. Blomberg and Hess (2002) find a strong correlation between internal conflict and external conflict, particularly during periods of economic downturn. They write: The linkages between internal and external conflict and prosperity are strong and mutually reinforcing. Economic conflict tends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn returns the favour. Moreover, the presence of a recession tends to **amplify** the **extent** to which international and external conflicts self-reinforce each other. (Blomberg & Hess, 2002. p. 89) Economic decline has also been linked with an increase in the likelihood of terrorism (Blomberg, Hess, & Weerapana, 2004), which has the capacity to spill across borders and lead to external tensions. Furthermore, crises generally reduce the popularity of a sitting government. "Diversionary theory" suggests that, when facing unpopularity arising from economic decline, sitting governments have increased incentives to fabricate external military conflicts to create a 'rally around the flag' effect. Wang (1996), DeRouen (1995). and Blomberg, Hess, and Thacker (2006) find supporting evidence showing that economic decline and use of force are at least indirectly correlated. Gelpi (1997), Miller (1999), and Kisangani and Pickering (2009) suggest that the tendency towards diversionary tactics are greater for democratic states than autocratic states, due to the fact that democratic leaders are generally more susceptible to being removed from office due to lack of domestic support. DeRouen (2000) has provided evidence showing that periods of weak economic performance in the United States, and thus weak Presidential popularity, are statistically linked to an increase in the use of force. In summary, recent economic scholarship positively correlates economic integration with an increase in the frequency of economic crises, whereas political science scholarship links economic decline with external conflict at systemic, dyadic and national levels.5 This implied connection between integration, crises and armed conflict has not featured prominently in the economic-security debate and deserves more attention.

#### Nuclear terrorism independently causes US-Russia nuclear war—only scenario for extinction—deterrence doesn’t check

Barrett et al 13 – Anthony has a PhD in Engineering and Public Policy from Carnegie Mellon University, is a Fellow in the RAND Stanton Nuclear Security Fellows Program, and is the Director of Research at Global Catastrophic Risk Institute. Seth Baum has a PhD in Geography from Pennsylvania State University is a Research Scientist at the Blue Marble Space Institute of Science, and is the Executive Director of Global Catastrophic Risk Institute. Kelly Hostetler has a BS in Political Science from Columbia and is a Research Assistant at the Global Catastrophic Risk Institute. (“Analyzing and Reducing the Risks of Inadvertent Nuclear War Between the United States and Russia”, Science and Global Security 21(2), June 28, 2013, <http://sethbaum.com/ac/2013_NuclearWar.pdf>)

Note: this version of the article is a little different from the one published in the actual journal; I cut this version from the link in the cite above.

War involving significant fractions of the U.S. and Russian nuclear arsenals, which are by far the largest of any nations, could have globally catastrophic effects such as severely reducing food production for years,1 potentially leading to collapse of modern civilization worldwide and even **the extinction of humanity**.2 Nuclear war between the United States and Russia could occur by various routes, including accidental or unauthorized launch; deliberate first attack by one nation; and inadvertent attack. In an accidental or unauthorized launch or detonation, system safeguards or procedures to maintain control over nuclear weapons fail in such a way that a nuclear weapon or missile launches or explodes without direction from leaders. In a deliberate first attack, the attacking nation decides to attack based on accurate information about the state of affairs. In an inadvertent attack, the attacking nation mistakenly concludes that it is under attack and launches nuclear weapons in what it believes is a counterattack.3 (Brinkmanship strategies incorporate elements of all of the above, in that they involve intentional manipulation of risks from otherwise accidental or inadvertent launches.4 ) Over the years, nuclear strategy was aimed primarily at minimizing risks of intentional attack through development of deterrence capabilities, though numerous measures were also taken to reduce probabilities of accidents, unauthorized attack, and inadvertent war. For purposes of deterrence, both U.S. and Soviet/Russian forces have maintained significant capabilities to have some forces survive a first attack by the other side and to launch a subsequent counterattack. However, concerns about the extreme disruptions that a first attack would cause in the other side’s forces and command-and-control capabilities led to both sides’ development of capabilities to detect a first attack and launch a counter-attack before suffering damage from the first attack.5 Many people believe that with the end of the Cold War and with improved relations between the United States and Russia, the risk of East-West nuclear war was significantly reduced.6 However, it has also been argued that inadvertent nuclear war between the United States and Russia has continued to present a **substantial risk**.7 While **the U**nited **S**tates **and Russia** are not actively threatening each other with war, they **have remained ready to launch nuclear missiles in response to indications of attack.**8 False indicators of nuclear attack could be caused in several ways. First, a wide range of events have already been mistakenly interpreted as indicators of attack, including weather phenomena, a faulty computer chip, wild animal activity, and control-room training tapes loaded at the wrong time.9 Second, terrorist groups or other actors might cause attacks on either the United States or Russia that resemble some kind of nuclear attack by the other nation by actions such as exploding a stolen or improvised nuclear bomb,10 especially if such an event occurs during a crisis between the United States and Russia.11 A variety of nuclear terrorism scenarios are possible.12 Al Qaeda has sought to obtain or construct nuclear weapons and to use them against the United States.13 Other methods could involve attempts to circumvent nuclear weapon launch control safeguards or exploit holes in their security.14

#### TWO INTERNAL LINKS:

#### First, the pink tide makes terrorism in Latin America uniquely likely

Ferkaluk 10 – Brian is in the Diplomacy Dept of Norwich University, writing in Global Security Studies—peer-reviewed. (“Latin America: Terrorist Actors on a Nuclear Stage”, Global Security Studies, Fall 2010, Volume 1, Issue 3, http://globalsecuritystudies.com/Ferkaluk%20Latin%20America.pdf)

The policy implications for the United States are that of close surveillance and even closer diplomacy. Latin America has historically been an area of relative hostility for the US. It is an area prone to authoritarianism and is an ideal environment for violent ideologies to take root. Because of these factors, it is potentially susceptible to influence from the enemies of the US. Although it has made great strides in the last few decades, its tendency toward disunion has made it particularly difficult to fully mobilize it against terrorist activity. It also means the US cannot afford to ignore Latin America as a potential battleground in the GWOT. The dramatic pink tide in Latin American politics has commanded the attention of US foreign policy. If the US does not continue to engage Latin America with anti-terrorist support, it will quickly become a manifestation of the type of terrorism that has exploded in the Middle East and the political-revolutionary type of terrorism that has exploded in Africa. The US must continue to demonstrate to Latin American states that it fully supports their struggle against leftist guerrillas. It must do this also as delicately as possible. For instance, the US provided economic and military assistance to El Salvador in its struggle against a leftist guerrilla insurgency. If the US does not continue to support Latin states who call out for help in their time of need, they will either be overcome by the revolutionaries that threaten their existence, or they will be heavily influenced by the more leftist Latin American regimes, spreading their militant ideologies across the region.

#### Second, the *growth of nuclear power* and *lack of effective security* make Latin America key to *trafficking* and *nuclear weapons access*

Sanchez 10 – W. Alejandro “Alex” Sánchez Nieto is a Research Fellow at the Council on Hemispheric Affairs (COHA) where he focuses on geopolitics and security issues. Sanchez holds a Master’s degree in International Peace and Conflict Resolution from the School of International Service at American University and has attended the Institute of World Politics, Johns Hopkins’ School of Advanced International Studies, as well as universities in Austria, Belgium and France. His analyses have appeared in journals including Small Wars and Insurgencies, Defence Studies, the Journal of Slavic Military Studies, European Security, Studies in Conflict and Terrorism and Cuban Affairs. (“Nuclear Security Issues in Latin America and the Caribbean Under the Radar”, January 11th, 2010, http://www.thecuttingedgenews.com/index.php?article=11902)

Globally, nuclear power has become an increasingly important source of energy, accounting for about 15 percent of the world’s electricity supply. When it comes to Latin America, 3.1 percent of electricity comes from this source. However, the nettlesome security issues resulting from utilizing nuclear energy sources largely **have been ignored**. On March 2008, Colombian authorities discovered that the FARC insurgent movement managed to obtain (it was never clarified from where) 9 kilograms of depleted uranium. Then, in early 2009, the Argentine media reported that an employee of the Baker Atlas Company oil-drilling operation in Neuquén had stolen a canister of nuclear substance Caesium-137, demanding up to $500,000 in ransom payments from Baker Atlas. Meanwhile, if Brazil successfully completes the construction of a nuclear-powered submarine — a national security goal since the era of the country’s brutal military junta (1964-85) — **the repercussions for regional geo-security could be profound**. Reports suggest that countries such as Venezuela and Chile are also currently assessing the benefits of nuclear energy. One can add to this growing list of nuclear issues the ongoing transshipment of nuclear waste from Europe to Japan via the Caribbean and Panama Canal. At the recently concluded December 2009 Copenhagen Summit, world leaders focused on pressing issues such as deforestation and climate change. Unfortunately, nuclear energy, which is closely linked with environmental issues, was not adequately addressed, especially in regards to Latin America. Nevertheless, the development of nuclear energy is primed to make a significant impact in the region and beyond. Nuclear security, as well as its impact on geopolitics, geosecurity and the dangers of illegal nuclear trafficking, will **have to be addressed more directly** as Brazil works to realize its plans for its nuclear submarine, and particularly if criminals and insurgents continue to be successful at getting their hands on radioactive material. Washington seems to be catching on to the likely prospects of nuclear trafficking as proven by its Megaports Initiative, which is aimed at detecting attempts to smuggle potential nuclear and radioactive material through major regional ports. Nevertheless, as inter-state tensions and high levels of violence persistently plague the region, vigilance is required of all nations interested in keeping the use of nuclear energy limited to peaceful ends. Nuclear Security Incidents and Their Aftermaths The development of nuclear energy in Latin America could present dramatic security issues, particularly taking into account the potential accidents and incidents that could occur within nuclear plants and other facilities that possess radioactive material. An October 2009 article in the Wall Street Journal reported the ease with which two criminals, one of them a former employee, stole Caesium-137, a radioactive material, from the Baker Atlas Company oil-drilling operation in Neuquén in February of last year. According to the article, it took “two armed men no more than three minutes to break into an underground bunker in Argentina, swipe a canister of radioactive material and [stage] a quick getaway after tying up the lone security guard on duty at the facility.” Diario Perfil, an Argentine daily, reported that law enforcement officers found the pilfered material and subsequently charged a former Baker Atlas employee with orchestrating the plot. Although the perpetrators demanded $500,000 in return for the canister, ultimately, it seemed that the individuals were more interested in discrediting the company than being part of a grand plot. Nevertheless, the incident raised the question of whether facilities that possess radioactive material have appropriate levels of security. Before the Argentine incident occurred, on March 1, 2008, the Colombia military raided a secret FARC base, just within the Ecuadorean border, where the second in command, Raul Reyes, was hiding and eventually killed. Files found in Reyes’ laptops made mention of the acquisition of uranium. Some weeks later, informants told the Colombia police the precise location where the material had been stored, outside of Bogota. According to National Police Chief Oscar Naranjo, “FARC are taking crucial steps in the world of terrorism to make themselves known as a great international, global aggressor.” The newswire Agence France Presse later speculated about the numerous ways the depleted uranium could have been used: “[it] can be used in a ‘dirty bomb’ to disseminate cancer-causing radioactivity […] it has a low-level of radioactivity and can be used to make anti-tank ammunition and aircraft cannons capable of penetrating armor.” However, the experts interviewed by the Spanish news agency EFE maintained that it was highly unlikely that the FARC had the technological equipment and expertise to actually create a dirty bomb. OAS Secretary General José Miguel Insulza has been quoted as saying, “[the] FARC don’t have the missiles [with the un-enriched uranium] that other groups have. I would doubt that they have the capacity to enrich uranium. But we will look into the matter, of course.” Most importantly, the FARC’s uranium source has yet to be revealed, or the issue resolved. These incidents in Colombia and Argentina highlight the importance of safeguarding installations where radioactive material traditionally is kept, from nuclear plants to hospitals and mining operations. Any discussion of nuclear security in the region also will require a lengthy inquiry into the security standards of nations with such programs. In an interview, Pedro Valdivia, a Peruvian nuclear engineer and former employee of the Peruvian Institute for Nuclear Energy (IPEN), explained that nuclear power plants are not the only concern: “several industries and entities (industries, hospitals, mining operations) that use radioactive material which, if combined, would reach enough amounts to make a ‘dirty bomb’ (not from uranium but from other materials).” Valvidia explained that in Peru, “there is not enough security. Many times the radioactive material is treated without enough security and transported by unqualified personnel, it would be all too easy to obtain radioactive material as several staff members, like drivers and security personnel, do not understand the risks.” On the other hand, experts like Carlos Ampuero, also from IPEN, are more optimistic about the prospects for safeguarding the use of nuclear energy in the region. In an interview, Ampuero explained that “[for example] the Peruvian nuclear center has worked since the 1980s, during the period of terrorism, and we never had any problems. Physical security is effective and reassuring […] for example, alarms don’t only go off within the installation but also alert friendly forces that can arrive in a few minutes by land and air.” Is Nuclear Security Catching on? A July 2008 article in the newswire service Marketwire highlights how Puerto Cortés, the largest port in Central America, located on Honduras’ Caribbean coast, “is the only port in the Western Hemisphere and one of only three in the world currently scanning all inbound and outbound shipments for nuclear substances.” The report quotes Vilma Sierra, Executive President of the Foundation for Investment and Development of Imports (FIDE) of Honduras, as saying, “Honduras is roughly four years ahead of the U.S. congressionally-mandated July 2012 deadline requiring 100 percent of all U.S.-bound containers to be scanned before entry, established by the Security and Accountability for Every Port Act (SAFE) of 2006.” Washington has taken some positive steps regarding nuclear security in both Latin America and the Caribbean. A November 2008 press release by the U.S. Department of Energy’s National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) announced that the agency has provided the Dominican Republic detection and communication equipment for the island’s port of Caucedo. The equipment will be used to detect nuclear and other radioactive materials in vessels passing through the port. Deputy Administrator William Tobey stated, “I am pleased to count the Dominican Republic as another partner in the worldwide effort to prevent nuclear proliferation and terrorism.” Under the umbrella of its Megaports Initiative, the U.S. began similar operations in Port of Kingston in Jamaica in May 2009, and in Mexico’s Port of Veracruz and Port of Lazaro Cardenas in March and July of 2009, respectively. Nuclear Energy and Plants in Latin America Though not yet widespread throughout the region, a number of countries including Brazil, Argentina, and Mexico possess reactors that provide their citizens with electricity; Peru and Colombia, the other countries in the region with nuclear capabilities, have not aimed their reactors at energy production, but are currently carrying out low-level research. Following is a brief description of some of the most relevant developments in Latin American nuclear states. Argentina For a time during the country’s last period of military rule (1976-1983), there were reports that Buenos Aires launched a major nuclear research effort in the southern part of the country, possibly paving the way for a nuclear weapons program. In recent years, after a prolonged period of antagonism, Argentina and Brazil have grown increasingly close when it comes to collaborating on nuclear energy projects. In “Brazil and Argentina’s Nuclear Cooperation,” a January 2009 report for the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Argentine security expert Irma Argüello explains that, “this strategic alliance could also turn Brazil and Argentina into global suppliers of enriched uranium and advanced reactors of intermediate power.” Of course, Buenos Aires is not solely dependent on Brasília for its nuclear initiatives. According to a February 2008 report in Latin America News Digest, Argentina had launched an ambitious nuclear program in 2006 with a budget of approximately $2 billion. The program aims to complete the construction of Atucha II, Argentina’s second nuclear plant, and includes studies on the construction of a fourth nuclear plant, upgrades to the Embalse nuclear plant and the resumption of enriched uranium production. In 2008, Argentina and Algeria agreed to boost their state cooperation on civil nuclear energy matters during Argentine President Cristina Kirchner’s visit to Algiers. In October 2009, Deutsche Presse-Agenteur reported that Argentina and India signed an agreement based on their mutual cooperation. Jordan, Russia, and Canada, through Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, have all reached comparable agreements during this period. Finally, a May 2009 press release in Marketwire reported that the Argentine government plans to reactivate the Pilcaniyeu uranium enrichment plant, in the province of Río Negro in the southern part of the country. Brazil As a rising global power, Brazil’s nuclear intentions are of particular importance. The country presently has two operating nuclear stations, Angra 1 and Angra 2, and plans for a third. A Business News Americas report in 2009 mentioned that Brasília expects construction for Angra 3 to be completed by May 30, 2015. The country has focused on a partnership with Argentina, including a February 2008 agreement between Brazilian President Lula da Silva and Argentina’s Kirchner to build a uranium enrichment plant. With French help, Brazil is seeking to build its own domestic-made nuclear submarine. Peruvian nuclear engineer Carlos Ampuero explained that “the size of the submarine will depend on the size of the reactor, which will depend on how enriched will the power source be. The consensus is that Brazil on its own can enrich uranium to the standards necessary for a small reactor to function.” It is still unclear how much assistance Paris will provide Brasília for the submarine, both in terms of general design and the reactor itself, but the extend of the cooperation is likely to be considerable. In 2007, the head of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), Mohamed ElBaradei, visited Brazil and declared that “our inspectors are here all the time, and they are working in close cooperation with the Brazilian authorities,” stressing that the country’s history of the nuclear program has not been anything like Iran’s and does not present a security threat. “Lately, we see a lot of interest into the expansion of nuclear power because of concerns about climate change, because of the competition for gas and oil, because of the increased need for energy to develop,” ElBaradei told the Associated Press as he toured the plant in Resende, 100 miles northwest of Rio de Janeiro. While Brasília’s decision not to pursue a nuclear weapons program is demonstrably a positive development, the security issues in the Angra plants as well as the pressing possibility of accidents must be addressed. In 1987, a Caesium-137 source (the same type that was stolen in Argentina) was improperly removed from an abandoned clinic in Goiania, Brazil and subsequently ruptured. As a result, four individuals died and 28 suffered radiation burns. Mexico The closest Latin American country to the U.S. has already developed nuclear energy with its Laguna Verde plant, located in the southern state of Veracruz. While there have been plans for expansion, Laguna Verde remains the country’s sole nuclear plant. As early as November 2009, Eugenio Laris, a senior official for Mexico’s state power company CFE, asserted that there is space to build a twin nuclear power plant to further meet the country’s energy needs. Ruben Camarillo, a PAN Senator, made similar statements in March, corroborating such plans. Peru While Lima possesses a small reactor in Huarangal, the facility is limited to support small research projects rather than provide energy on a large-scale. Peru has ambitions to further develop its nuclear energy capacities, however, and there have been plans to construct additional nuclear facilities. Under an agreement signed during the 14th APEC Leaders’ Meeting in November 2006, Russia pledged to help Peru make advances in areas such as agriculture, health, and nuclear energy, among other sectors. In 2007, the Peruvian Nationalist Party (PNP) submitted a bill to Congress declaring the development and use of nuclear energy as a “necessity” and of “public interest.” More recently, the Peruvian Institute for Nuclear Energy drafted a bill promoting investment for the generation of nuclear power. According to the president of IPEN, Conrado Seminario, the country is rich in uranium and could begin exporting the ore as early as 2011. Indeed, the Nuclear Energy Agency of the Paris-based Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development and the IAEA sponsored an International Uranium Resources Evaluation Project Mission to Peru in 1984. The mission estimated that the country’s speculative resources ranged from 6,000 to 11,000 tons of uranium, though experts interviewed point out that it may turn out to be more. Regarding Peru’s rich uranium deposits, Solex Resources Corp., a Canadian-based exploration company, explained in a press release last May that it has purchased all the shares of Minera Frontera Pacifica S.A., meaning that the company “will control 100 percent of operations taking the place over 904 square kilometers of uranium concessions on the Macusani Plateau in south-eastern Peru.” Colombia The country’s energy agency, Ingeominas, possesses one nuclear reactor called IAN R-1 which was constructed with U.S. help in 1965 and modernized in the 1990s. However, the reactor is only used for research purposes and not for energy production. In June 2008, reports from Bogotá pointed to Colombia’s newfound interest in developing this energy source. At a meeting with Turkish investors, former President Ernesto Samper explained that, “nuclear energy is something we are thinking about. Environmentalists are against this plan, but the increase in fuel prices does not leave many other choices. We are also working on developing biofuels, which today account for 18 percent of all fuel consumed in Colombia.” Experts estimate that Argentina, Brazil and Peru hold the most uranium deposits in the region. In 2007, Buenos Aires passed a bill which designated an $8 million budget for the country’s atomic energy commission (Comisión Nacional de Energía Atómica, CNEA), to carry out upgrades to the San Rafael uranium complex in the province of Mendoza. According to experts, policies to extract and exploit uranium deposits hinge on cost effectiveness. A Business News Americas report explains that the San Rafael mine, which was opened in the 1970s and produced nearly 1,600 tons of uranium, was shut down in 1995 due to low uranium prices. Interested States Several other countries have expressed a desire to develop nuclear energy in Latin America. In May, the Associated Press published a report explaining that the IAEA will aid Ecuador in the exploration of its territory for uranium deposits from 2009 to 2011. Following the trend of other countries, Ecuador signed an agreement with Russia in mid-2009 regarding civilian nuclear cooperation. According to the Colombian news network Caracol TV, the Ecuadorian Minister for Renewable Energy, Esteban Alvornoz, stated in August 2009 that, “cooperation with Russia cannot be measured in monetary terms, but with the benefits of this transfer of technology and science for countries like ours.” Chile has expressed interest in developing its own nuclear plants, but due to the country’s seismic instability, it is regarded as unsafe to depend upon nuclear energy. In September, Chile’s Energy Minister, Marcelo Tokman, stated that Chile could reduce the costs of its central electricity system by 8.5-10 percent towards the end of the 2020s by switching to nuclear power. In August, presidential candidate Eduardo Frei announced his intention to have a nuclear plan in place by 2020, and stated, “during my government we will have to create a Nuclear Energy Commission.” Frei is currently a contender in the final run-off election for the presidency. Venezuela, Brazil, and Iran While still unclear as to the extent of their exchange of nuclear information, the evolving Brasília-Tehran-Caracas triangle has the potential to become an issue for other Latin American states. This is likely to occur as these countries gain a collateral advantage for carrying out traditional warfare, **even if nuclear weaponry remains banned** in the region. Hugo Chávez repeatedly has stated his desire to construct a prospering nuclear program. The Venezuelan President, who has made his affinity for Iran no secret, believes the Middle Eastern country’s expertise will allow Venezuela to achieve its nuclear ambitious. An Agence France Presse report notes that, during a visit to Tehran, Chávez stated that Venezuela was working on a preliminary plan for the construction of a “nuclear village” in Venezuela, with Iranian assistance, “so that the Venezuelan people can count in the future with this marvelous resource for peaceful uses.” Venezuela is not alone in seeking aid from Iran, as neighboring Brazil is also looking for Iran’s support in developing a more ambitious nuclear program. In late November, Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad visited Brasília and met with his colleague, President Lula da Silva, where both leaders defended Iran’s right to develop civilian nuclear energy. The debate now rages over the motive behind Lula’s reasoning for defending Iran’s nuclear program. On one hand, it could be that, contrary to the U.S., Lula does not perceive Iran as a global security threat. On the other, he could be seeking technical and productive support from Tehran for Brazil’s own nuclear program, especially regarding the implementation of the French-backed nuclear submarine projects. Nuclear Waste in the Caribbean A final nuclear security issue regarding Latin America deals with the ongoing shipment of nuclear waste through Caribbean waters. Occasional shipments originating in countries like France and the United Kingdom carry industrial nuclear waste as they traverse the Caribbean or the Panama Canal on their way to Japan to have it processed. In February 2007, Panamanian environmentalists protested the passage of the ship Sandpiper, owned by the British Nuclear Group, Areva NC, and the Overseas Reprocessing Committee, through the Canal en route to Japan. These protests, however, still pale in comparison with the turmoil generated by the Pacific Swan, which, on its December 2000 voyage, was carrying eight shipping casks holding 192 half-ton logs of glassified nuclear waste, a byproduct of reprocessing spent nuclear fuel to remove weapons-grade plutonium. The vessel departed from Cherbourg, France for Japan via the southern route around Cape Horn, South America, due to fierce protests by Caribbean basin governments. This routing represented a considerable success on the part of Caribbean mini-states and environmental groups, as they managed to force this vessel and its dangerous cargo from sailing through their local waters. In addition, the publicity resulting from its detour around Cape Horn, the southernmost tip of South America, brought a heightened awareness of the dangers of such shipments to the Southern Cone nations of Brazil, Uruguay, Argentina and Chile, which also began to voice their concern over the Swan’s proposed route through their adjacent waters. Should Tlatelolco be Revisited? The continued applicability of the Treaty of the Tlatelolco is another important aspect of nuclear security to be considered. Signed and ratified in 1967, this treaty between Latin American and Caribbean nations created a nuclear weapons-free zone in the region. The treaty also established a monitoring agency, the Agency for Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean (OPANAL) with headquarters in Mexico City, to ensure that the signatories abided by the treaty’s stipulations. Should nuclear plants begin to expand throughout Latin America and eventually be used to power military equipment, Tlatelolco would have to be revisited in order to update the pact in line with ongoing, and at times fast-breaking, developments. At a November 2009 meeting between Russian President Dmitry Medvedev and his Chilean counterpart Michelle Bachelet, the two leaders issued a joint statement declaring, “the presidents noted the important role of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean.” While such rhetoric carries little weight, if any at all, the treaty has not being completely ignored by policymakers. Not all Latin American countries are signatories to the treaty, with Cuba, Trinidad and Tobago, Dominica, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, and Guatemala all declining to sign to date, and with Venezuela ratifying it only in 2002. If the nuclear-powered submarine project comes into being, this could provide a major advantage to the Brazilian military should a conflict occur with a neighboring country. In contacting OPANAL, the author was advised to instead contact the Argentine-Brazilian Agency of Accountability and Control of Nuclear Weapons (Agencia Brasileño-Argentina de Contabilidad y Control de Materiales Nucleares, ABACC) and the Regional Cooperation Agreement for the Promotion of Nuclear Science and Technology in Latin America (Acuerdo Regional de Cooperación para la Promoción de la Ciencia y Tecnología Nucleares en América Latina, ARCAL). Neither ABACC nor ARCAL responded to requests for interviews. Peruvian nuclear engineer Valdivia maintains that while a nuclear-powered submarine would be a heady boost to the Brazil’s national ego, it would be enormously expensive to maintain, particularly if the country does not currently face a credible outside threat. He argued that because a nuclear submarine is not necessarily a nuclear weapon, no revision to the Tlatelolco Treaty is required. He added, “Furthermore, new technology will allow for the detection of such silent submarines, which will take the ‘edge’ off their importance […] one lonely nuclear submarine without nuclear weaponry is simply a an insupportable luxury for the Brazilian military.” The Copenhagen Summit itinerary indicated that only two meetings focused on nuclear energy: a discussion by the European Nuclear Society and “False promises of nuclear energy,” organized by the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom. It seems that none of the attending countries and organizations see nuclear security issues as a compelling issue confronting the international community, particularly as they pertain to Latin America. Given the extensive history of unfulfilled nuclear plans in the region, it is far from clear that the possible construction of a nuclear submarine by Brazil should be regarded as the dawn of a new nuclear century for Latin America. If all goes according to plan, the submarine will be fully operational in 2015, at the earliest. Countries like Venezuela, Chile, and Ecuador have expressed varying degrees of interest in developing their own nuclear energy projects, but it remains to be seen if they can harness their natural and human resources and gather the massive funds required to carry these ambitious plans to fruition. Latin America today is a region with dangerous levels of violence, and though inter-state warfare remains mercifully scarce, developing nuclear infrastructure may not merit the security risks or potential for accident. The Argentine and FARC incidents appear to have been isolated events, though there is always the concern that they could become more common place, particularly in view of plans for more nuclear energy plants and more nuclear waste passing through the Caribbean.

#### THE PLAN SOLVES:

#### First, it fractures the pink tide and spills over to broader cooperation

**White 13** – Robert is senior fellow at the Center for International Policy and former U.S. ambassador to Paraguay and El Salvador. (“After Chávez, a Chance to Rethink Relations With Cuba”, New York Times, 3/7/13, [http://www.nytimes.com/2013/03/08/opinion/after-chavez-hope-for-good-neighbors-in-latin-america.html?pagewanted=all)](http://www.nytimes.com/2013/03/08/opinion/after-chavez-hope-for-good-neighbors-in-latin-america.html?pagewanted=all)//TL)

We don’t like ableist language

FOR most of our history, the United States assumed that its security was inextricably linked to a partnership with Latin America. This legacy dates from the Monroe Doctrine, articulated in 1823, through the Rio pact, the postwar treaty that pledged the United States to come to the defense of its allies in Central and South America. Yet for a half-century, our policies toward our southern neighbors have alternated between intervention and neglect, inappropriate meddling and missed opportunities. The death this week of President Hugo Chávez of Venezuela — who along with Fidel Castro of Cuba was perhaps the most vociferous critic of the United States among the political leaders of the Western Hemisphere in recent decades — offers an opportunity to restore bonds with potential allies who share the American goal of prosperity. Throughout his career, the autocratic Mr. Chávez used our embargo as a wedge with which to antagonize the United States and alienate its supporters. His fuel helped prop up the rule of Mr. Castro and his brother Raúl, Cuba’s current president. The embargo no longer serves any useful purpose (if it ever did at all); President Obama should end it, though it would mean overcoming powerful opposition from Cuban-American lawmakers in Congress. An end to the Cuba embargo would send a powerful signal to all of Latin America that the United States wants a new, warmer relationship with democratic forces seeking social change throughout the Americas. I joined the State Department as a Foreign Service officer in the 1950s and chose to serve in Latin America in the 1960s. I was inspired by President John F. Kennedy’s creative response to the revolutionary fervor then sweeping Latin America. The 1959 Cuban revolution, led by the charismatic Fidel Castro, had inspired revolts against the cruel dictatorships and corrupt pseudodemocracies that had dominated the region since the end of Spanish and Portuguese rule in the 19th century. Kennedy had a charisma of his own, and it captured the imaginations of leaders who wanted democratic change, not violent revolution. Kennedy reacted to the threat of continental insurrection by creating the Alliance for Progress, a kind of Marshall Plan for the hemisphere that was calculated to achieve the same kind of results that saved Western Europe from Communism. He pledged billions of dollars to this effort. In hindsight, it may have been overly ambitious, even naïve, but Kennedy’s focus on Latin America rekindled the promise of the Good Neighbor Policy of Franklin D. Roosevelt and transformed the whole concept of inter-American relations. Tragically, after Kennedy’s assassination in 1963, the ideal of the Alliance for Progress crumbled and “la noche mas larga” — “the longest night” — began for the proponents of Latin American democracy. Military regimes flourished, democratic governments withered, moderate political and civil leaders were labeled Communists, rights of free speech and assembly were curtailed and human dignity crushed, largely because the United States abandoned all standards save that of anti-Communism. During my Foreign Service career, I did what I could to oppose policies that supported dictators and closed off democratic alternatives. In 1981, as the ambassador to El Salvador, I refused a demand by the secretary of state, Alexander M. Haig Jr., that I use official channels to cover up the Salvadoran military’s responsibility for the murders of four American churchwomen. I was fired and forced out of the Foreign Service. The Reagan administration, under the illusion that Cuba was the power driving the Salvadoran revolution, turned its policy over to the Pentagon and C.I.A., with predictable results. During the 1980s the United States helped expand the Salvadoran military, which was dominated by uniformed assassins. We armed them, trained them and covered up their crimes. After our counterrevolutionary efforts failed to end the Salvadoran conflict, the Defense Department asked its research institute, the RAND Corporation, what had gone wrong. RAND analysts found that United States policy makers had refused to accept the obvious truth that the insurgents were rebelling against social injustice and state terror. As a result, “we pursued a policy unsettling to ourselves, for ends humiliating to the Salvadorans and at a cost disproportionate to any conventional conception of the national interest.” Over the subsequent quarter-century, a series of profound political, social and economic changes have undermined the traditional power bases in Latin America and, with them, longstanding regional institutions like the Organization of American States. The organization, which is headquartered in Washington and which excluded Cuba in 1962, was seen as irrelevant by Mr. Chávez. He promoted the creation of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States — which excludes the United States and Canada — as an alternative. At a regional meeting that included Cuba and excluded the United States, Mr. Chávez said that “the most positive thing for the independence of our continent is that we meet alone without the hegemony of empire.” Mr. Chávez was **masterful at manipulating America’s antagonism toward** Fidel **Castro** as a rhetorical stick with which to attack the United States as an imperialist aggressor, an enemy of progressive change, interested mainly in treating Latin America as a vassal continent, a source of cheap commodities and labor. Like its predecessors, the Obama administration has given few signs that it has grasped the magnitude of these changes or cares about their consequences. After President Obama took office in 2009, Latin America’s leading statesman at the time, Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva, then the president of Brazil, urged Mr. Obama to normalize relations with Cuba. Lula, as he is universally known, correctly identified our Cuba policy as the chief stumbling block to renewed ties with Latin America, as it had been since the very early years of the Castro regime. After the failure of the 1961 Bay of Pigs invasion, Washington set out to accomplish by stealth and economic strangulation what it had failed to do by frontal attack. But the clumsy mix of covert action and porous boycott succeeded primarily in bringing shame on the United States and turning Mr. Castro into a folk hero. And even now, despite the relaxing of travel restrictions and Raúl Castro’s announcement that he will retire in 2018, the implacable hatred of many within the Cuban exile community continues. The fact that two of the three Cuban-American members of the Senate — Marco Rubio of Florida and Ted Cruz of Texas — are rising stars in the Republican Party complicates further the potential for a recalibration of Cuban-American relations. (The third member, Senator Robert Menendez, Democrat of New Jersey, is the new chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, but his power has been weakened by a continuing ethics controversy.) Are there any other examples in the history of diplomacy where the leaders of a small, weak nation can prevent a great power from acting in its own best interest merely by staying alive? The re-election of President Obama, and the death of Mr. Chávez, give America a chance to reassess the irrational hold on our imaginations that Fidel Castro has exerted for five decades. The president and his new secretary of state, John Kerry, should quietly reach out to Latin American leaders like President Juan Manuel Santos of Colombia and José Miguel Insulza, secretary general of the Organization of American States. The message should be simple: The president is prepared to show some flexibility on Cuba and asks your help. Such a simple request could transform the Cuban issue from a bilateral problem into a multilateral challenge. It would then be up to Latin Americans to devise a policy that would help Cuba achieve a sufficient measure of democratic change to justify its reintegration into a hemisphere composed entirely of elected governments. If, however, our present policy ~~paralysis~~ continues, we will soon see the emergence of two rival camps, the United States versus Latin America. While Washington would continue to enjoy friendly relations with individual countries like Brazil, Mexico and Colombia, the vision of Roosevelt and Kennedy of a hemisphere of partners cooperating in matters of common concern would be reduced to a historical footnote.

#### This specifically spills over to cooperation on *nuclear security* and *trafficking*

Shifter 12 – 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. (“Remaking the Relationship: The United States and Latin America,” April, IAD Policy Report, http://www.thedialogue.org/PublicationFiles/IAD2012PolicyReportFINAL.pdf)

Cuba, too, poses a significant challenge for relations between the United States and Latin America. The 50-year-old US embargo against Cuba is rightly criticized throughout the hemisphere as a failed and punitive instrument. It has long been a strain on US-Latin American relations. Although the United States has recently moved in the right direction and taken steps to relax restrictions on travel to Cuba, Washington **needs to do far more** to dismantle its severe, outdated constraints on normalized relations with Cuba. Cuba is one of the residual issues that most obstructs more effective US-Latin American engagement. At the same time, Cuba’s authoritarian regime should be of utmost concern to all countries in the Americas. At present, it is the only country without free, multi-party elections, and its government fully controls the press. Latin American and Caribbean nations could be instrumental in supporting Cuba’s eventual transition to democratic rule. An end to the US policy of isolating Cuba, without setting aside US concern about human rights violations, would be an important first step. regionAL And gLobAL CooperAtion Many of the issues on the hemispheric agenda carry critical global dimensions. Because of this, the United States should seek greater cooperation and consultation with Brazil, Mexico, and other countries of the region in world forums addressing shared interests. Brazil has the broadest international presence and influence of any Latin American nation. In recent years it has become far more active on global issues of concern to the United States. The United States and Brazil have clashed over such issues as Iran’s nuclear program, non-proliferation, and the Middle East uprisings, but they have cooperated when their interests converged, such as in the World Trade Organization and the G-20 (Mexico, Argentina, and Canada also participate in the G-20), and in efforts to rebuild and provide security for Haiti . Washington has worked with Brazil and other Latin American countries to raise the profile of emerging economies in various international financial agencies, including the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. In addition to economic and financial matters, Brazil and other Latin American nations are assuming enhanced roles on an array of global political, environmental, and security issues. Several for which US and Latin American cooperation could become increasingly important include:  As the world’s lone nuclear-weapons-free region, Latin America has the opportunity to participate more actively in non-proliferation efforts. Although US and Latin American interests do not always converge on non-proliferation questions, they align on some related goals. For example, the main proliferation challenges today are found in developing and unstable parts of the world, as well as in the leakage—or transfer of nuclear materials—to terrorists. In that context, **south-south connections are crucial**. Brazil could play a pivotal role.

#### Second, Cuba is the *critical litmus test* for broader cooperation

**Perez 10** ­– David has a JD from Yale Law. (“America's Cuba Policy: The Way Forward: A Policy Recommendation for the U.S. State Department” 13 Harv. Latino L. Rev. 187, Spring, lexis)

Anti-Americanism has become the political chant de jour for leaders seeking long-term as well as short-term gains in Latin American elections. In Venezuela, the anti-American rhetoric spewed by Hugo Chavez masks his otherwise autocratic tendencies, while countries like Bolivia and Ecuador tilt further away from Washington, both rhetorically and substantively. The former expelled the U.S. Ambassador in October 2008, and the latter has refused to renew Washington's lease on an airbase traditionally used for counter-narcotics missions. The **systemic neglect** for eight years during the Bush Administration meant that political capital was never seriously spent dealing with issues affecting the region. Because of this, President Bush was unable to get much headway with his proposal to reform immigration, and his free trade agreement with Colombia encountered significant opposition in Congress. Recent examples of U.S. unilateralism, disregard for international law and norms, and a growing financial crisis, have all been seized by a new generation of populist Latin American leaders who stoke anti-American sentiment. The region, however, is absolutely critical to our national interest and security. Over thirty percent of our oil comes from Latin America - more than the U.S. imports from the Middle East. Additionally, over half of the foreign-born population in the United States is Latin American, meaning that a significant portion of American society is intrinsically tied to the region. n1 These immigrants, as well as their sons and daughters, have already begun to take their place amongst America's social, cultural, and political elite. Just south of America's borders, a deepening polarization is spreading throughout the entire region. In the last few years ideological allies in Bolivia, Ecuador, and Venezuela have written and approved new constitutions that have consolidated the power of the executive, while extending - or in Venezuela's case eliminating - presidential term limits. In Venezuela the polarization has been drawn along economic lines, whereby Chavez's base of support continues to be poor Venezuelans. In Bolivia the polarization has been drawn along racial lines: the preamble to the new Bolivian constitution, approved in January 2009, makes reference to the "disastrous colonial times," a moment in history that Bolivians of Andean-descent particularly lament. Those regions in Bolivia with the most people of European or mixed descent have consistently voted for increased provincial autonomy and against the constitutional changes proposed by President Morales. Perhaps due to its sweeping changes, the new Constitution was rejected by four of Bolivia's nine provinces. n2 Like Bolivia, Latin America is still searching for its identity. [\*191] Traditionally the U.S. has projected its influence by using varying combinations of hard and soft power. It has been a long time since the United States last sponsored or supported military action in Latin America, and although highly context-dependent, it is very likely that Latin American citizens and their governments would view any overt display of American hard power in the region negatively. n3 One can only imagine the fodder an American military excursion into Latin America would provide for a leader like Hugo Chavez of Venezuela, or Evo Morales of Bolivia. Soft power, on the other hand, can win over people and governments without resorting to coercion, but is limited by other factors. The key to soft power is not simply a strong military, though having one helps, but rather an enduring sense of legitimacy that can then be projected across the globe to advance particular policies. The key to this legitimacy is a good image and a reputation as a responsible actor on the global and regional stage. A good reputation and image can go a long way toward generating goodwill, which ultimately will help the U.S. when it tries to sell unpopular ideas and reforms in the region. n4 In order to effectively employ soft power in Latin America, the U.S. must repair its image by going on a diplomatic offensive and reminding, not just Latin America's leaders, but also the Latin American people, of the important relationship between the U.S. and Latin America. Many of the problems facing Latin America today cannot be addressed in the absence of U.S. leadership and cooperation. Working with other nations to address these challenges is the best way to shore up legitimacy, earn respect, and repair America's image. Although this proposal focuses heavily on Cuba, every country in Latin America is a potential friend. Washington will have to not only strengthen its existing relationships in the region, but also win over new allies, who look to us for "ideas and solutions, not lectures." n5 When analyzing ecosystems, environmental scientists seek out "keystone species." These are organisms that, despite their small size, function as lynchpins for, or barometers of, the entire system's stability. Cuba, despite its size and isolation, is a keystone nation in Latin America, having disproportionately dominated Washington's policy toward the region for decades. n6 As a result of its continuing tensions with Havana, America's reputation [\*192] in the region has suffered, as has its ability to deal with other countries. n7 For fifty years, Latin American governments that hoped to endear themselves to the U.S. had to pass the Cuba "litmus test." But now the tables have turned, and the Obama Administration, if it wants to repair America's image in the region, will have to pass a Cuba litmus test of its own. n8 In short, America must once again be admired if we are going to expect other countries to follow our example. To that end, warming relations with Cuba would have a reverberating effect throughout Latin America, and would go a long way toward creating goodwill.

### 1AC—Plan

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

### 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.

**Status quo food production is failing—a shift to urban agriculture is key to *sustainable food systems* and *biodiversity preservation***

Peters 10 – LL.M. expected 2011, University of Arkansas School of Law, Graduate Program in Agricultural and Food Law; J.D. 2010, University of Oregon School of Law. (“Creating a Sustainable Urban Agriculture Revolution”, Journal of Environmental Law and Litigation, Vol. 25, 203, http://law.uoregon.edu/org/jell/docs/251/peters.pdf)

URBAN AGRICULTURE Urban agriculture is a system that ensures food security by providing access to land and resources to support urban farming efforts.68 The United Nations Development Programme defines urban agriculture as follows: [A]n industry that produces, processes, and markets food and fuel, largely in response to the daily demand of consumers within a town, city, or metropolis, on land and water dispersed throughout the urban and peri-urban area, applying intensive production methods, using and reusing natural resources and urban wastes, to yield a diversity of crops and livestock.69 In the United States, urban agriculture is perhaps better known as community gardening.70 Community gardens are areas where residents grow food on publicly held or privately held land that they do not own.71 Most often, community gardens are located within neighborhoods, on public housing premises, or on school grounds.72 In the face of an imminent food shortage, especially in light of the economic and energy crises discussed above, it is **imperative that urban residents expand** urban **food production**. Neglected and abandoned vacant lots in blighted urban areas comprise a vast amount of land that could be converted into urban gardens.73 In addition to vacant lots, other urban areas including schoolyards, hospital grounds, parks and other open spaces, utility easements, alleys, rooftops, building walls,75 and even windowsills all provide opportunities for urban agriculture.76 While the many benefits of a sustainable urban agricultural system will be discussed below, additional benefits to urban communities deserve mention here. Urban gardens beautify and green urban neighborhoods while also building a sense of community.77 Urban gardens provide educational and employment opportunities, promote self-respect, and can even reduce crime rates.78 These gardens also offer urban residents an opportunity to connect with nature and can instill environmental ethics.79 Additionally, urban gardens promote entrepreneurship, as urban farmers can sell excess produce at farmers’ markets, through Community Supported Agriculture programs,80 and directly to restaurants.81 Finally, urban gardening provides lowincome urban residents with a supply of fresh and healthy organic food that can combat problems associated with inadequate nutrition, such as illness, fatigue, depression, anxiety, and hunger.82 IV SUSTAINABILITY Sustainability is best described as a concept of making decisions for the courses of action we choose in a way that balances the three “E’s” of sustainability—environment, economy, and social equity83 — as well as the lesser known prong of sustainability, national security.84 Sustainability is a big-picture concept. Our individual actions as well as local, state, and federal policies do not exist in a vacuum; every action has an impact on the world at large and on future generations. To create a truly sustainable world, all of our decisions, from individual choices to federal policies, must consider the impact on the environment, economy, society, and national security. Media coverage, marketing of consumer products,85 and recent documentaries have all contributed to bringing the terms “green” and “sustainability” into our everyday vocabulary,86 yet no clear definitions of these terms exist. While green focuses on protection of the environment, sustainability is much broader. In 1987, the World Commission on Environment and Development, in the Brundtland Report, defined sustainable development as “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.”87 At a more fundamental level, sustainability can be defined as “able to be sustained,”88 where sustain means to “strengthen or support physically or mentally . . . [to] keep (something) going over time or continuously.”89 In this broader context, sustainability requires that we look at our current lifestyles and practices and evaluate their capability of being continued indefinitely. Much of the recent attention concerning sustainability focuses on technologies designed to reduce energy consumption and foster development of renewable energy sources.90 Little discourse has been directed towards the immediate impact individuals can have merely by reducing personal levels of consumption through a simplified lifestyle, yet such a reduction would yield immediate results and require little financial investment. As individuals, we can foster sustainability while increasing our food supply simply by providing more for ourselves through a sustainable urban agricultural system. Government incentives, discussed infra Part VII, provide land and resources that would enable individuals and communities to take action to transform our agricultural system into one that is both sustainable and secure. In the following sections, this Note provides an overview of each of the four elements of sustainability—environment, economy, equity, and national security. This Note also discusses modern industrial agriculture, urban development trends, and urban agriculture in terms of the elements of sustainability. A. Environmental Sustainability In the environmental context, sustainability encourages production and development methods that preserve and protect our natural resources and reduce our impact on the environment.91 This involves “protecting existing environmental resources (both in the natural and ‘built’ world), including the preservation of historical sites and the development of environmental resources and assets for future use.”92 To accomplish this goal, we must find innovative ways to reduce our consumption of resources and replenish the resources we do consume. We must protect biodiversity and ecosystems, as well as our land, air, and water resources by reducing greenhouse gas emissions, carbon footprints, air and water pollution, and soil contamination.93 In the context of land use and food production, environmental sustainability demands that we conserve undeveloped land and employ food production methods that will have a minimal impact on the planet. 1. Environmental Sustainability and Industrial Agriculture Industrial agriculture is a system in which economies of scale and maximization of profits are the ultimate goals.94 Profits are maximized when agribusinesses produce the largest yield of single crops at the lowest possible cost, primarily through mechanization and intensive use of agricultural chemicals.95 As discussed supra Part I, the environmental effects of industrial agricultural methods include soil erosion, depletion of soil nutrients, groundwater contamination from chemical inputs, and consumption of finite fuels.96 Additionally, as crop yields decline due to environmental degradation and demand for agricultural products rises due to population growth and the increased use of plant-derived biofuels, more and more land will be consumed by industrial agriculture. This will result in an agricultural system that depletes and destroys natural resources at an increasing rate, which will negatively impact the planet’s carrying capacity.97 Along with farm subsidies and corporate control of food production in the United States, policies that allow the harms of industrial agriculture to be treated as externalities help perpetuate the current agricultural system.98 Under the current system, agribusinesses may pollute the environment, deplete clean water and soil, and promote social inequity without having to account for these harms when calculating profits. These external costs are significant; contaminated industrial farm runoff alone causes an estimated $9 billion of damage annually to U.S. surface waters.99 Further, the externalization of these costs discourages agribusinesses from conserving water, fertile land, and other natural resources. 2. Environmental Sustainability and Urban Development Trends Current urban development trends impact the environment in several significant ways. The most direct impacts are land consumption and the destruction of natural habitats.100 While interior urban areas are deteriorating and being abandoned at an increasing rate, the constant consumption of land to support new urban development is destroying greenfields, forests, and species.101 These new communities require land not only for building homes and businesses, but also for housing public services, such as schools and hospitals, and for creating an expanded transportation infrastructure.102 Increased commuting associated with urban sprawl and flight from blighted areas relies on oil, a finite resource with decreasing availability, and significantly contributes to greenhouse gas emissions,103 which pollute the air and contribute to climate change.104 Urban sprawl further contributes to the degradation of the environment by polluting water sources with runoff from newly constructed impervious surfaces such as homes and transportation infrastructures.105 During the construction phase, stormwater flows over construction sites, “pick[ing] up debris, chemicals, and sediment that flow into water bodies.”106 Water pollution continues to degrade the environment post-construction as stormwater runoff from paved surfaces, including new roads and highways, is also contaminated.107 3. Environmental Sustainability and Urban Agriculture Transitioning from an industrial agricultural system to a sustainable urban agricultural system would minimize the impacts of food production on the planet. Urban agriculture reduces the consumption of undeveloped land for farming. Food would be produced in areas that are already developed and populated, thereby conserving open space for natural habitat. Due to the proximity of urban gardens to dwellings and other buildings, urban agriculture must be performed without the use of large machinery and without the use of chemical pesticides and fertilizers.108 While lack of such inputs could be perceived as a challenge, urban gardening methods may result in increased crop yields on smaller plots of land than conventional farming practices achieve.109 Rather than maximizing crop yields through extensive use of chemicals, sustainable agriculture relies on crop rotation, composting, biofertilizers, and other organic farming techniques to improve soil fertility.110 Organic farming methods also protect water resources because organic farms do not use chemical inputs so there is no contamination of groundwater and streams.111 Furthermore, organic fertilizers reduce the amount of waste deposited in landfills because they are made from composted and recycled food waste, leaves, and lawn clippings.112 Urban gardening reduces the effects of climate change by decreasing greenhouse gas emissions. Unlike industrial farms, urban gardens are cultivated and harvested with minimal mechanization and do not use oil-based fertilizers.113 Moreover, food that is grown and sold locally eliminates the need for wasteful plastic packaging and fossil-fueled transport to market.114 Additionally, having fresh food available in every neighborhood would reduce carbon-emitting automobile trips to the grocery store.115 Urban agriculture presents an opportunity to reverse the decline of urban areas. A significant benefit of urban gardens is the beautification of urban neighborhoods and strengthening of community spirit.116 Urban gardens also can prompt the cleanup of contaminated vacant lots.117 Furthermore, increasing the amount of vegetation in urban areas would reduce surface temperatures during hot months and improve urban air quality.118 B. Economic Sustainability Sustainability requires that economic growth and development must be integrated with environmental protection and sustainable utilization of resources.119 Economic growth and development must also promote both intergenerational and intragenerational equity.120 While a steadily expanding economy is considered prosperity, a growing world population coupled with increasing overall consumption threatens to strain our planet beyond its carrying capacity.121 When economic stability is equated with increased consumption, we push the limits of the planet’s carrying capacity. Simply put, we are depleting the Earth’s resources at a rate that threatens the Earth’s future ability to support our species. The economic aspect of sustainability also addresses the fact that many of the planet’s resources are treated as externalities in the marketplace.122 For example, the costs of depleting natural resources and polluting the air, water, and ground are not reflected in the price of goods. Through regulations, mandates, and incentives, the U.S. government addresses some of these environmental costs,123 but more must be done to implement policies that will incorporate external costs into pricing structures. 1. Economic Sustainability and Industrial Agriculture **Industrial agriculture is not economically sustainable**. Industrial agriculture seeks to maximize profits without regard for environmental degradation or the long-term effects of heavy reliance on chemical pesticides and fertilizers. Rather than balancing economic growth with environmental protection and equity, industrial agriculture concentrates on maximizing profits at the expense of the environment and society, both in the present and the future. The United States currently has no regulations or policies in place that would impose costs upon agribusinesses for externalities;124 rather, current policies promote harmful industrial agricultural methods.125 A food production system that allows businesses to maximize profits without concern for its impact on society and the environment is not sustainable.

**Ecosystem collapse causes extinction**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Warming is *real* and *anthropogenic*—reject skeptics**

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.

The right-wing institutes and the energy lobby beat the bushes to find scientists—any scientists—who might disagree with the scientific consensus. As investigative journalists and scientists have documented over and over again,26 the denialist conspiracy essentially paid for the testimony of anyone who could be useful to them. The day that the 2007 IPCC report was released (Feb. 2, 2007), the British newspaper The Guardian reported that the conservative American Enterprise Institute (funded largely by oil companies and conservative think tanks) had offered $10,000 plus travel expenses to scientists who would write negatively about the IPCC report.27

We are accustomed to the hired-gun “experts” paid by lawyers to muddy up the evidence in the case they are fighting, but this is extraordinary—buying scientists outright to act as shills for organizations trying to deny scientific reality. With this kind of money, however, you can always find a fringe scientist or crank or someone with no relevant credentials who will do what they’re paid to do. The NCSE satirized this tactic of composing phony “lists of scientists” with their “Project Steve.”28 They showed that there were more scientists named “Steve” than their entire list of “scientists who dispute evolution.” It may generate lots of PR and a smokescreen to confuse the public, but it doesn’t change the fact that scientists who actually do research in climate change are unanimous in their insistence that anthropogenic global warming is a real threat. Most scientists I know and respect work very hard for little pay, yet they still cannot be paid to endorse some scientific idea they know to be false.

The climate deniers have a lot of other things in common with creationists and other anti-science movements. They too like to quote someone out of context (“quote mining”), finding a short phrase in the work of legitimate scientists that seems to support their position. But when you read the full quote in context, it is obvious that they have used the quote inappropriately. The original author meant something that does not support their goals. The “Climategate scandal” is a classic case of this. It started with a few stolen emails from the Climate Research Unit of the University of East Anglia. If you read the complete text of the actual emails29 and comprehend the scientific shorthand of climate scientists who are talking casually to each other, it is clear that there was no great “conspiracy” or that they were faking data. All six subsequent investigations have cleared Philip Jones and the other scientists of the University of East Anglia of any wrongdoing or conspiracy.30

Even if there had been some conspiracy on the part of these few scientists, there is no reason to believe that the entire climate science community is secretly working together to generate false information and mislead the public. If there’s one thing that is clear about science, it’s about competition and criticism, not conspiracy and collusion. Most labs are competing with each other, not conspiring together. If one lab publishes a result that is not clearly defensible, other labs will quickly correct it. As James Lawrence Powell wrote31:

Scientists….show no evidence of being more interested in politics or ideology than the average American. Does it make sense to believe that tens of thousands of scientists would be so deeply and secretly committed to bringing down capitalism and the American way of life that they would spend years beyond their undergraduate degrees working to receive master’s and Ph.D. degrees, then go to work in a government laboratory or university, plying the deep oceans, forbidding deserts, icy poles, and torrid jungles, all for far less money than they could have made in industry, all the while biding their time like a Russian sleeper agent in an old spy novel? Scientists tend to be independent and resist authority. That is why you are apt to find them in the laboratory or in the field, as far as possible from the prying eyes of a supervisor. Anyone who believes he could organize thousands of scientists into a conspiracy has never attended a single faculty meeting.

There are many more traits that the climate deniers share with the creationists and Holocaust deniers and others who distort the truth. They pick on small disagreements between different labs as if scientists can’t get their story straight, when in reality there is always a fair amount of give and take between competing labs as they try to get the answer right before the other lab can do so. The key point here is that when all these competing labs around the world have reached a consensus and get the same answer, there is no longer any reason to doubt their common conclusion. The anti-scientists of climate denialism will also point to small errors by individuals in an effort to argue that the entire enterprise cannot be trusted. It is true that scientists are human, and do make mistakes, but the great power of the scientific method is that peer review weeds these out, so that when scientists speak with consensus, there is no doubt that their data are checked carefully.

Finally, a powerful line of evidence that this is a purely political controversy, rather than a scientific debate, is that the membership lists of the creationists and the climate deniers are highly overlapping. Both anti-scientific dogmas are fed to their overlapping audiences through right-wing media such as Fox News, Glenn Beck, and Rush Limbaugh. Just take a look at the “intelligent-design” creationism website for the Discovery Institute. Most of the daily news items lately have nothing to do with creationism at all, but are focused on climate denial and other right-wing causes.32

If the data about global climate change are indeed valid and robust, any qualified scientist should be able to look at them and see if the prevailing scientific interpretation holds up. Indeed, such a test took place. Starting in 2010, a group led by U.C. Berkeley physicist Richard Muller re-examined all the temperature data from the NOAA, East Anglia Hadley Climate Research Unit, and the Goddard Institute of Space Science sources (see Figure 5 below). Even though Muller started out as a skeptic of the temperature data, and was funded by the Koch brothers and other oil company sources, he carefully checked and re-checked the research himself. When the GOP leaders called him to testify before the House Science and Technology Committee in spring 2011, they were expecting him to discredit the temperature data. Instead, Muller shocked his GOP sponsors by demonstrating his scientific integrity and telling the truth: the temperature increase is real, and the scientists who have demonstrated that the climate is changing are right. In the fall of 2011, his study was published, and the conclusions were clear: global warming is real, even to a right-wing skeptical scientist. Unlike the hired-gun scientists who play political games, Muller did what a true scientist should do: if the data go against your biases and preconceptions, then do the right thing and admit it—even if you’ve been paid by sponsors who want to discredit global warming. Muller is a shining example of a scientist whose integrity and honesty came first, and did not sell out to the highest bidder. Science and Anti-Science

## 2AC

### 2AC—Soil Erosion

#### No uniqueness—industrial ag is unsustainable and won’t solve—unsustainable land use and increasing biodiversity loss makes maintaining it impossible

#### Small farms are key to solve soil erosion, economy, pesticide use, monoculture, and biodiversity

**ROSSETT 1999** (Peter, Executive Director of Food First, “On the Benefits of Small Farms,” Feb 8, http://www.foodfirst.org/pubs/policybs/pb4.html)

For more than a century, pundits have confidently predicted the demise of the small farm, labeling it as backward, unproductive, and inefficient -- an obstacle to be overcome in the pursuit of economic development. But this is wrong. Far from being stuck in the past, small-farm agriculture provides a productive, efficient, and ecological vision for the future. If small farms are worth preserving, then now is the time to educate the world’s policy-makers about the genuine value of small farm agriculture. **Small Farm Productivity** How many times have we heard that large farms are more *productive* than small farms, and that we need to consolidate land holdings to take advantage of that greater productivity and efficiency? The actual data shows the opposite -- small farms produce far more per acre or hectare than large farms. One reason for the low levels of production on large farms is that they tend to be *monocultures*. The highest yield of a single crop is often obtained by planting it alone on a field. But while that may produce a lot of one crop, it generates nothing else of use to the farmer. In fact, the bare ground between crop rows invites weed infestation. The weeds then invest labor in weeding or money in herbicide. Large farmers tend to plant monocultures because they are the simplest to manage with heavy machinery. Small farmers, especially in the Third World, are much more likely to plant crop mixtures -- intercropping -- where the empty space between the rows is occupied by other crops. They usually combine or rotate crops and livestock, with manure serving to replenish soil fertility. Such integrated farming systems produce far more per unit area than do monocultures. Though the yield per unit area of one crop -- corn, for example -- may be lower on a small farm than on a large monoculture farm, the total production per unit area, often composed of more than a dozen crops and various animal products, can be far higher. This holds true whether we are talking about an industrial country like the United States, or any country in the Third World. Figure 1 shows the relationship between farm size and total production for fifteen countries in the Third World. In all cases, relatively smaller farm sizes are much more productive per unit area -- 200 to 1,000 percent more productive -- than are larger ones. In the United States the smallest farms, those of 27 acres or less, have more than ten times greater dollar output per acre than larger farms. While in the U.S. this is largely because smaller farms tend to specialize in high value crops like vegetables and flowers, it also reflects relatively more attention devoted to the farm, and more diverse farming systems. Small Farms in Economic Development More bushels of grain is not the only goal of most farm production; farm resources must also generate wealth for the overall improvement of rural life -- including better housing, education, health services, transportation, local business diversification, and more recreational and cultural opportunities. Here in the United States, the question was asked more than a half-century ago: what does the growth of large-scale, industrial agriculture mean for rural towns and communities? Walter Goldschmidt’s classic 1940s study of California’s San Joaquin Valley, *As You Sow: Three Studies in the Social Consequences of Agribusiness*, compared areas dominated by large corporate farms with those still characterized by smaller, family farms. In farming communities dominated by large corporate farms, nearby towns died off. Mechanization meant fewer local people were employed, and absentee ownership meant farm families themselves were no longer to be found. In these corporate-farm towns, the income earned in agriculture was drained off into larger cities to support distant enterprises, while in towns surrounded by family farms, the income circulated among local business establishments, generating jobs and community prosperity. Where family farms predominated, there were more local businesses, paved streets and sidewalks, schools, parks, churches, clubs, and newspapers, better services, higher employment, and more civic participation. Recent studies confirm that Goldschmidt’s findings remain true. If we turn toward the Third World we find similar local benefits to be derived from a small farm economy. The Landless Workers Movement (MST) is a grassroots organization in Brazil that helps landless laborers to organize occupations of idle land belonging to wealthy landlords. When the movement began in the mid-1980s, the mostly conservative mayors of rural towns were violently opposed to MST land occupations in surrounding areas. In recent times, their attitude has changed. Most of their towns are very depressed economically, and occupations can give local economies a much needed boost. Typical occupations consist of 1,000 to 3,000 families, who turn idle land into productive farms. They sell their produce in the marketplaces of the local towns and buy their supplies from local merchants. Not surprisingly those towns with nearby MST settlements are better off economically than other similar towns, and many mayors now actually petition the MST to carry out occupations near their towns. Local and regional economic development benefits from a small farm economy, as do the life and prosperity of rural towns. Can we re-create a small farm economy in places where it has been lost, to improve the well-being of the poor? Recreating a Small Farm Economy Recent history shows that the re-distribution of land to landless and land-poor rural families can be a very effective way to improve rural well-being. We can examine the outcome of every land reform program carried out in the Third World since World War II, being careful to distinguish between genuine land reforms -— when quality land was really distributed to the poor and the power of the rural oligarchy to distort and "capture" policies was broken -- and "fake land reforms" -- when the poor have been relegated to the poorest, most remote soils. In every case of genuine land reform, real, measurable poverty reduction and improvement in human welfare has invariably been the result. Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, Cuba, and China are all good examples. In contrast, countries with reforms that gave only poor quality land to beneficiaries, and/or failed to alter the rural power structures that work against the poor, failed to make a major dent in rural poverty. Mexico and the Philippines are typical cases of the latter. More recently IBASE, a research center in Brazil, studied the impact on government coffers of legalizing MST-style land occupations *cum* settlements versus the services used by equal numbers of people migrating to urban areas. When the landless poor occupy land and force the government to legalize their holdings, it implies costs: compensation of the former landowner, legal expenses, credit for the new farmers, and others. Nevertheless the total cost to the state to maintain the same number of people in an urban shanty town -- including the services and infrastructure they use -- exceeds in just one month, the yearly cost of legalizing land occupations. Another way of looking at it is in terms of the cost of creating a new job. Estimates of the cost of creating a job in the commercial sector of Brazil range from two to twenty times more than the cost of establishing an unem-ployed head of household on farm land, through agrarian reform. Land reform beneficiaries in Brazil have an annual income equivalent to 3.7 minimum wages, while still landless laborers average only 0.7 of the minimum. Infant mortality among families of beneficiaries has dropped to only half of the national average. This provides a powerful argument that using land reform to create a small farm economy is not only good for local economic development, but is also more effective social policy than allowing business-as-usual to keep driving the poor out of rural areas and into burgeoning cities. National Economic Development and "Bubble-Up" Economics A relatively equitable small farmer-based rural economy provides the basis for strong national economic development. The post-war experiences of Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan demonstrate how equitable land distribution fuels economic development. At the end of the war, circumstances including devastation and foreign occupation, conspired to create the conditions for "radical" land reforms in each country, breaking the eco-nomic stranglehold of the landholding class over rural economies. Combined with trade protection to keep farm prices high, and targeted investment in rural areas, small farmers rapidly achieved a high level of purchasing power, which guaranteed domestic markets for fledging industries. The post-war economic "miracles" of these three countries were each fueled at the start by these internal markets centered in rural areas, long before the much heralded "export orientation" policies which much later on pushed those industries to compete in the global economy. This was real triumph for "bubble-up" economics, in which re-distribution of productive assets to the poorest strata of society created the economic basis for rapid development. It stands in stark contrast to the failure of "trickle down" economics to achieve much of anything in the same time period in areas of U.S. dominance, such as much of Latin America, and to the Asian financial crisis, which happened after many of the original policies had been discontinued. Good Stewards of Natural Resources The benefits of small farms extend into the ecological sphere. Where large, industrial-style farms impose a scorched-earth mentality on resource management-- no trees, no wildlife, endless monocultures -- small farmers can be very effective stewards of natural resources and the soil. To begin with, small farmers utilize a broad array of resources and have a vested interest in their sustainability. Their farming systems are diverse, incorporating and preserving significant functional biodiversity within the farm. By preserving biodiversity, open space, and trees, and by reducing land degradation, small farms provide valuable ecosystem services to the larger society. In the United States, small farmers devote 17 percent of their area to woodlands, compared to only five percent on large farms, and keep nearly twice as much of their land in "soil improving uses," including cover crops and green manures. In the Third World, peasant farmers show a tremendous ability to prevent and even reverse land degradation, including soil erosion. Compared to the ecological wasteland of a modern export plantation, the small farm landscape contains a myriad array of biodiversity. The forested areas from which wild foods and leaf litter are extracted, the wood lot, the farm itself with intercropping, agroforestry, and large and small livestock, the fish pond, the backyard garden, allow for the preservation of hundreds if not thousands of wild and cultivated species. Simultaneously, the commitment of family members to maintaining soil fertility on the family farm means an active interest in long-term sustainability not found on large farms owned by absentee investors. The Small Farm Path To the productive, economic, and environmental benefits of small farm agriculture, we can add the continuance of cultural traditions and of the rural way of life. If we are truly concerned about rural peoples and ecosystems, then the preservation and promotion of small, family farm agriculture is a crucial step we must take.

### a/t: Avery

#### Avery’s a biased liar

**Funes and Altieri 09 –** \*Cuban Association of Agricultural and Forestry Technicians AND \*\*Profesor of Agroecology at the University of California, Berkeley and President of the Latin American Scientific Society of Agroecology(Fernando and Miguel, “The Avery Diet: The Hudson Institute’s Misinformation Campaign Against Cuban Agriculture” May, <http://globalalternatives.org/files/AveryCubaDiet.pdf>)

An article written by Dennis Avery, "Cubans Starve on Diet of Lies," was reproduced around the internet in April of this year. 1 Avery is the director of the Center for Global Food Issues at the Hudson Institute, a notorious Right-wing think tank. The financial backers of the Hudson Institute include major agribusiness(e.g. Archer Daniels Midland, ConAgra, Cargill), biotech and pesticide manufacturers(e.g. American Cyanamid, Ciba Geigy, Monsanto, Syngenta). Avery is a veteran of the State Department and the U.S.D.A. He is a well-known pro-industry pundit, and is an outspoken supporter of genetically-engineered crops, pesticides, food irradiation, industrial farming, and free trade, as well as a long-time critic of organic farming. He famously authored the book Saving the Planet With Pesticides and Plastic: The Environmental Triumph of High-Yield Farming (2000).

His article begins with the following phrases:

"The Cubans told the world they had heroically learned to feed themselves without fuel or farm chemicals after their Soviet subsidies collapsed in the early 1990s. They bragged about their “peasant cooperatives,” their biopesticides and organic fertilizers. They heralded their earthworm culture and the predator wasps they unleashed on destructive caterpillars. They boasted about the heroic ox teams they had trained to replace tractors. Organic activists all over the world swooned. Now, a senior Ministry of Agriculture official has admitted in the Cuban press that 84 percent of Cuba’s current food consumption isimported, according to our agricultural attaché in Havana. The organic success was all a lie—a great, gaudy, Communist-style Big Lie of the type that dictators behind the Iron Curtain routinely used throughout the Cold War to hornswoggle the Free World."

Despite the notably bombastic and un-scientific language, his claims deserve examination and rebuttal. He does not cite a source for the 84% figure. Nevertheless, it has been widely reported in the media that Megalys Calvo, Vice Minister of the Economy and Planning Ministry,said in February of 2007 that 84% of items "in the basic food basket" at that time were imported. 2 However, we believe these percentages represent only the food that is distributed through regulated government channels by means of a ration card. Overall data show that Cuba’s food import dependency has been dropping for decades, despite brief upturns due to natural and human-made disasters.

The best time series available on Cuban food import dependency is summarized in the following graph:

(graph omitted by dheidt)

One can see that Cuba's food import dependence actually declined between 1980 and 1997, aside from a spike in the early 1990s, when trade relations with the former Socialist Bloc collapsed.

### Food sec

#### Alt causes and organics solve

Leu 12 – Andre is the President of the International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements. (“Organic agriculture and food security – not a contradiction”, 8/24/2012, <http://www.rural21.com/english/a-closer-look-at/detail/article/organic-agriculture-and-food-security-not-a-contradiction-0000430/>)

Organic farming is not going to succeed in feeding the world’s growing population, its critics say. This is wrong, our author maintains, for there are numerous studies that refute the notion that conventional agriculture turns out higher yields in all circumstances. Moreover, increases in production levels achieved over the last few years have not been able to solve the problem of hunger either. Ever since economist Thomas Malthus wrote ‘An Essay on the Principle of Population’ in 1798 and first raised the spectre of overpopulation, various experts have been predicting the end of human civilisation because of mass starvation. Malthus predicted that human society would starve in the 1800s. The theme was again popularised by Stanford University Professor Paul Ehrlich in his 1968 book, ‘The Population Bomb’. According to his logic, we should all be starving now that the 21st century has arrived. ‘The battle to feed all of humanity is over. In the 1970s the world will undergo famines; hundreds of millions of people are going to starve to death in spite of any crash programs embarked upon now.’ The only famines that occurred since 1968 have been in countries saddled with corrupt governments, political turmoil, civil wars and periodic droughts. The world had enough food for the affected people. It was political and logistical events that prevented them from producing adequate food or stopped aid from reaching them. Hundreds of millions of people did not starve to death. The spectre of mass starvation is again being pushed, based on highly questionable and contestable assumptions, as the motive for justifying genetically modified organisms (GMOs) and the unsustainable use of toxic chemicals to push for higher yields. Enough food for everyone According to the UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and other figures, the world produces more than double the amount of food to feed everyone. Despite this, around one billion people suffer from hunger and another billion are malnourished, lacking the essential micronutrients they need to lead healthy lives. Clearly, our current market-based distribution systems are failing the poorest as they cannot afford to buy this food. The market-based systems concentrate the food in the areas where people have the money to pay for it. Consequently one billion adults are overweight and almost half of them are obese. Food losses also are staggering. About one-third of the food produced for human consumption is lost or wasted every year, amounting to about 1.3 billion tons annually (FAO, 2011). Reducing food losses and food waste, and improving food access, is highly relevant to efforts to combat hunger, raise income and improve food security in the world's poorest countries. Simple affordable measures such as village grain silos and better transport would prevent most of these losses. The problem of hunger is mostly due to poor distribution systems and inadequate production in the poorest communities. It has very little to do with the total amount of food produced in the world. Where Organic has higher yields: Conditions of climate extremes … Research has shown two significant areas where organic systems have higher yields than the conventional system. These are under conditions of climate extremes and in traditional smallholder systems. Both of these areas are critical to achieving global food security. According to research by NASA and others the world is seeing increases in the frequency of extreme weather events such as droughts and heavy rainfall. Even if the world stopped polluting the planet with greenhouse gases tomorrow, it would take many decades to reverse climate change. This means that farmers have to adapt to the increasing intensity and frequency of adverse and extreme weather events such as droughts and heavy, damaging rainfall. Published studies show that organic farming systems are more resilient to the predicted weather extremes and can produce higher yields than conventional farming systems in such conditions (Drinkwater, Wagoner and Sarrantonio, 1998; Welsh, 1999; Pimentel, 2005). For instance, the Wisconsin Integrated Cropping Systems Trials found that organic yields were higher in drought years and the same as conventional yields in normal weather years (Posner et al., 2008). Similarly, Farming Systems Trials (FST) of the US-based Rodale Institute showed that the organic systems produced more maize than the conventional system in drought years . The average maize yields during the drought years were from 28 per cent to 34 per cent higher in the two organic systems. The yields were 6,938 and 7,235 kg per hectare in the organic animal and the organic legume systems respectively, compared with 5,333 kg per hectare in the conventional system (Pimentel, 2005). The researchers attributed the higher yields in the dry years to the ability of the soils on organic farms to better absorb rainfall. This is due to the higher levels of organic carbon in these soils, which makes them more friable and better able to store and capture rainwater which can then be used for crops (La Salle and Hepperly, 2008). Improved efficiency of water use. Research also shows that organic systems use water more efficiently due to better soil structure and higher levels of humus and other organic matter compounds (Lotter, Seidel and Liebhart, 2003; Pimentel, 2005). Lotter and colleagues collected data over ten years during the Rodale Farming System Trials. Their research showed that the organic manure system and organic legume system (LEG) treatments improve the soil’s water-holding capacity, infiltration rate and water capture efficiency. The LEG maize soils averaged a 13 per cent higher water content than conventional system (CNV) soils at the same crop stage, and 7 per cent higher than CNV soils in soybean plots (Lotter, Seidel and Liebhart, 2003). The more porous structure of organically treated soil allows rainwater to quickly penetrate the soil, resulting in less water loss from run-off and higher levels of water capture. This was particularly evident during the two days of torrential downpours from Hurricane Floyd, which hit the eastern United States and the Bahamas in September 1999, when the organic systems captured around double the water than the conventional systems captured (Lotter, Seidel and Liebhart, 2003). This is very significant information as the majority of the world farming systems are rainfed. The world does not have the resources to irrigate all of the agricultural lands. Nor should such a project be started as damming the world's watercourses, pumping from all the underground aquifers and building millions of kilometres of channels would be an unprecedented environmental disaster. Improving the efficiency of rainfed agricultural systems through organic practices is the most efficient, cost effective, environmentally sustainable and practical solution to ensure reliable food production in the increasing weather extremes being caused by climate change. … and smallholder farmer systems The other critical area where research is showing higher yields for good practice organic systems is in traditional smallholder systems. This is very important information as over 95 per cent of the world’s farmers fall into this category. A report by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) found that organic agriculture increases yields in Africa. ‘… the average crop yield was … 116 per cent increase for all African projects and 128 per cent increase for the projects in East Africa.’ The report notes that despite the introduction of conventional agriculture in Africa, food production per person is 10 per cent lower now, than in the 1960s. ‘The evidence presented in this study supports the argument that organic agriculture can be more conducive to food security in Africa than most conventional production systems, and that it is more likely to be sustainable in the long term’, Supachai Panitchpakdi, Secretary General of UNCTAD and Executive Director of UNEP Achim Steiner stated. This is crucial information as FAO data shows that 80 per cent of the food in the developing world comes from smallholder farmers such as those in Africa. The developing world is also the region where most of the one billion undernourished people live, the majority of which are smallholder farmers. With a more than 100 per cent increase in food production in these traditional farming systems, organic agriculture provides the ideal solution to end hunger and ensure global food security**.** The key to food security Information published by the ETC group, an international organisation dedicated to “the conservation and sustainable advancement of cultural and ecological diversity and human rights”, shows that 70 per cent of the world's food is produced by smallholders and only 30 per cent by the agribusiness sector (ETC group, 2009; see Figure below). Increasing the yields in the 30 per cent that comes from the agribusiness sector will show little benefit for two reasons. Firstly, this sector is already high-yielding, and it has very little scope for large increases in yields such as the more than 100 per cent that can be achieved by organic methods in traditional smallholder systems. Secondly, this sector is largely focused on the commodity supply chain. The large food surpluses produced in the sector have not lowered the number of people who are hungry. According to FAO figures, this number has been steadily increasing since 1985. Fifty per cent of the world’s hungry are smallholder farmers and 20 per cent are the landless poor who rely on smallholders for their employment (see Figure below). Logically, increasing the yields in this sector is the key to ending hunger and achieving food security. Organic methods are the most suitable as the necessary methods and inputs that are needed to do this can be sourced locally at no or very little cost to the farmers. Conventional systems have largely failed to provide consistent higher yields to the poorest farmers as the expensive synthetic chemical inputs have to be purchased. Most of these farmers do not have the income to do this. It is an inappropriate economic model for the world’s most vulnerable farmers whereas organic agriculture is an appropriate one. A good example is a project managed by the Institute of Sustainable Development in Tigray, Ethiopia (see Box at the end of the article). What about yields and farm income? The assumption that greater inputs of synthetic chemical fertilisers and pesticides are needed to increase food yields is not always accurate. In a study published in The Living Land, Professor Jules Pretty of Essex University looked at projects in seven industrialised countries of Europe and North America. ‘Farmers are finding that they can cut their inputs of costly pesticides and fertilisers substantially, varying from 20 to 80 per cent, and be financially better off. Yields do fall to begin with (by 10 to 15 % typically), but there is compelling evidence that they soon rise and go on increasing. In the USA, for example, the top quarter sustainable agriculture farmers now have higher yields than conventional farmers, as well as a much lower negative impact on the environment’ (Pretty, 1998a). Numerous studies into organic systems confirm this insight – the following refers to only a few of them: US Agricultural Research Service (ARS) Pecan Trial. The ARS organically managed pecans out-yielded the conventionally managed, chemically fertilised Gebert orchard in each of the past five years. Yields on ARS’ organic test site surpassed the Gebert commercial orchard by 18 pounds of pecan nuts per tree in 2005 and by 12 pounds per tree in 2007 (Bradford J.M., 2008). Rodale Organic Low/No Till. The Rodale Institute (Pennsylvania, USA) has been trialling a range of organic low tillage and no tillage systems. The 2006 trials resulted in organic yields of 160 bushels an acre (bu/ac) compared to the County average of 130 bu/ac. Iowa Trials. The results from the Long Term Agroecological Research (LTAR), a 12 year collaborative effort between producers and researchers led by Dr Kathleen Delate of Iowa State University (Iowa, USA) showed that while the organic systems had lower yields in the beginning, by year four they started to exceed the conventional crops. Across all rotations, organic corn harvests averaged 130 bushels per acre while conventional corn yield was 112 bushels per acre. Similarly, organic soybean yield was 45 bu/ac compared to the conventional yield of 40 bu/ac in the fourth year. Cost-wise, on average, the organic crops’ revenue was twice that of conventional crops due to the savings from non-utilisation of chemical fertilisers and pesticides (Delate, 2010). Developing countries.Nicolas Parrott of Cardiff University, UK, authored a report, ‘The Real Green Revolution’. He gives case studies that confirm the success of organic and agroecological farming techniques in the developing world (Parrott, 2002): Studies comparing the income of organic farms with conventional farms have found that the net incomes are similar, with best practice organic systems having higher net incomes (Cacek, 1986 and Wynen, 2006). A study by Dr Rick Welsh of the Wallace Institute, USA, has also shown that organic farms can be more profitable. The premium paid for organic produce is not always a factor in this extra profitability. While many organic farmers have higher incomes due to the premium they receive, others have higher net incomes due to their lower input costs rather than from the premium. The United Nations report already cited notes: ‘A transition to integrated organic agriculture, delivering greater benefits at the scale occurring in these projects, has been shown to increase access to food in a variety of ways: by increasing yields, increasing total on-farm productivity, enabling farmers to use their higher earnings from export to buy food, and, as a result of higher on-farm yields, enabling the wider community to buy organic food at local markets.’ Conclusion There is very good research that clearly shows organic agriculture can get the yields that are needed to feed the poor and the hungry. This is especially the case in smallholder agriculture – the majority of the world’s farmers. ‘All case studies which focused on food production in this research where data have been reported have shown increases in per hectare productivity of food crops, which challenges the popular myth that organic agriculture cannot increase agricultural productivity’, the UN report stated. Organic agriculture is a low-cost and effective way to help many of the world’s poorest people to have good levels of nutrition and a better quality of life. We need to see more research and extension in this area to ensure that all farmers can improve their yields and resilience by adopting the appropriate best-practice organic systems (see article Challenges and opportunies for organic research and extension).

### T

#### This arg begs the question of what economic engagement is

#### We meet and counterinterpretation—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.

#### Our interpretation is key to aff ground—the entire Venezuela and Cuba parts of the topic are about the sanctions in place now—aff ground is key to effective topic innovation which turns ground

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

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

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

#### it’s the EMBARGO—no abuse

### CP

#### Perm do the counterplan—allow

#### Perm do both

#### The embargo is codified—you have to do law—IF they’re right that the aff DOESN’T have to do law, but that means there’s no distincton between the plan

#### Menendez blocks the plan—he’s too powerful

Goodman 12 Alana goodman, Editor @ Commentary Magazine, 12/18/12. <http://www.commentarymagazine.com/2012/12/18/menendez-expected-to-take-over-as-foreign-relations-chair/#more-814117>

Finally, some good news to come out of John Kerry’s likely secretary of state appointment: Sen. John Kerry’s (D-Mass.) anticipated move to the State Department would leave the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in the hands of Sen. Robert Menendez (D-N.J.), who has **consistently bucked the White House** on Cuba and Iran. Menendez is next in line to take over the panel if Sen. Barbara Boxer (D-Calif.) opts to keep her chairmanship of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, as is widely expected. That would give Menendez a **key role** in approving diplomatic nominees and international treaties — **crucial leverage to demand a tougher stance** against America’s foes. “You **can’t work around** the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee when he’s willing to **dig in his heels on important issues,”** said Roger Noriega, a former assistant secretary of State for Western Hemisphere Affairs under President George W. Bush who’s enthused by Menendez’s possible promotion. “At the same time, he’s going to be expected to be a team player — but that has its limits. “I think he’ll give folks in the administration **something to think about before they cross him,** frankly.” When it comes to Iran sanctions, it would be **difficult to find a stronger Democratic senator** than Menendez. He’s been **active on the issue for years,** at least since his time on the House international relations committee (now foreign affairs). On the Senate finance committee, he’s joined up with Senator Mark Kirk on several critically important Iran sanctions amendments. But the White House can’t be thrilled withMenendez’s likely new role. He’s had **no reservations about fighting** the Obama administration over sanctions,nor clashing with them over Armenia and Cuba. The last thing Obama wants is a critic from his own party attacking his Iran policy from such a prominent perch in the Senate.

#### Condo

### 2AC—Neoliberalism

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

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

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

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

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

#### Permutation do the plan and interrogate neoliberal economic engagement with latin America from the starting point of knowledge production.

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

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

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

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

#### Cuban globalization is inevitable and doesn’t cause assimilation
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Despite Backer’s assertion that Cuba, as a state, must relinquish its power and conform to a prevalent form of engagement, such as capitalism, Cuba has since shown that it will globalize without doing so. Instead, Cuba is a global actor by its own choice, without withering as a state, and by creating its own model of engagement in conformance with its ideology. Indeed, Cuba cannot and will not resist globalization; it must globalize to survive. And yet, while Cuba globalizes, it does so in its own manner, in accordance with its own history, culture, and ideology. A. Changes in Cuba 1. The Rise of Raúl: Changes from 2004 to 2011 Even before the announcement of the sixth National Congress of the Communist Part of Cuba and the economic reform, other major changes occurred over the previous seven years in Cuban policy—many of which precede the current economic proposals and provide context to the everchanging and globalizing world surrounding Cuban decision-making. The accession of Raúl Castro as president, following Fidel Castro’s illness in July 2006, marked the beginning of open acknowledgement of the struggling Cuban economy and a call for “open debate” regarding “structural and conceptual changes” that needed to occur.66 Within the first few years of Raúl’s presidency, changes allowed Cubans to embrace limited forms of consumerism by purchasing mobile phones and staying in tourist hotels67 and to increase autonomy by permitting private farmers to buy supplies and equipment to increase the use of land.68 Although the initial reforms seem minor, larger reforms followed in 2008, as the Cuban government implemented new policies that expanded access to public land for farming, increased wages, raised the retirement age, and modernized the infrastructure of transportation.69 Many of the changes implemented and issues raised for debate by Raúl Castro show the vast differences between his leadership and philosophy with that of Fidel Castro. To begin, Raúl Castro’s role as the former defense minister, the most profitable state agency, lends itself to an entirely different manner of governance, one in which Castro “takes the view that Cuba can no longer afford the bloated and paternalistic state he inherited from Fidel, and the state’s payroll should be linked to productivity.”72 Included in Castro’s goal for increased productivity are a restructuring of the economy, a reduction in spending on universal education and healthcare, phasing out ration book to be replaced with targeted help, and “granting wide autonomy to state companies” with expectations that they will “pay their own way— and [be] liquidated if they do not,” and can “set up joint ventures with foreign companies” to create jobs.73 These changes, while marking change in Cuba, show the Cuban state reconfiguring itself, albeit out of necessity, to remain an actor within the globalized world. Although changes exist, they are done in the context and by the power of the Cuban government, not in accordance with the U.S. or Chinese model of state engagement. 2. The Turning Point: The Sixth National Congress of the Communist Party of Cuba and Economic Reform In November 2010, Raúl Castro announced that Cuba would hold the sixth National Congress of the Communist Party of Cuba in April 2011, after a fourteen-year hiatus, to “make fundamental decisions on how to modernize the Cuban economic model and adopt the paths for economic and social policy of the party and the revolution.” In addition to the announcement, the Cuban government released the “Economic and Social Policy Development Project” (Proyecto de Lineamientos de la Política Económica y Social del Partido y la Revolución), a thirty-two page booklet that presents the government’s plans.75 The ultimate aim of these reforms is, in the words of Raúl Castro, to prevent Cuba from falling “off a cliff” due to economic disaster.76 More specifically, the plan intends “to boost exports and reduce reliance on imports, and to unify Cuba’s twin currencies of worthless domestic pesos and stronger ‘convertible’ ones.”77 The specific points of the plan include an economic management model and policies for macroeconomics, foreign affairs, science, technology and innovation, health, education and employment, agribusiness, industry and energy, tourism, transportation, housing and water resources, and trade.78 Despite the wide range of changes to be implemented and mounting commentary that such “bold changes . . . may herald the beginning of [Cuban communism’s] end,”79 the plan itself states that “[t]he economic policy in this new phase will follow the principle that socialism is the only way to overcome our difficulties and preserve the gains of the Revolution, and that as we update our economic model, planning will be paramount, not the market.”80 In addition to the plan, the Cuban government, the largest employer in the nation, declared its intention to lay off over one million workers; by April 1, 2011, 500,000 Cubans were scheduled to lose their jobs, to be followed by another 800,000 workers before 2013.81 Eventually, “up to two-in-five Cubans will no longer work for the state.”82 When compared to the current level of self-employment, which is at about 143,00083 of the 11.2 million citizens,84 the magnitude and significance of the layoffs is better understood. In place of government employment, the government encourages citizens to seek self-employment or create co-operatives with others85—a shocking development for a country that, for the last forty years, has not allowed citizens to employ other Cubans, as it is considered exploitation by the Cuban Constitution to have a non-family “employee.”86 The 178 government-approved forms of self-employment include eighty-three professions in which non-relative employees may be hired and twentynine previously unauthorized professions and consist of a wide range of professions, including food vendors, sports trainers, stonemasons, bookkeepers, auto body workers, and other various trades.87 In exchange for working in the private sector, the self-employed will pay taxes ranging from twenty-five to fifty percent of their personal income.88 The changes proposed by Cuba differ markedly from those of the past,89 raising questions about the future trajectory of this reform. This is especially so if Cuba eventually becomes a hybrid or market-based economy. Despite such conjecture, the Cuban government remains committed to its Marxist-Leninist roots; in the words of Marino Murillo Jorge, the Cuban Economic and Planning Minister, “[t]here is no reform, it is an update of the economic model. No one thinks that we are going to turn over property: we are going to administer it in another way.”90 Juan Triana, an economist at the University of Havana, declared these economic reforms are the most important for Cuba since 1975, because “[i]t reaffirms the revolutionary essence of our political system, but changes the philosophy of our economic management.”91 Ultimately, the Cuban government, out of necessity, aims to restructure its economic system to increase the now-lacking productivity and efficiency that continue to plague the country and to counterbalance many fundamental benefits provided by the Cuban government, including free health care and education, all within the context of its current political ideology.92 As such, Cuba remains resolute in its resistance to the predominant models of globalization, and due to the flexibility of globalization, it will be able to do so. B. Global Changes In addition to massive changes to the Cuban economic model, other changes around the world occurred that undoubtedly affected the Cuban policies, including the economic crisis that peaked in 2008.93 Additionally, the election of Barack Obama ushered in a possible era of improved relations with Cuba, as the President commented that he looked forward to “a new era of partnership.”94 This resulted in policies that eased travel restrictions to Cuba by Cuban Americans and limitations on the importation of food and medicine to Cuba and travel to Cuba to sell goods.95 Although these changes occurred, the United States blockade against Cuba remains, and most likely will continue to remain until Cuba becomes more “democratic,”96 despite pressure from the United Nations General Assembly,97 members of the United States Congress,98 and even the U.S. public99 to end the decades-old embargo. Indeed, in the face of positive gains that promise better ties with Cuba in the future, Raúl Castro deemed the changes “fine”100 and claimed that the embargo remains without political or moral justification and that Cuba is unwilling “to negotiate our sovereignty nor our political and social system, and our right to self-determination and internal affairs.”101 As such, Cuba remains resistant to the capitalist model of engagement espoused by the United States. In addition to increased pressure to fully harmonize Cuba with the global market through changes in United States-Cuban policy, another important development in the context of globalization is the growth of the Chinese economy. China has been growing by an average of more than ten percent per year for the last ten years; it is the world’s thirdlargest economy102 and has strengthened its links to Cuba’s economy, as evidenced by trade and commercial ties between the two countries.103 Yet, Cuba is not following any one model; instead, this engagement by Cuba as a global actor is dispositive of the flexibility of globalization. III. GLOBALIZATION AND CHANGE IN CUBA As Cuba trends against some scholars’ expectations, the focus now shifts to the reasons behind Cuba’s policies, the role of globalization in Cuba’s decisions, and what this teaches us about globalization and the role of the state. Finally, this paper puts forth three essential tenets to the Cuban ideology that must be reaffirmed and used as guidance as Cuba controls its entry into globalized society. A. Theories for Change Cuba is changing its economic policies, and this change marks a turning point in Cuban economic policy in the past half-century. It is equally clear that the driving forces of these policies are both internal and external, as Cuba struggles with pressures from the outside global market, natural disasters, and foreign relations while coping with increasing domestic problems of inefficiency, scarcity of resources, and political change within its own borders. Truly, the changes occurring in Cuba are a result of globalization, as external processes and internal forces transform Cuba and, at the same time, as Cuba participates in the transformation process itself in its implementation of new policies. In response to the proposed economic reforms, several theories emerged with explanations for the true reason for Cuba’s policies. As previously stated, Cuba is a different state; it would seem natural for Cuba to be immune to global pressure. Yet, Cuba finds its own ways to globalize. Although the explanations put forth by various commentators present an incomplete analysis of changes that, while significant, remain firmly attached to Marxist-Leninist doctrine, these explanations, when presented in the context of globalization, illuminate both the Cuban policies and the continued evolution of globalization, presenting another generation of globalization.104 While the three theories presented here—(1) that Cuba globalizes out of necessity; (2) that Cuba globalizes to prepare its government for the post-Castro transition; and (3) that Cuba globalizes due to internal pressure—each fails to provide a complete explanation for the Cuban economic reforms; they illustrate generally the role of the state as an actor in a globalized world. 1. Cuba Globalizes Out of Necessity This first theory for change is that Cuba, rather than readily doing so of its own free will, globalizes out of pure necessity. As previously discussed, the current economic state of Cuba is dire, leading some to argue that Cuba enacts these changes due to its economic distress after years spent as a “bloated and paternalistic state.”105 Under this theory, Cuba adopts a more efficient and streamlined economy because of its past failure rather than out of true enthusiasm for reform, marking a doctrinal turning point for Cuba.106 Another argument is that Cuba is globalizing because of pressure from China, a close political and economic ally,107 over Cuba’s struggles to repay debt.108 Looking to the similarities between potential reforms and those used in International Monetary Fund bail outs,109 it could be argued that pressure from China to improve Cuba’s waning economy drives the adoption of reforms, perhaps leading to the gradual adoption of a system similar to that of China’s market socialism. Although these theories argue that Cuba is becoming more marketbased and less based in Fidelismo, they are understood more appropriately as the acknowledgment by Cuba that it no longer can remain isolationist in a globalized world. Additionally, while it seems that Cuba is eager to learn from the Chinese experience,110 it does not appear that Cuba globalizes its economy or mirrors the Chinese hybrid system simply to motivate China to “further loosen[] its purse strings.”111 In the context of globalization, these changes are a result of global harmonization112 with common practices, rather than an acknowledgment of ideological defeat, and they reiterate that the state, even while resistant to predominant models of globalization, can refigure itself to globalize in its own model. 2. Cuba Globalizes to Prepare Its Government for the Post-Castro Transition Another theory looks to the age of the Cuban government as a motivation for the changes, perhaps arguing that the aging113 Castro brothers are preparing their country for transition into a new economic model after their deaths.114 With Fidel, the backbone of Cuban isolationism, no longer in power, perhaps Raúl, the more open-minded, pragmatic ruler, aims to institute reforms to prepare for the inevitable death of the revolutionary leaders. In addition to aging leaders, there is also the concern of aging ideas and whether the Cuban model is outdated and in need of updating. Backer emphasizes that the Cuban “vocabulary has become increasingly antiquated, even by Marxist-Leninist standards,” something that led to isolation even amongst Communist states such as China and Vietnam.115 Although in 2004 it seemed that Cuba was “increasingly unable or unwilling to understand changes in other Marxist-Leninist states,”116 today, it seems that Cuba is admittedly willing to “take advantage” of the reforms of other Communist countries117 and has opened the opportunity for dialogue regarding the possible benefits or shortcomings of the Chinese system as applied to Cuba. Moreover, while the influence of other Communist states that utilize a hybrid system may provide guidance, Cuba remains committed to socialism as it implements changes118 and insists that Cuba is not copying any other models in its reforms.119 Within the context of globalization, concerns regarding the aging leadership and outdated economic policies obviously influence Cuban policies, so they may be harmonized better with the global market. In addition, Cuba’s close relationship with China may partially influence how Cuba chooses to update its policies. Cuba is reforming its admittedly antiquated policies120 in order to withstand a change in power; in doing so, it will remain a powerful actor in its emerging global economy. In short, to succeed, the government must continue to bring Cuba into the global market so that it may continue to strengthen its links with other countries, organizations, and networks, yet, in doing so, the government must also choose the manner and mode of global engagement. 3. Cuba Globalizes Due to Internal Pressure A final presented theory is that the economic reforms merely legalize already-existing informal private enterprises that were formerly prohibited.121 While it could be argued that this reason undercuts the legitimacy of the decision or shows the weakness of the Cuban government, in the context of globalization, internal pressures are an acknowledged, powerful force in the decision-making process of the state. Internal pressures, whether based on linkages between citizens down the street or across the world, influence the decisionmaking of a state as much as forces from other states or international groups.122 In Cuba, there has long been internal criticism of “the centralizing, state-monopolistic, and bureaucratized form of Marxist-Leninism represented by Stalinist Cuba.”123 Dissent, even where citizens have limited access to the Internet124 and freedom of assembly,125 and actions taken by citizens, such as Cuban emigration due to a lack of earning potential,126 is a forceful internal, globalizing pressure that the Cuban government must and will address through its decision-making process. Rather than weakening, due to this pressure, the Cuban state evolves itself into an involved global actor. B. Globalization: the Cause and the Answer Ultimately, all of the forces found in these theories make it difficult for a state like Cuba to resist change, as predicted by Larry Catá Backer.127 Moreover, globalization itself accounts for all of these changes—it is both the transformative trigger and the answer to Cuba’s motivation to reform. From a case study of Cuba, a historically resistant country, the overwhelmingly unavoidable nature of globalization becomes obvious; in the words of Fidel Castro, globalization is an “inevitable phenomenon.”128 However, the mere fact that globalization is inescapable for Cuba does not mean that Cuba must change its ideological basis or goals in order to globalize; Castro conditioned his declaration by saying that globalization was not inevitable if it was an imposition of neoliberal globalization.129 Today, under the leadership of Raúl Castro, it is clear that, contrary to Backer’s 2004 prediction, a fundamental change of ideology is not a requisite for Cuban reform.130 Instead, Cuba changes its economy within the context and the understanding of its own Marxist-Leninist goals, rather than mirroring the Chinese or the neoliberal forms of globalization. The very fact that Cuba is reluctant to globalize or is not globalizing for altruistic, market-based reasons does not negate the significance of its reforms. Indeed, the importance of the reforms is that Cuba, as a state, decides to implement changes, albeit in a new model, to remain in power and to engage the global economy. Moreover, in the context of globalization, the fact that these changes are not accompanied with fundamental changes to the Cuban Marxist-Leninist framework is an even stronger argument that global harmonization does not require ideological homogenization, linear changes, or a simplistic one world model. Globalization is infinitely flexible, complex, and diverse. Globalization in today’s world no longer requires homogenization; Cuba does not need to either adopt a neoliberal or Maoist version of economics to globalize. Instead, it can remain Marxist-Leninist while entering into the global economy. Just as neoliberal policies are not the only concept of globalization, as seen in China, so too Chinese Maoism is not the only alternative form of globalization. The fundamental differences between China and Cuba are vast—for example, the focus of the Cuban reform differs from that of the Chinese,131 the decision by Cuban officials to shun Chinese “market socialism”132 in favor of limited Communist reforms,133 and the histories and cultures of the two countries differ.134 Cuba presents a different story of globalization—one of a nation, rather than making an ideological change without regard to outside circumstances, instead shifting policies out of necessity and the need to survive in a changed world. Moreover, Cuba’s story of globalization is one of a nation attempting to limit negative effects of globalization. Cuba, while symbolically isolated for the last sixty years, was not immune from globalization—the country’s resistance wreaked havoc upon the economic and social growth of the nation. Instead, Cuba, as a global actor, reconfigures itself to retain power in its new model of global engagement. And yet, Cuba’s decision to gradually reform economic policies is not made in isolation; while Raúl Castro certainly makes the decisions, many of these decisions have already been made for Cuba by a globalized world. Upon review, Cuba will retain its ideological goals without completely compromising or adhering to the other forms of governance—this is what globalization means, the permeation of even the most historically uncompromising country and the harmonization of certain key ideas and practices embraced by the rest of the world. Moreover, it shows that globalization does not stop with market-based or neoliberal governance; instead, as Deng Xiaoping stated, “[The] [m]arket can also serve socialism.”135 Although Cuba certainly will stop short of embracing market socialism, it is engaging economic globalization as a global actor.136 The state can carve out niches for globalization; however, the question remains how Cuba and other states can limit the undesirable aspects of globalization—here, the neoliberal parts—while benefitting from the harmonization of globalization.

### 2AC—Debt Ceiling DA

#### Passage inevitable because of polling numbers and PC isn’t key

Klein and Soltas 10-11 \*Columnist for the Washington Post, Bloomberg, (Ezra and Evan, “Wonkbook: The shutdown is a total disaster for the GOP,” www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2013/10/11/wonkbook-the-shutdown-is-a-total-disaster-for-the-gop/

Thursday's Wall Street Journal/NBC News poll hit the Republican Party like a bomb.¶ It found, as Gallup had, the Republican Party (and, separately, the Tea Party) at "all-time lows in the history of the poll." It found Republicans taking more blame for the shutdown than they had in 1995. It found more Americans believing the shutdown is a serious problem than in 1995.¶ Even worse for the GOP is what the pollsters called "the Boomerang Effect": Both President Obama and Obamacare are more popular than they were a month ago. Obamacare in particular gained seven points. (More poll highlights here, full results here.)¶ It's hard to overstate the magnitude of the GOP's strategic failure here: Obamacare's launch has been awful. More than a week after the federal insurance marketplaces opened, most people can't purchase insurance on the first try. But Republicans have chosen such a wildly unpopular strategy to oppose it that they've helped both Obamacare and its author in the polls.¶ This could've been a week when Republicans crystallized the case against Obamacare. Instead it's been a week in which they've crystallized the case against themselves.¶ And for what? In 2011, when Republicans last tried serious hostage taking, they managed to drive down both their numbers and President Obama's numbers. But even if they could manage that now -- and while the NBC/WSJ and Washington Post/ABC News polls both showed some improvement in Obama's numbers, an AP poll showed deterioration -- this isn't 2011.¶ In 2011, President Obama was going to be on the ballot against a Republican candidate who wasn't involved in the mess in Washington. The congressional GOP's kamikaze mission made sense as a way to aid an outsider challenger like Mitt Romney. But Obama won't be on any more ballots. Congressional Republicans will be. At this point, it's not a kamikaze mission. It's just suicide.¶ Senior Republicans -- who never wanted to be in this mess in the first place -- are increasingly desperate to get out. On Thursday, House Republicans floated a six-week delay of the debt ceiling and Senate Republicans floated a proposal that would reopen the government and raise the debt ceiling in return for repeal of the medical-device tax and a handful of other minor concessions.¶ Democrats didn't jump at either proposal. Their position is no policy negotiations until the government is reopened and the debt-ceiling is raised and they're seeing nothing in the polls to change their mind.¶ The problem for Republicans right now is they still believe they need to get something, anything, in return for funding the government and paying the bills. They promised their base concessions and they feel they need to deliver. But as of yet, they're still not prepared to give anything up -- at least not anything Democrats see as a concession.¶ The hope was that the pain of the shutdown and the Democrats' fear of the debt ceiling would give the GOP leverage. But all Democrats are seeing is a disaster for the GOP. And at this point, the GOP is seeing it, too.

#### Raising the debt ceiling isn’t an opportunity to the plan because the judge has agential ambit over both—you should only consider opportunity costs because that’s critical training for real-world decisionmaking

#### Obama fails and increases opposition

Klein 10/9 – Ezra Klein is the editor of Wonkblog and a columnist at the Washington Post, as well as a contributor to MSNBC and Bloomberg. His work focuses on domestic and economic policymaking, as well as the political system that’s constantly screwing it up. (“The problem with President Obama’s shutdown strategy”, October 9, 2013, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2013/10/09/the-problem-with-president-obamas-shutdown-strategy/>)

Added a letter for grammar

Being president of a divided country is basically an impossible job. To get anything done, you have to try to persuade the American people to support you. But the act of persuading the American people makes the opposition party more determined to oppose you.

This is the paradox of presidential leadership: When the president publicly leads, the minority party becomes less likely to follow.

On Tuesday, President Obama held a lengthy news conference on the shutdown. "Members of Congress, and the House Republicans in particular," he said, "don't get to demand ransom in exchange for doing their jobs. And two of their very basic jobs are passing a budget and making sure that America's paying its bills. They don't also get to say, you know, unless you give me what the voters rejected in the last election, I'm going to cause a recession. That's not how it works. No American president would deal with a foreign leader like this. Most of you would not deal with either co-workers or business associates in this fashion. And we shouldn't be dealing this way here in Washington."

What he was doing in the news conference made sense: He was arguing to the press and to the American people that the shutdown was the GOP's fault and that it would end -- and broader negotiations could begin -- as soon as Republicans decided to reopen the government.

The political theory here is clear: Obama is trying to marshal public opinion against the GOP. If enough Republicans are getting angry calls from their constituents and seeing polls that look disastrous for their party, they'll find a way to back down.

But it can backfire badly. Every second Obama stood at that podium made it a bit harder for the Republican[s] Party to retreat. The more he repeats that this is their shutdown and they need to end it, the more their party suffers if they can't find a way to prove the president wrong. Obama's efforts to move public opinion toward him also moves Republican opinion against him.

Frances Lee, a political scientist at the University of Maryland, has studied the effect of presidential polarization on the U.S. Congress. In her book “Beyond Ideology,” she shows that when the president announces his position on an issue -- even an uncontroversial one -- it increases the likelihood of a party-line vote.

“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 told me. “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.”

When the shutdown began, Obama wasn't much of a player in it. In fact, when the shutdown began, it was more of a Republican vs. Republican story than Republican vs. Democrat. A shutdown was a loss for John Boehner and a win for Ted Cruz.

But now Obama is a player. If the government is cleanly reopened, that's a win for Obama and a loss for John Boehner. More importantly, it's a win for Democrats and a loss for Republicans. And that makes it a much tougher problem to resolve because it unites Republicans who are against the shutdown strategy but even more against losing to Barack Obama.

The Washington Examiner's Byron York interviewed an anonymous Republican congressman about the shutdown. The congressman was clearly not happy that Republicans had let themselves end up in this position. "This isn't exactly the fight I think Republicans wanted to have, certainly that the leadership wanted to have," he said.

But that didn't matter anymore. Obama, the congressman continued, is "going to try to humiliate the speaker in front of his conference. And how effective a negotiating partner do you think he'll be then? You're putting the guy in a position where he's got nothing to lose, because you're not giving him anything to win."

You can see the results in the collapse of the GOP's demands. They're not trying to undo Obamacare anymore. They're embracing the kind of budget commissions they've spent six months opposing. They're just trying to find some way to eke out a win. This isn't about the policy anymore. It's about Obama. And Obama isn't giving Republicans a clear path to backing down without looking like they lost.

The White House knows this perfectly well. They just don't believe it's healthy to bend and buckle until Republicans find a way out. It's not their job, they say, to help Boehner out of promises he shouldn't have made. They weren't the ones who promised their base that the debt ceiling would be a moment of triumph. They weren't the ones who bowed to pressure from their extreme wing and chose a reckless strategy of brinksmanship. They weren't the ones who set up a political dynamic in which keeping the government open and paying our bills counts as "a loss" for one party or the other. Boehner needs to learn to stop writing checks he can't cash.

All that may be true. But the White House is still pursuing a strategy that makes it harder for Boehner and the Republicans to back down. Their gamble is that the power of public opinion will overwhelm the power of presidential polarization. And if the Republican Party loses totally -- loses in a way where they can't tell themselves it was a win -- that'll be the end of these tactics.

It might be a bet worth making. But it's still a bet. And every time Obama goes out and lashes the Republicans for shutting down the government, the stakes get a little bit higher.

#### Fiat solves the link—people don’t backlash against themselves and the plan passes immediately with no debate

#### He’s being briefed on the Merchant Marine Academy – this has taken his focus and dilluted his message

Jackson 10-13

[David. Politics for USA Today. <http://www.usatoday.com/story/theoval/2013/10/13/obama-mcdonough-merchant-marine-academy-nabors/2975763/> //GBS-JV]

White House Chief of Staff Denis McDonough and other aides will brief President Obama on Sunday about effects that include the cancellation of classes at the Merchant Marine Academy in Kings Point, N.Y.¶ The academy has been forced to cancel this week's classes because of the shutdown, the White House says. It had already moved up its fall break from Nov. 1 to Oct. 4.¶ Not on today's schedule: Meetings with members of Congress about the shutdown and debt ceiling.

#### Oil lobbies solve the link

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

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

#### Case turns the da—terrorist attack sends massive shocks and panic throughout the global economy

#### Obama will unilaterally resolve the crisis—their evidence doesn’t assume game theory

IHT 10-4 – International Herald Tribune, 10/4/13 edition, “White House has options if impasse arises on debt ceiling,” p. lexis

As a result, economists and investors have quietly begun to explore the options the White House might have in the event Congress fails to act.

The most widely discussed strategy would be for President Barack Obama to invoke authority under the 14th Amendment and essentially order the federal government to keep borrowing, an option that was endorsed by former President Bill Clinton during an earlier debt standoff in 2011.

And in recent days, prominent Democrats like Senator Max Baucus, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, and Representative Nancy Pelosi, the House minority leader, have urged the White House to seriously consider such a route, even if it might provoke a threat of impeachment from House Republicans and ultimately require the Supreme Court to rule on its legitimacy.

Other potential October surprises range from the logistically forbidding, like prioritizing payments, issuing i.o.u.'s or selling off gold and other assets, to more fanciful ideas, like minting a trillion-dollar platinum coin.

So far, administration officials have continued to insist that there is no plausible alternative to congressional action on the debt limit.

In December 2012, Jay Carney, the White House spokesman, flatly renounced the 14th Amendment option, saying: ''I can say that this administration does not believe that the 14th Amendment gives the president the power to ignore the debt ceiling - period.'' And on Wednesday, a senior administration lawyer said that remained the administration's view.

Still, some observers outside government in Washington and on Wall Street, citing an approach resembling game theory, suggest that the president's position is more tactical than fundamental, since raising the possibility of a way out for the White House like the constitutional gambit would take the heat off Republicans in Congress to act on their own before the Oct. 17 deadline.

''If a default is imminent, the option of raising the debt limit by executive fiat has to be on the table,'' said Greg Valliere, chief political strategist at Potomac Research. ''Desperate times require desperate measures.''

Some professional investors echoed his view, which is a reason Wall Street remains hopeful that the economic and financial disaster a government default could usher in will be avoided.

''At the end of the day if there is no action and the United States has a default looming, I think President Obama can issue an executive order authorizing the Treasury secretary to make payments,'' said David Kotok, chief investment officer of Cumberland Advisors in Sarasota, Florida, which has just over $2 billion under management. ''There's always been more flexibility in the hands of Treasury than they've acknowledged.''

According to some legal theorists, the president could essentially ignore the debt limit imposed by Congress, because the 14th Amendment states that the ''validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law,'' including debts like pensions and bounties to suppress insurrections, ''shall not be questioned.''

#### Latin American relations solve the economy

Shifter 12 Michael is the President of Inter-American Dialogue. “Remaking the Relationship: The United States and Latin America,” April, IAD Policy Report, http://www.thedialogue.org/PublicationFiles/IAD2012PolicyReportFINAL.pdf

There are compelling reasons for the United States and Latin America to pursue more robust ties. Every country in the Americas would benefit from strengthened and expanded economic relations, with improved access to each other’s markets, investment capital, and energy resources. Even with its current economic probbvlems, the United States’ $16-trillion economy is a **vital** market and source of capital (including remittances) and technology **for Latin America**, and it could contribute more to the region’s economic performance. For its part, **Latin America’s rising economies will** inevitably **become** more and more **crucial to the U**nited **S**tates’ economic future. The United States and many nations of Latin America and the Caribbean would also gain a great deal by more cooperation on such global matters as climate change, nuclear non-proliferation, and democracy and human rights.With a rapidly expanding US Hispanic population of more than 50 million, the cultural and demographic integration of the United States and Latin America is proceeding at an accelerating pace, setting a firmer basis for hemispheric partnership Despite the multiple opportunities and potential benefits, relations between the United States and Latin America remain disappointing . If new opportunities are not seized, relations will likely continue to drift apart . The longer the current situation persists, the harder it will be to reverse course and rebuild vigorous cooperation . Hemispheric affairs require urgent attention—both from the United States and from Latin America and the Caribbean.

## 1AR

### CP

**The’ means unique, as in there is one USFG or United States**

#### Merriam-Webster's Online Collegiate Dictionary, 08, http://www.m-w.com/cgi-bin/dictionary

#### b -- used as a function word to indicate that a following noun or noun equivalent is a unique or a particular member of its class <the President> <the Lord>

### Ag

**Democracy fails – preconditions dictate – Arab spring proves**

**Sowell 11**—Rose and Milton Friedman Senior Fellow, The Hoover Institution at Stanford University

(Thomas, “Instant Democracy Doesn’t Work”, WorldNetDaily, March 1, 2011, http://www.wnd.com/index.php?pageId=269313)AW

The fact that Egyptians or others in the Middle East and elsewhere want freedom does not mean that they are ready for freedom. Everyone wants freedom for himself. Even the Nazis wanted to be free to be Nazis. They just didn't want anybody else to be free. There is very little sign of tolerance in the Middle East, even among fellow Muslims with different political or religious views, and all too many signs of gross intolerance toward people who are not Muslims. Freedom and democracy cannot be simply conferred on anyone. Both have preconditions, and even nations that are free and democratic today took centuries to get there. If there were ever a time when people in Western democracies might be excused for thinking that Western institutions could simply be exported to other nations to create new free democracies, that time has long passed**.** It is easy to export the outward symbols of democracy – constitutions, elections, parliaments and the like – but you cannot export the centuries of experience and development that made those institutions work. All too often, exported democratic institutions have meant "one man, one vote – one time." We should not assume that our own freedom and democratic form of government can be taken for granted. Those who created this country did not. As the Constitution of the United States was being written, a lady asked Benjamin Franklin what he and the other writers were creating. He replied, "A republic, madam – if you can keep it." Generations later, Abraham Lincoln also posed it as a question, whether "government of the people, by the people and for the people" is one that "can long endure." Just as there are nations that have not yet developed the preconditions for freedom and democracy, so there are some people within a nation who have not. The advance toward universal suffrage took place slowly and in stages. Too many people, looking back today, see that as just being biased against some people. But putting the fate of a nation in the hands of the illiterate masses of the past, many with no conception of the complexities of government, might have meant risking the same fate of "one man, one vote – one time." Today, we take universal literacy for granted. But literacy has not been universal across all segments of the American population during all of the 20th century. Illiteracy was the norm in Albania as recently as the 1920s and in India in the second half of the 20th century. Bare literacy is just one of the things needed to make democracy viable. Without a sense of responsible citizenship, voters can elect leaders who are not merely incompetent or corrupt, but even leaders with contempt for the constitutional limitations on government power that preserve the people's freedom.

**Trade inevitable**

**Ikenson, 12** [March 5th, Daniel, [Daniel Ikenson](http://www.cato.org/people/daniel-ikenson) is director of the Herbert A. Stiefel Center for Trade Policy Studies at the Cato Institute,

 <http://www.cato.org/publications/free-trade-bulletin/trade-policy-priority-one-averting-uschina-trade-war>]

An emerging narrative in 2012 is that a proliferation of protectionist, treaty-violating, or otherwise illiberal Chinese policies is to blame for worsening U.S.-China relations. China trade experts from across the ideological and political spectra have lent credibility to that story. Business groups that once counseled against U.S. government actions that might be perceived by the Chinese as provocative have changed their tunes. The term "trade war" is no longer taboo.¶ The media have portrayed the United States as a victim of underhanded Chinese practices, including currency manipulation, dumping, subsidization, intellectual property theft, forced technology transfer, discriminatory "indigenous innovation" policies, export restrictions, industrial espionage, and other ad hoc impediments to U.S. investment and exports. ¶ Indeed, it is beyond doubt that certain Chinese policies have been provocative, discriminatory, protectionist, and, in some cases, violative of the agreed rules of international trade. But there is more to the story than that. U.S. policies, politics, and attitudes have contributed to rising tensions, as have rabble-rousing politicians and a confrontation-thirsty media. If the public's passions are going to be inflamed with talk of a trade war, prudence demands that the war's nature be properly characterized and its causes identified and accurately depicted.¶ Those agitating for tough policy actions should put down their battle bugles and consider that trade wars are never won. Instead, such wars claim victims indiscriminately and leave significant damage in their wake. Even if one concludes that China's list of offenses is collectively more egregious than that of the United States, the most sensible course of action — for the American public (if not campaigning politicians) — is one that avoids mutually destructive actions and finds measures to reduce frictions with China.¶ Nature of the U.S.-China Trade War¶ It should not be surprising that the increasing number of commercial exchanges between entities in the world's largest and second largest economies produce frictions on occasion. But the U.S.-China economic relationship has not descended into an existential call to arms**.** Rather, both governments have taken protectionist actions that are legally defensible or plausibly justifiable within the rules of global trade. That is not to say that those measures have been advisable or that they would withstand closer legal scrutiny, but to make the distinction that, unlike the free-for-all that erupted in the 1930s, these trade "skirmishes" have been prosecuted in a manner that speaks to a mutual recognition of the primacy of — if not respect for — the rules-based system of trade. And that suggests that the kerfuffle is containable and the recent trend reversible.1

### PTX

#### GOP legislators concede – moderates have already caved

Bloomberg 10-12, ("Budget Battle Ends Soon With Tea Party Loss: King, Corker," 2013, [www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-10-11/king-says-tea-party-republicans-have-lost-budget-battle.html](http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-10-11/king-says-tea-party-republicans-have-lost-budget-battle.html))

Congress will open the partially shuttered government and increase its borrowing limit on at least a short-term basis next week before the debt ceiling is reached Oct. 17, Senator Bob Corker said.¶ “Things are beginning to break,” Corker, a Tennessee Republican, said in an interview on Bloomberg Television’s “Political Capital with Al Hunt,” airing this weekend. “I’d be surprised if it goes all the way to the 17th,” he said. “Sometime midweek this will all be resolved, if not sooner.”¶ House Republicans aligned with the Tea Party have lost their fight with the president, and Congress soon will open the government and raise the debt ceiling on a short-term basis, Representative Peter King, a New York Republican who opposed the shutdown from the start, said in a separate interview on the same program this weekend.¶ A potential spending resolution without changes in government policy will “pass overwhelmingly,” King said. House Speaker John Boehner, an Ohio Republican, “has the leverage he needs, and I think it’s going to come to the House floor, no matter what.”¶ If Boehner doesn’t bring a measure to the floor, King said, he would support a discharge petition, in which a majority of the House can force the chamber to vote on a bill. Eighteen Republicans would have to join all 200 Democrats to compel the House to vote on opening the government, partially shuttered since Oct. 1, without conditions.¶ “If we have to do a discharge petition, ultimately, we will, but this is going to come,” King said.