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## \*\*Plan\*\*

#### Plan: The United States federal government should lift all economic restrictions on Cuba.

## \*\*Contention 1 is Conflict Resolution\*\*

**Scenario one is Obama**

**Engagement necessary in the squo to maintain international momentum**

**Dickerson** ‘**10** (LT. COLONEL SERGIO M. DICKERSON, "United States Security Strategy Towards Cuba," Strategy Research Project, US Army, January 14th, [www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf&AD=ADA518053](http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf&AD=ADA518053)) PD

Conclusion¶ Today, 20 years have passed since the fall of the Berlin Wall – it’s time to chip away at the diplomatic wall that still remains between U.S. and Cuba. As we seek a new foreign policy with Cuba it is imperative that we take into consideration that distrust will characterize negotiations with the Cuban government. On the other hand, consider that loosening or lifting the embargo could also be mutually beneficial. Cuba’s need and America’s surplus capability to provide goods and services could be profitable and eventually addictive to Cuba. Under these conditions, diplomacy has a better chance to flourish.¶ If the Cuban model succeeds President Obama will be seen as a true leader for multilateralism. Success in Cuba could afford the international momentum and credibility to solve other seemingly “wicked problems” like the Middle East and Kashmir. President Obama could leverage this international reputation with other rogue nations like Iran and North Korea who might associate their plight with Cuba. 35 The U.S. could begin to lead again and reverse its perceived decline in the greater global order bringing true peace for years to come.

#### Concessions to Cuba uniquely key to Obama’s diplomacy

**French ‘10** (ANYA LANDAU FRENCH, Director for the U.S.-Cuba Policy Initiative, “Stiffing Havana”, Foreign Policy, October 19th, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/10/19/stiffing\_havana#sthash.Md6RdYCr.dpbs) PD

In the high-stakes world of international diplomacy, bluffing is a seldom-seen practice -- the stakes are simply too high to risk getting called out. But, that's precisely what seems to have happened with the Obama administration's stated policy of détente toward Cuba. Havana is making concessions, but Washington seems incapable of responding in kind. The United States may be fumbling away its best chance at influencing Cuba in the way that it has claimed to have wanted for decades. It was nearly one year ago that President Barack Obama delivered a message to President Raúl Castro via Spain's prime minister, José Luis Rodríguez Zapatero: "We understand that change can't happen overnight, but down the road, when we look back at this time, it should be clear that now is when those changes began," Obama said. "We're taking steps, but if they don't take steps too, it's going to be very hard for us to continue." If Cuba proved willing to improve relations with the United States, Obama seemed willing to reciprocate. Obama's conciliatory message may have been on Castro's mind as the Cuban government began making improvements to its much maligned human rights record this summer. More than 40 Cuban political prisoners have been released from jail in recent months. Dozens more might soon follow as part of the government's unprecedented human rights dialogue with the Cuban Catholic Church; it's the first such dialogue of its kind for the church, an institution that previously had been treated with suspicion, if not hostility, by the Cuban government. The political changes have been paired with sweeping labor and economic reforms that have, however belatedly, begun to liberalize the moribund economy: 10 percent of Cuba's workforce will shift into the private sector by next year. The ball, clearly, is now in the United States' court. But so far, the Obama administration has failed to respond to the very concessions Washington has long demanded, and very recently promised to reward. Rather than greet the changes, Obama has replied with mild skepticism. "I think that any release of political prisoners, any economic liberalization that takes place in Cuba is positive, positive for Cuban people, but we've not yet seen the full results of these promises," Obama told Hispanic media at the White House Tuesday. Washington and Havana remain locked in their 50-year dispute. The U.S. trade and travel embargoes have only gotten tighter over the decades; under President George W. Bush, tensions threatened to reach a tipping point. Obama has called the inherited status quo a failure, but most of the Bush policies remain in place today. (Some in Washington argue that Obama has already made significant gestures to Havana by easing restrictions on Cuban-American families' travel and remittances to the island last year. But that change was more a gesture to Cuban-Americans in Miami -- where he campaigned on a promise to ease Bush's harsher restrictions on Cuban immigrant families -- than it was any significant political concession to Havana.) The Obama administration should instead be honoring the changes in Cuba by taking considerable steps of its own: A bold response by Washington will put the spotlight back on Havana to continue with its reforms. Obama's choice isn't between the status quo and a wholesale abandonment of the embargoes: There are many ways to craft a foreign policy that could help spur the economic growth needed to support the half-million new workers in Cuba's fledging private sector. Only Congress can lift the Cuban travel ban entirely, but the president possesses broad authority to allow some Americans to travel freely to the island. Cultural and academic trips to Cuba by Americans are currently permitted under U.S. law, at the discretion of the federal government; the Obama administration could easily broaden the definition of such "people-to-people" trips. That policy would trace its roots to the successful citizen diplomacy with the Soviet Union that President Ronald Reagan championed during the Cold War. President Bill Clinton successfully enacted such a policy toward Cuba during his time in office, but it was rolled back by Bush. But what if Obama chooses to do nothing or dithers so long that this historic opportunity to influence Cuban reforms passes? If the president fails to move now, after Cuba has apparently acted in good faith to the offer of an outstretched hand, his administration will lose credibility --not just in Havana, but among global allies that will see the president's reversal as a sign of weakness, incoherence, and even dishonesty. No one can say for sure, of course, where Cuba's reforms will lead. But it's clear -- even to Fidel Castro in his most unguarded moments -- that the old model just doesn't work anymore. Raúl Castro's reforms, deeper and broader than the limited Cuban reforms of the 1990s, signal that Havana is in search of a new system. It may or may not be the model America would choose, but if Washington wants to have any influence at this pivotal moment, the time to engage Cuba is now.

#### Obama cred uniquely key to solve conflict- deals key to ensure East Asian peace

**Coes ‘11** (BEN COES, former speechwriter in the George H.W. Bush administration, “The disease of a weak president”, September 30th, The Daily Caller, http://dailycaller.com/2011/09/30/the-disease-of-a-weak-president/) PD

The disease of a weak president usually begins with the Achilles’ heel all politicians are born with — the desire to be popular. It leads to pandering to different audiences, people and countries and creates a sloppy, incoherent set of policies. Ironically, it ultimately results in that very politician losing the trust and respect of friends and foes alike.¶ In the case of Israel, those of us who are strong supporters can at least take comfort in the knowledge that Tel Aviv will do whatever is necessary to protect itself from potential threats from its unfriendly neighbors. While it would be preferable for the Israelis to be able to count on the United States, in both word and deed, the fact is right now they stand alone. Obama and his foreign policy team have undercut the Israelis in a multitude of ways. Despite this, I wouldn’t bet against the soldiers of Shin Bet, Shayetet 13 and the Israeli Defense Forces.¶ But Obama’s weakness could — in other places — have implications far, far worse than anything that might ultimately occur in Israel. The triangular plot of land that connects Pakistan, India and China is held together with much more fragility and is built upon a truly foreboding foundation of religious hatreds, radicalism, resource envy and nuclear weapons.¶ If you can only worry about preventing one foreign policy disaster, worry about this one.¶ Here are a few unsettling facts to think about:¶ First, Pakistan and India have fought three wars since the British de-colonized and left the region in 1947. All three wars occurred before the two countries had nuclear weapons. Both countries now possess hundreds of nuclear weapons, enough to wipe each other off the map many times over.¶ Second, Pakistan is 97% Muslim. It is a question of when — not if — Pakistan elects a radical Islamist in the mold of Ayatollah Khomeini as its president. Make no mistake, it will happen, and when it does the world will have a far greater concern than Ali Khamenei or Mahmoud Ahmadinejad and a single nuclear device.¶ Third, China sits at the northern border of both India and Pakistan. China is strategically aligned with Pakistan. Most concerning, China covets India’s natural resources. Over the years, it has slowly inched its way into the northern tier of India-controlled Kashmir Territory, appropriating land and resources and drawing little notice from the outside world.¶ In my book, Coup D’Etat, I consider this tinderbox of colliding forces in Pakistan, India and China as a thriller writer. But thriller writers have the luxury of solving problems by imagining solutions on the page. In my book, when Pakistan elects a radical Islamist who then starts a war with India and introduces nuclear weapons to the theater, America steps in and removes the Pakistani leader through a coup d’état.¶ I wish it was that simple.¶ The more complicated and difficult truth is that we, as Americans, must take sides. We must be willing to be unpopular in certain places. Most important, we must be ready and willing to threaten our military might on behalf of our allies. And our allies are Israel and India.¶ There are many threats out there — Islamic radicalism, Chinese technology espionage, global debt and half a dozen other things that smarter people than me are no doubt worrying about. But the single greatest threat to America is none of these. The single greatest threat facing America and our allies is a weak U.S. president. It doesn’t have to be this way. President Obama could — if he chose — develop a backbone and lead. Alternatively, America could elect a new president. It has to be one or the other. The status quo is simply not an option.

#### Scenario two is Trade

#### Global commitment to free trade is collapsing – US hypocrisy regarding the CUBAN EMBARGO dooms all efforts to reinvigorate US trade leadership and the WTO

Ariyanti 12/6 (DESSIANING ARIYANTI, Associated Press, December 6th 2013, “Cuba throws wrench in WTO talks over trade embargo”, http://news.yahoo.com/cuba-throws-wrench-wto-talks-over-trade-embargo-025234855--finance.html)

BALI, Indonesia (AP) — Cuba and three other Latin American countries refused to sign off on a World Trade Organization agreement early Saturday that had appeared close to approval after negotiations that dragged on through the night. Dozens of trade ministers were presented with a draft of a slimmed-down deal that satisfied India, which had earlier refused to budge on a provision that could endanger subsidies for grains under a policy to feed its poor. After consensus appeared close among the 159 WTO member economies, Cuba, backed by Bolivia, Venezuela and Nicaragua rejected it due to removal of a reference to the decades-long U.S. trade embargo that Cuba wants lifted. "We need to continue our consultations and find a way to overcome this problem," WTO spokesman Keith Rockwell told reporters. Trade ministers had come to the four-day WTO meetings on Indonesia's resort island of Bali with little hope that an agreement to boost world trade would be reached. But after draft proposals released late Friday put the food subsidy issue on the backburner, hope for a deal emerged. The proposals also call for customs procedures to be simplified and more transparent to reduce barriers to trade. The deal could boost global trade by $1 trillion over time and help revive the WTO's broader Doha Round of trade negotiations, sometimes known as the development round because of sweeping changes in regulations, taxes and subsidies that would benefit low income countries. The idea is that if all countries play by the same trade rules, then all countries, rich or poor, will benefit. But some critics say WTO rules may hinder countries from setting their own priorities in environmental protection, worker rights, food security and other areas. And they say sudden reductions in import tariffs can wipe out industries, causing job losses in rich and poor countries. The meetings in Bali were seen as crucial after more than a decade of inertia, with failure possibly signaling an end to the WTO's relevance as a forum for trade negotiations among its 159 member economies

#### This is fueling the violent breakdown of global trading networks

Bhagwati ‘13 (JAGDISH BHAGWATI, professor, Columbia University, January 14th 2013, “Why the TPP is undermining the Doha Round”, <http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2013/01/14/why-the-tpp-is-undermining-the-doha-round/>)

**Under regional FTAs like the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), far fewer countries are involved compared to multilateral trade negotiations like the Doha Round.** The potential trade-offs in negotiations are more manageable and participant states may be more likely to make offers and examine concessions. But apart from this possible advantage, **the TPP process has many downsides, and is undermining successful multilateral free trade.** **Stronger countries often ‘divert’ trade from cheaper non-member sources to more expensive member sources, bringing harm rather than good.** Also, **the enormous growth of such FTAs, now more than 350 and still growing, has led to a systemic effect: creating a ‘spaghetti bowl’ of preferences and chaos in the world trading system** … The American doctrine of inducing multilateral trade liberalisation by signing on FTAs has proven to be a chimera’. For example, to liberalise agricultural trade, both production subsidies and export subsidies need to be eliminated. The Hong Kong Declaration in 2005 set out an agreement to abolish export subsidies. But to get rid of production subsidies a multilateral agreement (through the Doha Round), and not a bilateral one, is absolutely critical. This is because unlike with export subsidies, it is technically impossible to reduce or relax a production subsidy so that it applies bilaterally to only one country. Under a regional agreement like the TPP, this problem is only slightly reduced, because there are still not enough countries to effectively reduce production subsidies. The Republicans in Congress are now fiercely committed to protecting US agriculture. Their continued control of the US House of Representatives will make it more difficult to reach an agricultural deal under the TPP. US business lobbies also have little interest in liberalising agriculture — they want concessions in manufacturing and services. Although it is not yet clear whether these can be achieved either, they certainly cannot be done with Doha. Many aspects of the TPP reflect the demands of US business lobbies and are actually calculated to reduce the openness of the trade system for new members. Smaller countries, like Vietnam and Singapore, are therefore being pressured to have ‘WTO Plus’ kinds of copyright protection. The same problem occurs with respect to labour standards under the TPP. India could never agree to these aspects. Membership of the TPP should be open to countries willing to make trade concessions, and members should not be required to sign onto all of the TPP’s provisions. For example, countries should be allowed to sign onto the ‘WTO Plus’ rules on intellectual property, or sign onto different labour standards, but meeting the demands made by US lobbyists should not be a pre-condition to joining the TPP. ASEAN+1 and ASEAN+3, which preceded ASEAN+6, deliberately excluded the United States. But China’s aggressiveness on the external front pushed smaller Asian countries, such as Vietnam, Malaysia and Singapore, to support the TPP. The TPP thus became the United States’ way of getting back into the Asian region. **Yet US policy** — wittingly or unwittingly — **is moving to fragment Asia in the same way that it fragmented South America.** This is where the ASEAN+6 grouping could play a role, by demonstrating to the United States that it is welcome, but only within a genuine trade grouping. ASEAN+6’s Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership (RCEP) can only work if it is stripped of trade-unrelated demands, but it presents an alternative to the TPP, one where other countries — even countries such as Canada and France — could be included. If ASEAN+6 has India and China joining it, they can present the RCEP as a template where no comparable side conditions will apply. However, this may mean that the United States will not join it. **Finally, the investor-state dispute settlement mechanisms** being advocated as part of the TPP will invariably involve surrendering some sovereignty in order to gain other benefits. This is the case when a country joins any international agreement. **The problem with the TPP dispute settlement mechanisms is that there is already an incredibly successful and wide-reaching dispute settlement mechanism at the WTO, a multilateral institution**. But regional agreements like the **TPP** and bilateral agreements automatically **generate more dispute settlements and so-called arbitration within those groups. The bigger powers within those groupings, such as the United States** or the European Union, **have greater clout and will therefore have more influence over those arbitration panels and their outcomes, and that will in turn eventually undermine the WTO dispute settlement process. The WTO multilateral trade system and WTO dispute settlement system are likely to be undermined by the TPP.** Smaller powers have to ensure that the WTO dispute system remains paramount. Unless these complexities are better understood, they are going to miss the boat on better multilateral free trade.

**Removing economic sanctions shows that the US is committed to the WTO dispute settlement body- that reverberates and generates momentum for the WTO**

**Allen ‘10**, (Masheika, July 28th, former legal instructor at Strayer University, Florida International University, Masters of International Business 2011 - 2012 The George Washington University Law School Master of Laws in Litigation & Dispute Resolution 2003 - 2004 Florida State University College of Law Juris Doctorate 2000 - 2003 Florida International University Bachelors of Arts- English 1996 - 2000 <http://www.writerscafe.org/writing/pnut1913/582992/>)

A 1996 Security Council Resolution regarding aviation safety is the only resolution that has been enacted against Cuba. The resolution did not find Cuba to be a threat to the peace and was a statement of policy that did not include sanctions. As this resolution does not call for or justify sanctions by the Security Council it provides no basis for member sanctions. Not only has the United States failed to secure a Security Council sanctions mandate, the Helms-Burton Act has been widely condemned in the international community. “According to the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, no State may use or encourage the use of economic, political or any other type of measures to coerce another State in order to obtain from it the subordination of the exercise of its sovereign rights and to secure from it advantages of any kind” (Resolution 2003/17). The United Nations passes a yearly condemnation resolution and recently passed its 17th consecutive Resolution Against Embargo (“Overwhelming UN General Assembly,” 2010). As of the date of this writing, no international body has ever found expropriation to be a threat to the peace.¶ ¶ In lieu of making a national security argument, the United States has the right to suspend obligations and or concessions with Cuba under DSU Article 22. Article 22 allows for “compensation and the suspension of concessions or other obligations.” (DSU Art. 22(1)). However, said suspensions “are temporary measures available in the event that the recommendations and rulings are not implemented within a reasonable period of time,” Id. The Article requires parties to determine their actual damages and use suspension to offset those damages. It provides principles and procedures for determining what obligations to suspend (DSU Art. 22(3)). Finally, it requires the level of suspension to be “equivalent to the level of the nullification or impairment” (DSU Art. 22(4)). Therefore, under DSU Article 22, the United States would be required to determine the value of the takings and subsequent trafficking and impose sanctions on Cuba equivalent to the United States’ damages. Considering the vast difference in Cuba’s development and relative fiscal power, an endless, complete embargo could not be sustained under DSU Article 22.¶ ¶ Article 22 serves a dual purpose in this discussion. It is also one of America’s stated concerns that “the international judicial system, as currently structured, lacks fully effective remedies for the wrongful confiscation of property and for unjust enrichment from the use of wrongfully confiscated property by governments and private entities at the expense of the rightful owners of the property” (U.S.C. ch. 22, § 301(8), 1996). Article 22 provides a competent framework utilizing a recognized and respected judiciary system with proven effective remedies to resolve issues of financial inequity. Perhaps the United States has not utilized Article 22’s provisions as its embargo may be prohibited under the Uruguay Round Agreement and the DSU as “the DSB shall not authorize suspension of concessions or other obligations if a covered agreement prohibits such suspension” (DSU Art. 22(5)).¶ ¶ The United States has chosen a path of isolation in an attempt to use economic means to create a regime change in Cuba. As both the United States and Cuba are members of the World Trade Organization, the United States is bound by treaty obligations to give Cuban products and services most favored nation treatment. GATT Article 21 provides a method for claiming an exception to said obligations on specific security grounds. Cuba’s expropriation of American assets forms the foundation for America’s economic national security argument. This argument is buttressed with an allegation of insufficient international legal processes and enforcement measures to provide American entities with adequate redress. Yet, no international legal or security body has ever interpreted expropriation to be a national security threat. Countries’ sanction actions under GATT Article 21 have been taken in conjunction with Security Council Resolutions authorized under Article 39 of the United Nations Charter. Not only has the Security Council not found that Cuba’s expropriation is a “threat to peace” in the context of Article 39, the United Nations as a body has passed repeated resolutions condemning the United States’ embargo.¶ ¶ As the United States has no established legal basis, domestically or internationally, for imposing said embargo on a national security basis, it is obliged to avail itself of the dispute resolution procedures of the WTO. Under Article 22 of the DSU, the United States may impose sanctions in response to Cuba’s illegal takings but must do so in an equivalent manner. Therefore, under Article 22, the United States would not be able to maintain its complete embargo. The DSU also provides a framework for settling expropriation disputes utilizing systems, actors and a judiciary that are highly respected and competent to handle such matters. Therefore, as the 1994 passage of the DSU created a legal system with proven enforcement mechanisms for handling expropriation disputes and its efficacy has been aptly demonstrated during its sixteen years of operation, the United States’ Cuban embargo is no longer justifiable on economic grounds and should be ended.

#### Indo/ Pak free trade increases economic interdependence and reduces the risk of war

The Diplomat ‘13 (THE DIPLOMAT, magazine, Asia Pacific Region, April 15th 2013, “[Growing India-Pakistan Trade Bodes Well for South Asia](http://thediplomat.com/the-pulse/2013/04/15/growing-india-pakistan-trade-bodes-well-for-south-asia/)” ¶ April 15th 2013¶ <http://thediplomat.com/the-pulse/2013/04/15/growing-india-pakistan-trade-bodes-well-for-south-asia/>) PD

That South Asia is one of the world’s least integrated regions has been well chronicled. Historical tensions and regional rivalries have hampered intra-regional trade, with prime responsibility lying squarely on regional heavyweights India and Pakistan, which have fought three wars since their independence from Britain in 1947.¶ Proposals for a South Asia Free Trade Agreement (SAFTA) to boost intra-regional trade from [U.S. $11 billion in 2007 to U.S. $40 billion by 2015](http://siteresources.worldbank.org/SOUTHASIAEXT/Resources/223546-1192413140459/4281804-1192413178157/4281806-1265938468438/BeyondSAFTAFeb2010Chapter6.pdf)seem like a pipedream. Intra-regional trade has languished for decades as only about 5 percent of the region’s total trade occurs between its nations, despite their geographical proximity and shared history. This contrasts with [intra-regional trade in Africa and East Asia](http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/c3331146-80ef-11e0-8351-00144feabdc0.html) where the corresponding figures are 15 percent and 50 percent, respectively.¶ However, the latest trade figures indicate that two-way trade between India and Pakistan may have turned a corner. India’s exports to Pakistan increased 15 percent between April 2012 and February 2013 to U.S. $1.6 billion, up from U.S. $1.4 billion in the corresponding period last year. Meanwhile, Indian imports from Pakistan registered a 30 percent increase from U.S. $375 million to U.S. $488 million during the same period.¶ According to a [report in the Indian Express](http://www.indianexpress.com/news/indiapak-trade-at-its-peak-exports-see-a-15--jump/1102584/), this expansion showed that India-Pakistan trade was approaching the levels of New Delhi’s economic relations with other neighbors, such as Sri Lanka and Bangladesh.¶ While still modest, these figures are also the highest ever between the two countries, indicating that a recent thaw in diplomatic ties between the two South Asian rivals could be bearing fruit. The thaw comes after the fledgling India-Pakistan peace process, which began in 2004, but was suspended by India in 2008 when Pakistan-based militants carried out a terror attack on India’s financial hub, Mumbai, leaving 166 people dead.¶ A slew of high-level engagements between the two sides last year brought the dialogue process back on track. In April 2012, Pakistani President Asif Ali Zardari visited India on a day-long private visit during which he held talks with Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh. The visit was followed by reciprocal visits by Pakistani and Indian foreign ministers in July and September, leading to the signing of a landmark visa agreement that eased travel restrictions between the two sides.¶ The South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) Chamber of Commerce and Industry, a regional trade body, welcomed the agreement, saying that the new liberalized visa regime would significantly boost bilateral trade.¶ Further, last year the Pakistan Peoples Party (PPP) government announced its intention to grant New Delhi’s long-standing demand for [Most Favored Nation](http://articles.economictimes.indiatimes.com/2013-04-10/news/38434021_1_mfn-status-most-favoured-nation-normalise-trade-relations) (MFN) status, but has since balked on the issue amid strong opposition at home. The chances that India will be granted MFN status will likely depend on the outcome of Pakistan’s [elections in May](http://m.indianexpress.com/news/new-pak-govt-will-take-call-on-giving-india-mfn-status/1100581/).¶ Still, these tentative steps towards normalizing economic ties have wider implications for the region. For one, strengthening trade ties can help prevent deterioration in political relations between the nuclear-armed neighbors. Further, stronger economic ties can significantly increase the cost of conflict.¶ While it is too early to judge the extent of the positive influence of trade, these facts could potentially serve as catalysts for better ties between India and Pakistan, possibly paving the way for the resolution of more contentious issues such as the Kashmir dispute.

#### Kashmir escalates in the squo- Pakistani government, water scarcity, and fear of preemptive strike- effective conflict resolution key

Krepon 12/3 (MICHAEL KREPON, co-founder of the Stimson Center, December 3rd 2013, “Deterrence stability and escalation control in South Asia”, December 3rd 2013, Rising Kashmir, [http://www.risingkashmir.com/deterrence-stability-and-escalation-control-in-south-asia/) PD](http://www.risingkashmir.com/deterrence-stability-and-escalation-control-in-south-asia/%29%20PD)

Even though the nuclear competition on the subcontinent pales by comparison to the Superpower competition, it is nonetheless dangerous. The primary dangers do not relate to a lack of professionalism on the part of those responsible for nuclear stewardship. Instead, escalatory dangers are rooted in the absence of normal relations between nuclear-armed neighbors, the presence of spoilers who seek to disrupt more normal relations, and the potential for incidents that could lead to renewed conflict. The United States and the Soviet Union did not have to concern themselves with domestic and cross-border threats to deterrence stability. Pakistan and India do. New challenges to stability are rising. Governance in Pakistan continues to be in decline. Water is becoming an increasingly scarce — and perhaps contested commodity. Crises may be prompted by disaffected Indian Muslims who seek to settle domestic scores by violent means, actions that may be hard to distinguish from Pakistan-based spoilers. The introduction of short-range delivery vehicles for nuclear weapons, whose utility depends on their proximity to battlefields, leaves much to chance. Some pathways to conflict, such as premeditated, large-scale conventional warfare, as might have been contemplated in 1987, and as was the case in 1965 and 1971, now seem unlikely because of offsetting nuclear capabilities. Fears of preemptive nuclear strikes, like those plaguing Washington and Moscow during the Cold War, seem even more improbable on the subcontinent. Instead, the most likely scenario for conflict in this region continues to arise from escalation sparked by spectacular acts of violence on Indian soil by individuals trained and based in Pakistan. This scenario has confronted decision makers on two prior occasions – the “Twin Peaks” crisis sparked by an attack on the Indian Parliament in 2001 followed by an attack on the dependents of troops deployed on the front lines in 2002, and after multiple attacks on iconic targets in Mumbai in 2008. On these occasions, spectacular acts of terrorism did not lead inexorably to war. Neither did a limited war, fought in the heights above Kargil in 1999, lead to uncontrolled escalation. In these three instances, national leaders acted responsibly and outsiders played constructive roles to defuse tensions, and escalatory pressures were deflated. This may hold true in the future, as well. But there can be no assurance of the absence of another triggering event. Nor can there be assurance that Indian and Pakistani leaders will react in the same way in the future as in the past. Indeed, there is good reason to assume that there will be another crisis-triggering event, whether relations between Pakistan and India remain poor or, perhaps more likely, if national leaders seek improved ties. Deterrence stability is not a given and does not automatically result from acquiring offsetting nuclear capabilities. Even when the United States and the Soviet Union acquired a triad of basing modes for nuclear weapon delivery vehicles on land, at sea, and with aircraft, and even after Washington and Moscow each acquired and deployed over 10,000 nuclear weapons, deterrence stability proved elusive. To the contrary, both Superpowers felt more insecure as the other’s capabilities and stockpiles grew. The more each adversary increased its nuclear weapon-related capabilities, the less its force structure appeared to be for deterrence purposes, and the more it appeared to be seeking advantage in nuclear war-fighting scenarios. India and Pakistan are slowly climbing this familiar path, adding perhaps ten warheads per year as they add delivery vehicles for their use, if deterrence fails. India and Pakistan appear on course to each have a triad, large families of ballistic and cruise missiles, and in the case of Pakistan (with perhaps India to follow), a declared requirement for short-range nuclear weapons for use at the forward edge of future battlefields. There were no official statements hinting at nuclear forces of current sizes, no mention of requirements for “tactical” nuclear weapons, no mention of expanded infrastructure to produce fissile material, and no hint of vetoing negotiations for a fissile material cut-off negotiation in the years immediately following the 1998 tests.

## \*\*Contention 2 is Sugar Ethanol\*\*

#### Demand for ethanol is here to stay- RFS

**Mead ‘13** (WALTER MEAD, Professor of Foreign Affairs and Humanities, Bard College, “Ethanol Still a Boondoggle,” July 17th 2013, [http://blogs.the-american-interest.com/wrm/2013/07/17/ethanol-still-a-boondoggle/)](http://blogs.the-american-interest.com/wrm/2013/07/17/ethanol-still-a-boondoggle/%29) PD

The US has a law on the books, the Renewable Fuel Standard, that mandates an ever-increasing amount of ethanol to be blended into gasoline. Under the 2007 law, oil companies must blend the required amount of ethanol or, in lieu of that, buy credits, known as renewable identification numbers (RINs). The price of those credits has skyrocketed this year more than 2,300 percent, hitting an all-time high yesterday. The ethanol targets set by the Renewable Fuel Standard are out of sync with both the demand for ethanol and its potential supply. Gasoline consumption is projected to be relatively flat this year, a change that the Renewable Fuel Standard lacks a mechanism to account for. This shortfall in demand could potentially be fixed if producers up the percentage of ethanol they mix in with their gasoline past the current industry standard of 10 percent, but few oil companies are willing to move past this so-called “blend wall,” citing studies that link higher ethanol content with engine damage. Even if refiners started blending in more ethanol, the supply problem remains: this year’s supply is projected to be less than the mandate. All of this explains why oil companies are snatching up increasingly-rare RINs at ever-higher prices. Oh, the RIN-sanity! This is a mess even before you consider the foibles of the source of the lion’s share of this ethanol: corn. Before the Renewable Fuel Standard set these arbitrarily high targets, the US used just 23 percent of its corn to produce ethanol. Last year 43 percent of our corn crops went towards producing the biofuel. That shift has driven up global prices for corn, starving the world’s poor and potentially fueling food riots. And to what end? Corn ethanol is categorized as a biofuel, but it doesn’t reduce emissions. Advanced biofuels produced from such sources as sugarcane and algae pass the green test, but they haven’t yet proven their commercial viability.

#### Plan key to revive sugar biofuel production in Cuba

**Holmes ‘10** (MICHAEL G. HOLMES, graduate student, Georgetown University, Masters of Arts in Liberal Studies Thesis, “Seizing The Moment,” June 21st 2010, <http://repository.library.georgetown.edu/bitstream/handle/10822/553334/holmesMichael.pdf?sequence=1)> PD

Creating a new market for U.S. goods and services creates a strong financial incentive for the United States to remove the embargo. Another benefit of removing the embargo presents an economic benefit for Cuba but also addresses U.S. concerns over alternative fuels. The push for alternative fuel production as a means of reducing U.S. dependence on foreign oil from hostile nations has taken a toll on global markets. The strain on corn crops caused by ethanol production has caused the price of corn to nearly double. This in turn has caused the price of all corn related commodities to increase, resulting in a public outcry. 17 Business Week recently reported that the current rise in gasoline prices has pushed the price of corn futures to the highest they have been in almost two years. This is based on the idea that as gas price. Fidel Castro and Venezuela President Hugo Chavez, (a protégé of Fidel) both have claimed that U.S. production of corn based ethanol will inevitably contribute to world hunger. 19 Ironically, Cuba may be the answer to address many of Castro’s criticisms. U.S. consumption of corn-based ethanol production has forced corn demand to outpace supply. In 2005 the U.S. Department of agriculture concluded that corn-based ethanol is, “not a renewable energy resource, is not an economical fuel and its production and use contribute to air, water and soil pollution and global warming.” It takes just under 6 pounds of corn to produce 1 liter, (a little over a quarter gallon), of ethanol. It cost approximately six times as much to produce a liter of ethanol versus a liter of gasoline. The increased production of ethanol has driven up the price of corn, which has inevitably driven up the price of other food products. Corn is the principal feed for various livestock. Demand for corn for fuel, increases demand for rise, the demand for alternative fuels will rise as well.2 18 corn and the cost of feed for livestock. It is estimated that corn-based ethanol production has increased the cost of beef production by over a $1 billion dollars. Ethanol production is also overtaking land resources. To produce a little more than 300 gallons of ethanol a year, .06 hectare, (64, 583 sq ft), of corn must be planted and harvested. It takes .05 hectare, (5,382 sq ft), to feed every American each year. To fill up a car with a fuel mixture that is only one-third ethanol every year would utilize more land than it would take to feed every American citizen in a year. 20 Corn-base ethanol is an unsustainable fuel source. This obvious drawback to the move to corn-based ethanol prompted former President George W. Bush to meet with President Luiz Inacio Lula da Silva of Brazil. Over the past thirty years Brazil has successfully managed to create an alternative to gasoline by refining sugar into ethanol. Sugar-based ethanol production is far more efficient than corn-based ethanol and does not affect the global food market to such a severe degree. 21 Although the United States will be able to develop and apply the technology to produce the ethanol, it is unlikely it will able to cultivate the volume of sugar necessary to meet fuel demands. Historically the United States has only contributed less than 10 percent to the global sugar market.22 Cuba can play a key role in U.S. fuel production and national security. As a result of the U.S. embargo and the fall of the Soviet Union Cuba has had to actually reduce its sugar production. In 2002 the Cuban government closed more than 70 sugar mills and reduced the amount of land allocated to sugarcane cultivation. 23 Those mills alone had the capacity to process nearly 15 million tons of sugar. This sugar could have potentially been processed into tens of thousands of gallons of ethanol. Although Cuba has scaled back sugar production, it has reconfigured several of the remaining mills to not only process sugar but to use the sugar cane residue to actually generate electricity to power the mills. In Remedios, Cuba the Heriberto Duquesne Mill has already utilized Brazilian ethanol production technology. It is currently producing more than 13,000 gallons of ethanol a day. 24 Removing the embargo will revive a once bustling Cuban sugar market. The increased production will cause the Cuban government to reopen sugar production facilities, which will create jobs and reinvigorate the Cuban economy. The increase in trade and investment will stimulate Cuba's technology sector and potentially increase the ease and volume of ethanol production.

**The impact is global food shocks**

**Wise ‘12** (TIMOTHY WISE, Policy Research Director, Global Development and Environment Institute, Tufts University, “US corn ethanol fuels food crisis in developing countries,”[http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2012/10/201210993632838545.html)](http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2012/10/201210993632838545.html%29)

Record drought in the US farm belt this summer withered corn fields and parched hopes for a record US corn harvest, but US farmers may not be the ones most severely affected by the disaster. Most have insurance against crop failure. Not so the world's import-dependent developing countries, nor their poorest consumers. They are hurting. This is the third food price spike in the last five years, and this time the finger is being pointed squarely at biofuels. More specifically, the loss of a quarter or more of the projected US corn harvest has prompted urgent calls for reform in that country's corn ethanol programme. Domestically, livestock producers dependent on corn for feed have led demands for change in the US Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS), which mandates that a rising volume of fuel come from renewable sources. Up to now that has been overwhelmingly corn-based ethanol. In November, the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) will rule on a request for a waiver of the RFS mandate to reduce pressures on US corn supplies. But US livestock producers aren't the only ones affected by shortages and high prices. The most devastating impact is on the poor in developing countries, who often use more than half their incomes to buy food. It also hurts low-income developing countries dependent on corn imports. As I showed in my recent study, "The Costs to Developing Countries of US Ethanol Expansion", the US ethanol programme pushed up corn prices by up to 21 per cent as it expanded to consume 40 per cent of the US harvest. This price premium was passed on to corn importers, adding an estimated $11.6bn to the import bills of the world's corn-importing countries since 2005. More than half of that - $6.6bn - was paid by developing countries between 2005 and 2010. The highest cost was borne by the biggest corn importers. Mexico paid $1.1bnmore for its corn, Egypt $727m. Besides Egypt, North African countries saw particularly high ethanol-related losses: Algeria ($329m), Morocco ($236m), Tunisia ($99m) and Libya ($68m). Impacts were also high in other strife-torn countries in the region - Syria ($242m), Iran ($492m) and Yemen ($58m). North Africa impacts totalled $1.4bn. Scaled to population size, these economic losses were at least as severe as those seen in Mexico. The link between high food prices and unrest in the region is by now well documented, and US ethanol is contributing to that instability. Biofuel impacts on food prices The debate over biofuels has grown urgent since food prices first spiked in 2007-2008, ushering in a food crisis characterised by repeated jumps in global food prices. Prices for most staple foods doubled, fell when the bubble burst in 2009, then jumped again to their previous high levels in 2010-2011. After a brief respite in the first half of this year, the US drought triggered a new wave of price spikes, the third in just five years. Corn prices were particularly hard-hit, reaching record levels of more than $8.00/bushel, and more than $300 per metric tonne. Before the first spikes, prices had languished around $100/metric tonne. Experts have debated how much of the price increases should be blamed on global biofuels expansion. Few argue now that the contribution is small. A US National Academy of Sciences review attributed 20-40 per cent of the 2007-2008 price spikes to global biofuels expansion. Subsequent studies have confirmed this range for the later price increases. Why is the impact so large? Because so much food and feed is now diverted to produce fuel, and so much land is now used for biofuels feedstocks - corn and sugar for ethanol, soybeans, palm oil and a variety of other plants for biodiesel. This rapidly growing market was fuelled by a wide range of government incentives and mandates and by the rising price of petroleum. "That 40 per cent of the US corn crop being put into US cars represents an astonishing 15 per cent of global corn production." Nowhere is the impact clearer than in the diversion of US corn into ethanol production. Ethanol now consumes roughly 40 per cent of the US corn crop, up from just 5 per cent a decade ago. The biggest jump came after the US Congress enacted the RFS in 2005 then expanded it dramatically in 2007. A blending allowance of 10 per cent for domestic gasoline added to the demand, a level now potentially being raised to 15 per cent. These mandates for rising corn ethanol production combined with tax incentives to gasoline blenders and tariff protection against cheaper imports to create today's massive ethanol demand for corn. As corn prices rose farmers increased production, but not enough to accommodate the increased ethanol demand. So prices just kept rising and corn stocks just kept getting thinner and thinner. They were at dangerously low levels - about 15 per cent of global use - when the first price spikes happened in 2007-2008. They are at 14 per cent now.

**A diversity of studies confirm corn biofuels are a key internal link to global food shocks**

**Bryce 12** - senior fellow at the Manhattan Institute, is the author, most recently, of Power Hungry: The Myths of “Green” Energy and the Real Fuels of the Future
(Robert, “Democrats and Republicans Support Harmful Ethanol Subsidies for the Sake of Votes,”[http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2012/09/05/democrats-and-republicans-support-harmful-ethanol-subsidies-for-the-sake-of-votes.html)](http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2012/09/05/democrats-and-republicans-support-harmful-ethanol-subsidies-for-the-sake-of-votes.html%29)

At least 17 studies—done by organizations ranging from Purdue University to the World Bank—have exposed the link between increasing biofuel production and higher food prices. Last year the Farm Foundation, a nonprofit entity formed in 1933 that focuses on agriculture issues, issued a [report](http://www.farmfoundation.org/news/articlefiles/105-FoodPrices_web.pdf) saying that the ethanol mandate creates a “large, persistent and non-price responsive demand for corn.” The report went on, saying “there is little doubt that biofuels play a role in the corn price level and variability, and this has spilled over into other commodity markets.”

**Food shock instability escalates to all-out war and hurts the US economy**

**Klare 12** (MICHAEL KLARE, professor, world security studies, Hampshire College, August 7th 2012, “The Hunger Wars in our Future,” <http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-215_162-57489345/the-hunger-wars-in-our-future/?pageNum=1andtag=page)>

The Great Drought of 2012 has yet to come to an end, but we already know that its consequences will be severe. With more than one-half of America’s counties designated as drought disaster areas, the 2012 harvest of corn, soybeans, and other food staples is guaranteed to fall far short of predictions. This, in turn, will boost food prices domestically and abroad, causing increased misery for farmers and low-income Americans and far greater hardship for poor people in countries that rely on imported U.S. grains. This, however, is just the beginning of the likely consequences: If history is any guide, rising food prices of this sort will also lead to widespread social unrest and violent conflict. Food—affordable food—is essential to human survival and well-being. Take that away, and people become anxious, desperate, and angry. In the United States, food represents only about 13 percent of the average household budget, a relatively small share, so a boost in food prices in 2013 will probably not prove overly taxing for most middle—and upper-income families. It could, however, produce considerable hardship for poor and unemployed Americans with limited resources. “You are talking about a real bite out of family budgets,” commented Ernie Gross, an agricultural economist at Omaha’s Creighton University. This could add to the discontent already evident in depressed and high-unemployment areas, perhaps prompting an intensified backlash against incumbent politicians and other forms of dissent and unrest. It is in the international arena, however, that the Great Drought is likely to have its most devastating effects. Because so many nations depend on grain imports from the U.S. to supplement their own harvests, and because intense drought and floods are damaging crops elsewhere as well, food supplies are expected to shrink and prices to rise across the planet. “What happens to the U.S. supply has immense impact around the world,” says Robert Thompson, a food expert at the Chicago Council on Global Affairs. As the crops most affected by the drought, corn and soybeans, disappear from world markets, he noted, the price of all grains, including wheat, is likely to soar, causing immense hardship to those who already have trouble affording enough food to feed their families. The Hunger Games, 2007-2011 What happens next is, of course, impossible to predict, but if the recent past is any guide, it could turn ugly. In 2007-2008, when rice, corn, and wheat experienced prices hikes of 100 percent or more, sharply higher prices—especially for bread—sparked “food riots” in more than two dozen countries, including Bangladesh, Cameroon, Egypt, Haiti, Indonesia, Senegal, and Yemen. In Haiti, the rioting became so violent and public confidence in the government’s ability to address the problem dropped so precipitously that the Haitian Senate voted to oust the country’s prime minister, Jacques-Édouard Alexis. In other countries, angry protestors clashed with army and police forces, leaving scores dead. Those price increases of 2007-2008 were largely attributed to the soaring cost of oil, which made food production more expensive. (Oil’s use is widespread in farming operations, irrigation, food delivery, and pesticide manufacture.) At the same time, increasing amounts of cropland worldwide were being diverted from food crops to the cultivation of plants used in making biofuels. The next price spike in 2010-11 was, however, closely associated with climate change. An intense drought gripped much of eastern Russia during the summer of 2010, reducing the wheat harvest in that breadbasket region by one-fifth and prompting Moscow to ban all wheat exports. Drought also hurt China’s grain harvest, while intense flooding destroyed much of Australia’s wheat crop. Together with other extreme-weather-related effects, these disasters sent wheat prices soaring by more than 50 percent and the price of most food staples by 32 percent. Once again, a surge in food prices resulted in widespread social unrest, this time concentrated in North Africa and the Middle East. The earliest protests arose over the cost of staples in Algeria and then Tunisia, where—no coincidence—the precipitating event was a young food vendor, Mohamed Bouazizi, setting himself on fire to protest government harassment. Anger over rising food and fuel prices combined with long-simmering resentments about government repression and corruption sparked what became known as the Arab Spring. The rising cost of basic staples, especially a loaf of bread, was also a cause of unrest in Egypt, Jordan, and Sudan. Other factors, notably anger at entrenched autocratic regimes, may have proved more powerful in those places, but as the author of Tropic of Chaos, Christian Parenti, wrote, “The initial trouble was traceable, at least in part, to the price of that loaf of bread.” As for the current drought, analysts are already warning of instability in Africa, where corn is a major staple, and of increased popular unrest in China, where food prices are expected to rise at a time of growing hardship for that country’s vast pool of low-income, migratory workers and poor peasants. Higher food prices in the U.S. and China could also lead to reduced consumer spending on other goods, further contributing to the slowdown in the global economy and producing yet more worldwide misery, with unpredictable social consequences. The Hunger Games, 2012-? If this was just one bad harvest, occurring in only one country, the world would undoubtedly absorb the ensuing hardship and expect to bounce back in the years to come. Unfortunately, it’s becoming evident that the Great Drought of 2012 is not a one-off event in a single heartland nation, but rather an inevitable consequence of global warming which is only going to intensify. As a result, we can expect not just more bad years of extreme heat, but worse years, hotter and more often, and not just in the United States, but globally for the indefinite future. Until recently, most scientists were reluctant to blame particular storms or droughts on global warming. Now, however, a growing number of scientists believe that such links can be demonstrated in certain cases. In one recent study focused on extreme weather events in 2011, for instance, climate specialists at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and Great Britain’s National Weather Service concluded that human-induced climate change has made intense heat waves of the kind experienced in Texas in 2011 more likely than ever before. Published in the Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, it reported that global warming had ensured that the incidence of that Texas heat wave was 20 times more likely than it would have been in 1960; similarly, abnormally warm temperatures like those experienced in Britain last November were said to be 62 times as likely because of global warming. It is still too early to apply the methodology used by these scientists to calculating the effect of global warming on the heat waves of 2012, which are proving to be far more severe, but we can assume the level of correlation will be high. And what can we expect in the future, as the warming gains momentum? When we think about climate change (if we think about it at all), we envision rising temperatures, prolonged droughts, freakish storms, hellish wildfires, and rising sea levels. Among other things, this will result in damaged infrastructure and diminished food supplies. These are, of course, manifestations of warming in the physical world, not the social world we all inhabit and rely on for so many aspects of our daily well-being and survival. The purely physical effects of climate change will, no doubt, prove catastrophic. But the social effects including, somewhere down the line, food riots, mass starvation, state collapse, mass migrations, and conflicts of every sort, up to and including full-scale war, could prove even more disruptive and deadly. In her immensely successful young-adult novel, The Hunger Games (and the movie that followed), Suzanne Collins riveted millions with a portrait of a dystopian, resource-scarce, post-apocalyptic future where once-rebellious “districts” in an impoverished North America must supply two teenagers each year for a series of televised gladiatorial games that end in death for all but one of the youthful contestants. These “hunger games” are intended as recompense for the damage inflicted on the victorious capitol of Panem by the rebellious districts during an insurrection. Without specifically mentioning global warming, Collins makes it clear that climate change was significantly responsible for the hunger that shadows the North American continent in this future era. Hence, as the gladiatorial contestants are about to be selected, the mayor of District 12’s principal city describes “the disasters, the droughts, the storms, the fires, the encroaching seas that swallowed up so much of the land [and] the brutal war for what little sustenance remained.” In this, Collins was prescient, even if her specific vision of the violence on which such a world might be organized is fantasy. While we may never see her version of those hunger games, do not doubt that some version of them will come into existence—that, in fact, hunger wars of many sorts will fill our future. These could include any combination or permutation of the deadly riots that led to the 2008 collapse of Haiti’s government, the pitched battles between massed protesters and security forces that engulfed parts of Cairo as the Arab Spring developed, the ethnic struggles over disputed croplands and water sources that have made Darfur a recurring headline of horror in our world, or the inequitable distribution of agricultural land that continues to fuel the insurgency of the Maoist-inspired Naxalites of India. Combine such conflicts with another likelihood: that persistent drought and hunger will force millions of people to abandon their traditional lands and flee to the squalor of shantytowns and expanding slums surrounding large cities, sparking hostility from those already living there. One such eruption, with grisly results, occurred in Johannesburg’s shantytowns in 2008 when desperately poor and hungry migrants from Malawi and Zimbabwe were set upon, beaten, and in some cases burned to death by poor South Africans. One terrified Zimbabwean, cowering in a police station from the raging mobs, said she fled her country because “there is no work and no food.” And count on something else: millions more in the coming decades, pressed by disasters ranging from drought and flood to rising sea levels, will try to migrate to other countries, provoking even greater hostility. And that hardly begins to exhaust the possibilities that lie in our hunger-games future. At this point, the focus is understandably on the immediate consequences of the still ongoing Great Drought: dying crops, shrunken harvests, and rising food prices. But keep an eye out for the social and political effects that undoubtedly won’t begin to show up here or globally until later this year or 2013. Better than any academic study, these will offer us a hint of what we can expect in the coming decades from a hunger-games world of rising temperatures, persistent droughts, recurring food shortages, and billions of famished, desperate people.

**Food shocks threaten stability everywhere- the impact is extinction**

**Brown ’09** (LESTER R. BROWN, founder, Worldwatch Institute and the Earth Policy Institute, Scientific American, May 2009, “Could Food Shortages Bring Down Civilization?” http://www.scientificamerican.com/article/civilization-food-shortages/ )

**The biggest threat to global stability is the potential for food crises** in poor countries **to cause government collapse. Those crises are brought on by ever worsening environmental degradation** One of the toughest things for people to do is to anticipate sudden change. Typically we project the future by extrapolating from trends in the past. Much of the time this approach works well. But sometimes it fails spectacularly, and people are simply blindsided by events such as today's economic crisis. For most of us, **the idea that civilization** itself **could disintegrate** probably **seems preposterous**. Who would not find it hard to think seriously about such a complete departure from what we expect of ordinary life? What evidence could make us heed a warning so dire--and how would we go about responding to it? We are so inured to a long list of highly unlikely catastrophes that we are virtually programmed to dismiss them all with a wave of the hand: Sure, our civilization might devolve into chaos--and Earth might collide with an asteroid, too! For many years I have studied global agricultural, population, environmental and economic trends and their interactions. **The combined effects of those trends and the political tensions they generate point to the breakdown of governments and societies**. Yet I, too, have resisted the idea that food shortages could bring down not only individual governments but also our global civilization. I can no longer ignore that risk. **Our continuing failure to deal with the environmental declines that are undermining the world food economy--most important, falling water tables, eroding soils and rising temperatures**--forces me to conclude that **such a collapse is possible**. The Problem of Failed States Even a cursory look at the vital signs of our current world order lends unwelcome support to my conclusion. And those of us in the environmental field are well into our third decade of charting trends of environmental decline without seeing any significant effort to reverse a single one. In six of the past nine years world grain production has fallen short of consumption, forcing a steady drawdown in stocks. When the 2008 harvest began, world carryover stocks of grain (the amount in the bin when the new harvest begins) were at 62 days of consumption, a near record low. In response, world grain prices in the spring and summer of last year climbed to the highest level ever. **As demand for food rises faster than supplies are growing, the resulting food-price inflation puts severe stress on the governments of countries already teetering on the edge of chaos.** Unable to buy grain or grow their own, hungry people take to the streets. Indeed, even before the steep climb in grain prices in 2008, the number of failing states was expanding [see sidebar at left]. Many of their problem's stem from a failure to slow the growth of their populations. But **if the food situation continues to deteriorate, entire nations will break down at an ever increasing rate**. We have entered a new era in geopolitics. **In the 20th century the main threat to international security was superpower conflict; today it is failing states.** It is not the concentration of power but its absence that puts us at risk. States fail when national governments can no longer provide personal security, food security and basic social services such as education and health care. They often lose control of part or all of their territory. When governments lose their monopoly on power, law and order begin to disintegrate. After a point, countries can become so dangerous that food relief workers are no longer safe and their programs are halted; in Somalia and Afghanistan, deteriorating conditions have already put such programs in jeopardy. **Failing states are of international concern because they are a source of terrorists, drugs, weapons and refugees, threatening political stability everywhere**. Somalia, number one on the 2008 list of failing states, has become a base for piracy. Iraq, number five, is a hotbed for terrorist training. Afghanistan, number seven, is the world's leading supplier of heroin. Following the massive genocide of 1994 in Rwanda, refugees from that troubled state, thousands of armed soldiers among them, helped to destabilize neighboring Democratic Republic of the Congo (number six). **Our global civilization depends on a functioning network of politically healthy nation-states to control the spread of infectious disease, to manage the international monetary system, to control international terrorism and to reach scores of other common goals. If the system for controlling infectious diseases--such as polio, SARS or avian flu--breaks down, humanity will be in trouble. Once states fail**, no one assumes responsibility for their debt to outside lenders. If enough states disintegrate, **their fall will threaten the stability of global civilization itself.**