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#### Engagement is the lynchpin of neoliberal expansion into Cuba

**Wenston & Woods ’08** – Trotskyist political theorist and author and leading members of the International Marxist Tendency (Fred & Alan, “[Vultures hovering over Cuba after Fidel Castro steps down](http://www.cjournal.info/2008/02/20/vultures-hovering-over-cuba-after-fidel-castro-steps-down/)”, http://www.cjournal.info/2008/02/20/vultures-hovering-over-cuba-after-fidel-castro-steps-down/)//VP

They all pretend to be democrats when it comes to Cuba. In reality they are like vultures waiting for the day they can get their beaks and claws into the flesh of Cuba. What they are after is the end of the economic system brought into being by the Cuban revolution. They want capitalism to return to Cuba. That is what they mean by “democracy”! Another fashionable term these days is “engagement”. While Bush sticks to his guns and insists on the embargo being stepped up, the more intelligent bourgeois, both in the USA and Europe are raising the need for “engagement”, i.e. on removing the embargo and opening up trade channels. Does this wing of the bourgeois have different interests or aims? No, they simply understand better than Bush and his obtuse circle of friends that the best way to re-introduce capitalism into Cuba is to lift the embargo, begin trading, flood Cuba with cash and let the process unfold.¶ That is why it is even more disgusting when we hear some reformist elements on the left advocating such “engagement”. What they are actually doing is giving the bourgeois advice on how to remove this thorn in their side.¶ All this talk of democracy is in fact a cover for the real aims of imperialism. Not so long ago the Financial Times was giving more sober advice. They were suggesting a “Chinese road” for Cuba accompanied by a lifting of the US-sponsored embargo. The Chinese model would envisage an opening up of Cuba to capitalism accompanied by a firm grip on state power at the top.

#### Neoliberalism causes extinction through ecological destruction and resource wars

**Darder, 10** – Professor Antonia Darder, Distinguished Professor of Education, University of Illinois, Urbana Champaign (“Preface” in *Critical Pedagogy, Ecoliteracy, & Planetary Crisis: The Ecopedagogy Movement* by Richard V. Kahn, 2010, pp. x-xiii)//VP

GENDER MODIFIED

It is fitting to begin my words about Richard Kahn’s Critical Pedagogy, Ecoliteracy, and Planetary Crisis: The Ecopedagogy Movement with a poem. The direct and succinct message of The Great Mother Wails cuts through our theorizing and opens us up to the very heart of the book’s message—to ignite a fire that speaks to **the ecological crisis** at hand; a crisis orchestrated by the inhumane greed and economic brutality of the wealthy. Nevertheless, as is clearly apparent, none of us is absolved from complicity with the devastating destruction of the earth. As members of the global community, we are all implicated in this destruction by the very manner in which we define ourselves, each other, and all living beings with whom we reside on the earth. Everywhere we look there are glaring signs of political systems and social structures that propel us toward **unsustainability and extinction**. In this historical moment, the planet faces some of the most horrendous forms of “[hu]man-made” devastation ever known to humankind. Cataclysmic “natural disasters” in the last decade have sung the environmental hymns of planetary imbalance and reckless environmental disregard. A striking feature of this ecological crisis, both locally and globally, is the **overwhelming concentration of wealth** held by the ruling elite and their agents of capital. This environmental malaise is characterized by the staggering loss of livelihood among working people everywhere; gross inequalities in educational opportunities; an absence of health care for millions; an unprecedented number of people living behind bars; and trillions spent on fabricated wars fundamentally tied to the control and domination of the planet’s resources. The Western ethos of mastery and supremacy over nature has accompanied, to our detriment, the unrelenting expansion of capitalism and its unparalleled domination over all aspects of human life. This hegemonic worldview has been unmercifully imparted through a host of public policies and practices that conveniently gloss over gross inequalities as commonsensical necessities for democracy to bloom. As a consequence, the liberal democratic rhetoric of “we are all created equal” hardly begins to touch the international pervasiveness of racism, patriarchy, technocracy, and economic piracy by the West, all which have fostered the erosion of civil rights and the unprecedented ecological exploitation of societies, creating conditions that now threaten our peril, if we do not reverse directions. Cataclysmic disasters, such as Hurricane Katrina, are unfortunate testimonies to the danger of ignoring the warnings of the natural world, especially when coupled with egregious governmental neglect of impoverished people. Equally disturbing, is the manner in which ecological crisis is vulgarly exploited by unscrupulous and ruthless capitalists who see no problem with turning a profit off the backs of ailing and mourning oppressed populations of every species—whether they be victims of weather disasters, catastrophic illnesses, industrial pollution, or inhumane practices of incarceration. Ultimately, these constitute ecological calamities that speak to the inhumanity and tyranny of material profiteering, at the expense of precious life. The arrogance and exploitation of neoliberal values of consumption dishonor the contemporary suffering of poor and marginalized populations around the globe. Neoliberalism denies or simply mocks (“Drill baby drill!”) the interrelationship and delicate balance that exists between all living beings, including the body earth. In its stead, values of individualism, competition, privatization, and the “free market” systematically debase the ancient ecological knowledge of indigenous populations, who have, implicitly or explicitly, rejected the fabricated ethos of “progress and democracy” propagated by the West. In its consuming frenzy to gobble up the natural resources of the planet for its own hyperbolic quest for material domination, the exploitative nature of capitalism and its burgeoning technocracy has dangerously deepened the structures of social exclusion, through the destruction of the very biodiversity that has been key to our global survival for millennia. Kahn insists that this devastation of all species and the planet must be fully recognized and soberly critiqued. But he does not stop there. Alongside, he rightly argues for political principles of engagement for the construction of a critical ecopedagogy and ecoliteracy that is founded on economic redistribution, cultural and linguistic democracy, indigenous sovereignty, universal human rights, and a fundamental respect for all life. As such, Kahn seeks to bring us all back to a formidable relationship with the earth, one that is unquestionably rooted in an integral order of knowledge, imbued with physical, emotional, intellectual, and spiritual wisdom. Within the context of such an ecologically grounded epistemology, Kahn uncompromisingly argues that our organic relationship with the earth is also intimately tied to our struggles for cultural self-determination, environmental sustainability, social and material justice, and global peace. Through a carefully framed analysis of past disasters and current ecological crisis, Kahn issues an urgent call for a critical ecopedagogy that makes central explicit articulations of the ways in which societies construct ideological, political, and cultural systems, based on social structures and practices that can serve to promote ecological sustainability and biodiversity or, conversely, lead us down a disastrous path of unsustainability and extinction. In making his case, Kahn provides a grounded examination of the manner in which consuming capitalism manifests its repressive force throughout the globe, disrupting the very ecological order of knowledge essential to the planet’s sustainability. He offers an understanding of critical ecopedagogy and ecoliteracy that inherently critiques the history of Western civilization and the anthropomorphic assumptions that sustain patriarchy and the subjugation of all subordinated living beings—assumptions that continue to inform traditional education discourses around the world. Kahn incisively demonstrates how a theory of multiple technoliteracies can be used to effectively critique the ecological corruption and destruction behind mainstream uses of technology and the media in the interest of the neoliberal marketplace. As such, his work points to the manner in which the sustainability rhetoric of mainstream environmentalism actually **camouflages** wretched neoliberal policies and practices that left unchecked **hasten the annihilation of the globe’s ecosystem**. True to its promise, the book cautions that any anti-hegemonic resistance movement that claims social justice, universal human rights, or global peace must contend forthrightly with the deteriorating ecological crisis at hand, as well as consider possible strategies and relationships that rupture the status quo and transform environmental conditions that threaten disaster. A failure to integrate ecological sustainability at the core of our political and pedagogical struggles for liberation, Kahn argues, is to blindly and misguidedly adhere to an anthropocentric worldview in which emancipatory dreams are deemed solely about human interests, without attention either to the health of the planet or to the well-being of all species with whom we walk the earth.

#### The alternative is to reject the 1ac to interrogate neoliberal economic engagement with latin America from the starting point of knowledge production- that is a prerequisite to breaking down neoliberalism

**Walsh, 12** – Estudios Culturales Latinoamericanos de la Universidad Andina Simón Bolívar (Catherine, “The Politics of Naming”, Cultural Studies, 26.1, Project Muse)//VP

Cultural Studies, in our project, is constructed and understood as more than a field of ‘study’. It is broadly understand as a formation, a field of possibility and expression. And it is constructed as a space of encounter between disciplines and intellectual, political and ethical projects that seek to combat what Alberto Moreiras called the impoverishment of thought driven by divisions (disciplinary, epistemological, geographic, etc.) and the socio-political-cultural fragmentation that increasingly makes social change and intervention appear to be divided forces (Moreiras 2001). As such, Cultural Studies is conceived as a place of plural-, inter-, transand in-disciplinary (or undisciplined) critical thinking that takes as major concern the intimate relationships between culture, knowledge, politics and economics mentioned earlier, and that sees the problems of the region as both local and global. It is a space from which to search for ways of thinking, knowing, comprehending, feeling and acting that permit us to intervene and influence: a field that makes possible convergence and articulation, particularly between efforts, practices, knowledge and projects that focus on more global justice, on differences (epistemic, ontological, existential, of gender, ethnicity, class, race, nation, among others) constructed as inequalities within the framework of neo-liberal capitalism. It is a place that seeks answers, encourages intervention and engenders projects and proposals. It is in this frame of understanding and practice in our Ph.D. programme in Latin-American Cultural Studies at the Universidad Andina Simo´n Bolı´var, that this broad description-definition continues to take on more concrete characteristics. Here I can identify three that stand out: the inter-cultural, the inter-epistemic and the de-colonial. The inter-cultural has been and still is a central axis in the struggles and processes of social change in the Andean region. Its critical meaning was first affirmed near the end of the 1980s in the Ecuadorian indigenous movement’s political project. Here inter-culturality was positioned as an ideological principal grounded in the urgent need for a radical transformation of social structures, institutions and relationships, not only for indigenous peoples but also for society as a whole. Since then, inter-culturality has marked a social, political, ethical project and process that is also epistemological;6 a project and a process that seek to re-found the bases of the nation and national culture, understood as homogenous and mono-cultural. Such call for re-founding does not to simply add diversity to what is already established, but rather to rethink, rebuild and inter-culturalize the nation and national culture, and with in the terrains of knowledge, politics and life-based visions. It is this understanding of the inter-cultural that is of interest. Concretely, we are interested in the spaces of agency, creation, innovation and encounter between and among different subjects, knowledges, practices and visions. Referring to our project of Cultural Studies as (inter)Cultural Studies, enables and encourages us to think from this region, from the struggles, practices and processes that question Eurocentric, colonial and imperial legacies, and work to transform and create radically different conditions for thinking, encountering, being and coexisting or co-living. In a similar fashion, the inter-epistemic focuses on the need to question, interrupt and transgress the Euro-USA-centric epistemological frameworks that dominate Latin-American universities and even some Cultural Studies programmes. To think with knowledges produced in Latin America and the Caribbean (as well as in other ‘Souths’, including those located in the North) and by intellectuals who come not only from academia, but also from other projects, communities and social movements are, for us, a necessary and essential step, both in de-colonization and in creating other conditions of knowledge and understanding. Our project, thus, concerns itself with the work of inverting the geopolitics of knowledge, with placing attention on the historically subjugated and negated plurality of knowledge, logics and rationalities, and with the political-intellectual effort to create relationships, articulations and convergences between them. The de-colonial element is intimately related to the two preceding points. Here our interest is, on one hand, to make evident the thoughts, practices and experiences that both in the past and in the present have endeavoured to challenge the colonial matrix of power and domination, and to exist in spite of it, in its exterior and interior. By colonial matrix, we refer to the hierarchical system of racial civilizational classification that has operated and operates at different levels of life, including social identities (the superiority of white, heterosexual males), ontological-existential contexts (the dehumanization of indigenous and black peoples), epistemic contexts (the positioning of Euro-centrism as the only perspective of knowledge, thereby disregarding other epistemic rationalities), and cosmological (the control and/or negation of the ancestral-spiritual-territorial-existential bases that govern the life-systems of ancestral peoples, most especially those of African Diaspora and of Abya Yala) (see Quijano 1999). At the centre or the heart of this matrix is capitalism as the only possible model of civilization; the imposed social classification, the idea of ‘humanity’, the perspective of knowledge and the prototype life-system that goes with it defines itself through this capitalistic civilizational lens. As Quijano argues, by defending the interests of social domination and the exploitation of work under the hegemony of capital, ‘the ‘‘racialization’’ and the ‘‘capitalization’’ of social relationships of these models of power, and the ‘‘eurocentralization’’ of its control, are in the very roots of our present problems of identity,’ in Latin America as countries, ‘nations’ and States (Quijano 2006). It is precisely because of this that we consider the de-colonial to be a fundamental perspective. Within our project, the de-colonial does not seek to establish a new paradigm or line of thought but a critically-conscious understanding of the past and present that opens up and suggests questions, perspectives and paths to explore. As such, and on the other hand, we are interested in stimulating methodologies and pedagogies that, in the words of Jacqui Alexander (2005), cross the fictitious boundaries of exclusion and marginalization to contribute to the configuration of new ways of being and knowing rooted not in alterity itself, but in the principles of relation, complement and commitment. It is also to encourage other ways of reading, investigating and researching, of seeing, knowing, feeling, hearing and being, that challenge the singular reasoning of western modernity, make tense our own disciplinary frameworks of ‘study’ and interpretation, and persuade a questioning from and with radically distinct rationalities, knowledge, practices and civilizational-life-systems. It is through these three pillars of the inter-cultural, the inter-epistemic and the de-colonial that we attempt to understand the processes, experiences and struggles that are occurring in Latin America and elsewhere. But it is also here that we endeavour to contribute to and learn from the complex relationships between culture-politics-economics, knowledge and power in the world today; to unlearn to relearn from and with perspectives otherwise. Practices, experiences and challenges In this last section, my interest is to share some of the particularities of our doctorate programme/project, now in its third cycle; its achievements and advancements; and the challenges that it faces in an academic context, increasingly characterized regionally and internationally, by disciplinarity, depolitization, de-subjectivation, apathy, competitive individualism and nonintervention. Without a doubt, one of the unique characteristics of the programme/ project is its students: all mid-career professionals mainly from the Andean region and from such diverse fields as the social sciences, humanities, the arts, philosophy, communication, education and law. The connection that the majority of the students have with social and cultural movements and/or processes, along with their dedication to teaching or similar work, helps to contribute to dynamic debate and discussion not always seen in academia and post-graduate programmes. Similarly, the faculty of the programme stand out for being internationally renowned intellectuals, and, the majority, for their commitment to struggles of social transformation, critical thinking and the project of the doctorate itself. The curriculum offering is based on courses and seminars that seek to foment thinking from Latin American and with its intellectuals in all of their diversity comprehend, confront and affect the problems and realities of the region, which are not only local but global. The pedagogical methodological perspective aforementioned works to stimulate processes of collective thought and allow the participants to think from related formations, experiences and research topics and to think with the differences disciplinary, geographical, epistemic and subjective thereby fracturing individualism by dialoguing, transgressing and inter-crossing boundaries. Trans-disciplinarity, as such, is a fundamental position and process in our project. The fact that the graduate students come from an array of different backgrounds provides a plurality in which the methodologicalpedagogical practice becomes the challenge of collectively thinking, crossing disciplinary backgrounds and creating new positions and perspectives, conceived and formed in a trans-disciplinary way. The majority of courses, seminars and professors, also assume that this is a necessary challenge in today’s world when no single discipline and no single intellectual is capable alone of analyzing, comprehending or transforming social reality. Nevertheless, trans-disciplinary gains continue to be a point of criticism and contention, especially given the present trend to re-discipline the LatinAmerican university. As Edgardo Lander has argued (2000a), this tendency reflects the neo-liberalization of higher education, as well as the increasing conservatism of intellectuals, including those that previously identified as or to continue to identify themselves as progressives and/or leftists. To establish oneself in a discipline or presume truth through a discipline, a common practice today, is to reinstall the geopolitics of knowing. This, in turn, strengthens Euro-USA-centrism as ‘the place’ of theory and knowledge. As such, the subject of dispute is not simply the trans-disciplinary aspect of Cultural Studies but also its ‘indisciplinary’ nature, that is, the effort central to our project to include points of view that come from Latin America and thinkers who are not always connected to academia (see Walsh et al. 2002). Our interest is not, as some claim, to facilitate the agendas or cultural agency of subaltern groups or social movements, promote activism or simply include other knowledge forms, but instead to build a different political-intellectual project a political-intellectual project otherwise. Such project gives centrality to the need to learn to think from, together and with Latin American reality and its actors, thereby stimulating convergences, articulations and inter-culturalizations that aim at creating an academia that is committed to life itself. Such a perspective does not eliminate or deny knowledge conceived in Europe or North America usually named as ‘universal’ or its proponents and thinkers. Instead, it incorporates such knowledge as part of a broader canon and worldview that seeks pluriversality, recognizing the importance of places and loci of enunciation. For our project, all of this serves to highlight the doubly complicated situation that is still in flux. On one hand, there is the negative association with trans-disciplinarity and the academic suppositions that accompany it, particularly in the area of research; this requires that our theses be doubly rigorous. And, on the other hand, there is the geopolitical limitation not only of disciplines but also of academic disciplining. To argue, as we do, that knowledge and thought are also produced outside of universities and, in dialogue with Hall, that political movements also produce and provoke theoretic moments and movements, is to question and challenge the academic logic and the authority of a universal and singular reasoning and science. We will, through such questioning and challenges, always be marginalized, placed on the fringe, under a microscope, criticized and disputed. Because of this, the challenges that we have encountered have been many. On one hand, there are those challenges that many face in the Latin-American academic context: the real difficulties of financing, infrastructure and research support. On the other hand, are the challenges that come with the traditional academic disciplinary structure, its de-politization and de-subjectification. Here the challenge is to transgress the established norms of neutrality, distance and objectivity. It is also to confront the standards that give little relevance to historically subjugated groups, practices and knowledges, and to the interlinking of race, ethnicity, gender and sexuality with the structures and models of power and knowledge. It is to make evident past and present struggles that give real meaning to the arguments of heterogeneity, decoloniality and inter-culturality. Here the criticism and dispute comes from many sides: from those who describe these efforts as too politicized (and, as such, supposedly less ‘academic’), uni-paradigmatic (supposedly limited to only one ‘line of thought’), fundamentalist (supposedly exclusionary of those subjects not marked by the colonial wound) and as obsessed with conflict (and therefore far from the tradition of ‘culture’, its letters and object of study). These challenges together with the tensions, criticisms and disputes that they mark often times make the path more difficult. Still, and at the same time, they allow us to clarify the distinctive and unique aspects of our project and its motivations to continue with its course of construction, insurgence and struggle. Our concern here is not so much with the institutionalizing of Cultural Studies. Better yet, and in a much broader fashion, we are concerned with epistemic inter-culturalization, with the de-colonialization and pluriversalization of the ‘university’, and with a thinking from the South(s). To place these concerns, as argued here, within a perspective and a politics of naming: ‘(inter)Cultural Studies in de-colonial code,’ is to open, not close, paths. Conclusion In concluding the reflections I have presented here, it is useful to return to a fundamental point touched by Stuart Hall: ‘intervention’. In particular and with Hall, I refer to the will to intervene in and transform the world, an intervention that does not simply relate to social and political contexts and fields, but also to epistemology and theory. That is to an intervention and transformation in and a de-colonization of the frameworks and logics of our thinking, knowing and comprehending. To commit oneself in mind, body and spirit as Frantz Fanon argued. To consider Cultural Studies today a project of political vocation and intervention is to position and at the same time build our work on the borders of and the boundaries between university and society. It is to seriously reflect on whom we read and with whom we want and/or need to dialogue and think, to understand the very limits or our knowledge. And precisely because of this, it is to act on our own situation, establishing contacts and exchanges of different kinds in a pedagogicalmethodological zeal to think from and think with, in what I have elsewhere called a critical inter-culturality and de-colonial pedagogy (Walsh 2009). In universities and societies that are increasingly characterized by nonintervention, auto-complacency, individualism and apathy, intervention represents, suggests and promotes a position and practice of involvement, action and complicity. To take on such a position and practice and to make it an integral part of our political-intellectual project is to find not only ethical meaning in work on culture and power, but also to give this work some heart. That is to say, to focus on the ever-greater need and urgency of life. To call these Cultural Studies or critical (inter)Cultural Studies is only one of our options, and part of the politics of naming.
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#### Debt ceiling will be raised now – PC key and GOP stand-off doesn’t matter

**Roberts, 9/26** – Reporter for the Guardian (Dan, “Obama stands firm on healthcare in face of escalating Republican stand-off”, 2013, Politico, http://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/sep/26/obama-healthcare-standoff-boehner-congress)//VP

Barack Obama refused to blink on Thursday in the escalating stand-off over his healthcare reforms, insisting he would not heed Republican calls to negotiate over their twin threats to shut down the government and force a debt default.¶ "They are threatening steps that would badly hurt our economy," the president said in his first big speech of the latest budgetary stand-off. "That's not going to happen as long as I'm president. The Affordable Care Act is here to stay."¶ Minutes earlier, Republican leaders in the House of Representatives upped the ante by announcing a new set of demands in exchange for extending the US debt ceiling when it expires in mid-October.¶ In addition to postponing the implementation of the Affordable Care Act, also known as Obamacare, they are now demanding a host of broader political concessions, including tax reform and energy deregulation, in exchange for agreeing to allow further federal borrowing.¶ House speaker John Boehner also refused to give any indication how he might resolve the separate clash over the so-called continuing resolution (CR), which would authorise government spending to carry on after the current authorisation expires on Monday night.¶ The initial Republican plan to link this crucial budget motion with their demands for defunding Obamacare is fast unravelling in the Senate, where a majority of Democrats are shortly expected to pass a so-called "clean" bill, shorn of any threat to healthcare reform.¶ But a cryptic Boehner press conference left open the possibility that Republicans would drop this demand at the last minute and pursue their demands by threatening the debt ceiling instead.¶ Asked by a reporter, "will you now accept a clean CR from the Senate to avoid a government shutdown," Boehner replied: "I do not see that happening."¶ Many commentators took this to mean that Boehner could continue to frustrate passage of the bill, by sending it back to the Senate with new demands attached. "If that's the case, what do you plan on sending back to the Senate to avoid that happening?" Boehner was asked.¶ Raising his eyebrows theatrically, Boehner suggested it was the government shutdown he did not see happening. "I have made it clear for months and months that we have no interest in seeing a government shutdown," he said. There will be options available to us but there is not going to be any speculation about what we might do or not until the Senate passes the continuing resolution."¶ Other Republican leaders called on the White House to help them out of what look increasingly looks to be a tactical cul-de-sac.¶ "The president does not call to say 'let's sit over this', he calls to say he will not negotiate," complained House majority whip Kevin McCarthy. "That's not the same message he gives to world leaders."¶ Obama gave no ground however during a speech to community groups in Baltimore that was intended to focus attention back on the benefits of his healthcare reforms to the 50 million Americans without medical insurance. "Sometimes you just need to escape Beltway politics," Obama said, dismissing what he called "the antics going on in Congress right now".¶

#### Liberalizing policy towards Cuba costs capital – Congress will upset other items on the agenda

**LeoGrande 12**

William, School of Public Affairs @ American University, Fresh Start for a Stale Policy: Can Obama Break the Stalemate in U.S.-Cuban Relations?, 2012, http://www.american.edu/clals/upload/LeoGrande-Fresh-Start.pdf

Where in the executive branch will control over Cuba policy lie? Political considerations¶ played a major role in Obama's Cuba policy during the first term, albeit not as preeminent a¶ consideration as they were during the Clinton years. In 2009, Obama's new foreign policy team¶ got off to a bad start when they promised Senator Menendez that they would consult him before¶ changing Cuba policy. That was the price he extracted for providing Senate Democrats with the¶ 60 votes needed to break a Republican filibuster on a must-pass omnibus appropriations bill to¶ keep the government operating. For the next four years, administration officials worked more¶ closely with Menendez, who opposed the sort of major redirection of policy Obama had¶ promised, than they did with senators like John Kerry (D-Mass.), chair of the Foreign Relations¶ Committee, whose views were more in line with the president's stated policy goals.¶ At the Department of State, Assistant Secretary Arturo Valenzuela favored initiatives to¶ improve relations with Cuba, but he was stymied by indifference or resistance elsewhere in the¶ bureaucracy. Secretary Hillary Clinton, having staked out a tough position Cuba during the¶ Democratic primary campaign, was not inclined to be the driver for a new policy. At the NSC,¶ Senior Director for the Western Hemisphere Dan Restrepo, who advised Obama on Latin¶ America policy during the 2008 campaign, did his best to avoid the Cuba issue because it was so¶ fraught with political danger. ¶ When the president finally approved the resumption of people-to-people travel to Cuba,¶ which Valenzuela had been pushing, the White House political team delayed the announcement¶ for several months at the behest of Debbie Wasserman Schultz. Any easing of the travel¶ regulations, she warned, would hurt Democrats' prospects in the upcoming mid-term elections.43¶ The White House shelved the new regulations until January 2011, and then announced them late¶ Friday before a holiday weekend. Then, just a year later, the administration surrendered to¶ Senator Rubio's demand that it limit the licensing of travel providers in exchange for him¶ dropping his hold on the appointment of Valenzuela's replacement.44¶ With Obama in his final term and Vice-President Joe Biden unlikely to seek the¶ Democratic nomination in 2016 (unlike the situation Clinton and Gore faced in their second¶ term), politics will presumably play a less central role in deciding Cuba policy over the next four¶ years. There will still be the temptation, however, to sacrifice Cuba policy to mollify¶ congressional conservatives, both Democrat and Republican, who are willing to hold other¶ Obama initiatives hostage to extract concessions on Cuba. And since Obama has given in to such¶ hostage-taking previously, the hostage-takers have a strong incentive to try the same tactic again.¶ The only way to break this cycle would be for the president to stand up to them and refuse to give¶ in, as he did when they attempted to rollback his 2009 relaxation of restrictions on CubanAmerican travel and remittances.¶ Much will depend on who makes up Obama's new foreign policy team, especially at the¶ Department of State. John Kerry has been a strong advocate of a more open policy toward Cuba,¶ and worked behind the scenes with the State Department and USAID to clean up the "democracy¶ promotion" program targeting Cuba, as a way to win the release of Alan Gross. A new secretary¶ is likely to bring new assistant secretaries, providing an opportunity to revitalize the Bureau of¶ Western Hemisphere Affairs, which has been thoroughly cowed by congressional hardliners. But¶ even with new players in place, does Cuba rise to the level of importance that would justify a¶ major new initiative and the bruising battle with conservatives on the Hill? Major policy changes¶ that require a significant expenditure of political capital rarely happen unless the urgency of the¶ problem forces policymakers to take action.

#### Failure collapses the economy – goes global and past events don’t disprove

**Davidson 9/10**

Adam, co-founder of NPR’s “Planet Money,” Our Debt to Society, New York Times, 9/10/13, http://www.nytimes.com/2013/09/15/magazine/our-debt-to-society.html?pagewanted=all

If the debt ceiling isn’t lifted again this fall, some serious financial decisions will have to be made. Perhaps the government can skimp on its foreign aid or furlough all of NASA, but eventually the big-ticket items, like Social Security and Medicare, will have to be cut. At some point, the government won’t be able to pay interest on its bonds and will enter what’s known as sovereign default, the ultimate national financial disaster achieved by countries like Zimbabwe, Ecuador and Argentina (and now Greece). In the case of the United States, though, it won’t be an isolated national crisis. If the American government can’t stand behind the dollar, the world’s benchmark currency, then the global financial system will very likely enter a new era in which there is much less trade and much less economic growth. It would be, by most accounts, the largest self-imposed financial disaster in history.¶ Nearly everyone involved predicts that someone will blink before this disaster occurs. Yet a small number of House Republicans (one political analyst told me it’s no more than 20) appear willing to see what happens if the debt ceiling isn’t raised — at least for a bit. This could be used as leverage to force Democrats to drastically cut government spending and eliminate President Obama’s signature health-care-reform plan. In fact, Representative Tom Price, a Georgia Republican, told me that the whole problem could be avoided if the president agreed to drastically cut spending and lower taxes. Still, it is hard to put this act of game theory into historic context. Plenty of countries — and some cities, like Detroit — have defaulted on their financial obligations, but only because their governments ran out of money to pay their bills. No wealthy country has ever voluntarily decided — in the middle of an economic recovery, no less — to default. And there’s certainly no record of that happening to the country that controls the global reserve currency.¶ Like many, I assumed a self-imposed U.S. debt crisis might unfold like most involuntary ones. If the debt ceiling isn’t raised by X-Day, I figured, the world’s investors would begin to see America as an unstable investment and rush to sell their Treasury bonds. The U.S. government, desperate to hold on to investment, would then raise interest rates far higher, hurtling up rates on credit cards, student loans, mortgages and corporate borrowing — which would effectively put a clamp on all trade and spending. The U.S. economy would collapse far worse than anything we’ve seen in the past several years.¶ Instead, Robert Auwaerter, head of bond investing for Vanguard, the world’s largest mutual-fund company, told me that the collapse might be more insidious. “You know what happens when the market gets upset?” he said. “There’s a flight to quality. Investors buy Treasury bonds. It’s a bit perverse.” In other words, if the U.S. comes within shouting distance of a default (which Auwaerter is confident won’t happen), the world’s investors — absent a safer alternative, given the recent fates of the euro and the yen — might actually buy even more Treasury bonds. Indeed, interest rates would fall and the bond markets would soar.¶ While this possibility might not sound so bad, it’s really far more damaging than the apocalyptic one I imagined. Rather than resulting in a sudden crisis, failure to raise the debt ceiling would lead to a slow bleed. Scott Mather, head of the global portfolio at Pimco, the world’s largest private bond fund, explained that while governments and institutions might go on a U.S.-bond buying frenzy in the wake of a debt-ceiling panic, they would eventually recognize that the U.S. government was not going through an odd, temporary bit of insanity. They would eventually conclude that it had become permanently less reliable. Mather imagines institutional investors and governments turning to a basket of currencies, putting their savings in a mix of U.S., European, Canadian, Australian and Japanese bonds. Over the course of decades, the U.S. would lose its unique role in the global economy.¶ The U.S. benefits enormously from its status as global reserve currency and safe haven. Our interest and mortgage rates are lower; companies are able to borrow money to finance their new products more cheaply. As a result, there is much more economic activity and more wealth in America than there would be otherwise. If that status erodes, the U.S. economy’s peaks will be lower and recessions deeper; future generations will have fewer job opportunities and suffer more when the economy falters. And, Mather points out, no other country would benefit from America’s diminished status. When you make the base risk-free asset more risky, the entire global economy becomes riskier and costlier.

#### Nuclear war

**Friedberg and Schoenfeld 8**

Aaron, Prof. Politics. And IR @ Princeton’s Woodrow Wilson School and Visiting Scholar @ Witherspoon Institute, and Gabriel, Senior Editor of Commentary and Wall Street Journal, “The Dangers of a Diminished America” <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB122455074012352571.html>

Then there are the dolorous consequences of a potential collapse of the world's financial architecture. For decades now, Americans have enjoyed the advantages of being at the center of that system. The worldwide use of the dollar, and the stability of our economy, among other things, made it easier for us to run huge budget deficits, as we counted on foreigners to pick up the tab by buying dollar-denominated assets as a safe haven. Will this be possible in the future? Meanwhile, traditional foreign-policy challenges are multiplying. The threat from al Qaeda and Islamic terrorist affiliates has not been extinguished. Iran and North Korea are continuing on their bellicose paths, while Pakistan and Afghanistan are progressing smartly down the road to chaos. Russia's new militancy and China's seemingly relentless rise also give cause for concern. If America now tries to pull back from the world stage, it will leave a dangerous power vacuum. The stabilizing effects of our presence in Asia, our continuing commitment to Europe, and our position as defender of last resort for Middle East energy sources and supply lines could all be placed at risk. In such a scenario there are shades of the 1930s, when global trade and finance ground nearly to a halt, the peaceful democracies failed to cooperate, and aggressive powers led by the remorseless fanatics who rose up on the crest of economic disaster exploited their divisions. Today we run the risk that rogue states may choose to become ever more reckless with their nuclear toys, just at our moment of maximum vulnerability. The aftershocks of the financial crisis will almost certainly rock our principal strategic competitors even harder than they will rock us. The dramatic free fall of the Russian stock market has demonstrated the fragility of a state whose economic performance hinges on high oil prices, now driven down by the global slowdown. China is perhaps even more fragile, its economic growth depending heavily on foreign investment and access to foreign markets. Both will now be constricted, inflicting economic pain and perhaps even sparking unrest in a country where political legitimacy rests on progress in the long march to prosperity. None of this is good news if the authoritarian leaders of these countries seek to divert attention from internal travails with external adventures.

### 1nc

#### Text: Congress should delegate the authority to reduce restrictions on the registration or renewal of trademarks or trade names in connection with a business confiscated by the government of Cuba to the Department of State. The Department of State should pursue and enact the congressional delegation.

#### **CP is competitive – they don’t spec their agent which is a reason to vote neg because it kills agent CPs and branch specific DA’s AND hurts knowledge about implementation.**

#### Counterplan solves the aff and doesn’t link to politics.

**Epstein and O’Hallaron 99** (David Epstein- Department of Political Science and Stanford Graduate School of Business, Columbia and Stanford University, and Sharyn O’Hallaron- Department of Political Science and the School of International and Public Affairs and Hoover Institution, Columbia and Stanford University, January 1999 (“The Nondelegation Doctrine and the Separation of Powers” – Cardozo Law Review) p. lexis

Our institutional analysis begins with the observation that there are two alternative modes for specifying the details of public policy. Policy can be made through the typical legislative process, in which a committee considers a bill and reports it to the floor of the chamber, and then a majority of the floor members must agree on a policy to enact. Alternatively, Congress can pass a law that delegates authority to regulatory agencies, allowing them to fill in some or all of the details of policy. The key is that, given a fixed amount of policy details to be specified, these two modes of poli [\*962] cymaking are substitutes for each other. To the degree that one is used more, the other will perforce be used less. Note also that it is Congress who chooses where policy is made. Legislators can either write detailed, exacting laws, in which case the executive branch will have little or no substantive input into policy, they can delegate the details to agencies, thereby giving the executive branch a substantial role in the policymaking process, or they can pick any point in between. Since legislators' primary goal is reelection, it follows that policy will be made so as to maximize legislators' reelection chances. Thus, delegation will follow the natural fault lines of legislators' political advantage. In making this institutional choice, legislators face costs either way. Making explicit laws requires legislative time and energy that might be profitably spent on more electorally productive activities. After all, one of the reasons bureaucracies are created is for agencies to implement policies in areas where Congress has neither the time nor expertise to micro-manage policy decisions, and by restricting flexibility, Congress would be limiting agencies' ability to adjust to changing circumstances. This tradeoff is captured well by Terry Moe in his discussion of regulatory structure: The most direct way [to control agencies] is for today's authorities to specify, in excruciating detail, precisely what the agency is to do and how it is to do it, leaving as little as possible to the discretionary judgment of bureaucrats - and thus as little as possible for future authorities to exercise control over, short of passing new legislation... Obviously, this is not a formula for creating effective organizations. In the interests of public protection, agencies are knowingly burdened with cumbersome, complicated, technically inappropriate structures that undermine their capacity to perform their jobs well. n40 Where oversight and monitoring problems do not exist, legislators would readily delegate authority to the executive branch, taking advantage of agency expertise, conserving scarce resources of time, staff, and energy, and **avoiding the logrolls, delays, and informational inefficiencies** associated with the committee system. Consider, for example, the issue of airline safety, which is characterized on the one hand by the need for technical expertise, and on the other hand by an almost complete absence of potential political benefits. That is, policymakers will receive little credit if airlines run well and no disasters occur, but they will have to with [\*963] stand intense scrutiny if something goes wrong. n41 Furthermore, legislative and executive preferences on this issue would tend to be almost perfectly aligned - have fewer accidents as long as the costs to airlines are not prohibitive. The set of individuals receiving benefits, the public who use the airlines, is diffused and ill organized, while those paying the costs of regulation, the airline companies, are well-organized and politically active. Furthermore, keeping in mind that deficiencies in the system are easily detectable, delegated power is relatively simple to monitor. For all these reasons, even if legislators had unlimited time and resources of their own (which they do not), delegation to the executive branch would be the preferred mode of policymaking.

### 1nc

#### A. Interpretation - Economic Engagement is defined as expanding economic ties with a country to change its behavior – this means they have to be gov to gov

**Kahler, 6** - Graduate School of International Relations and Pacific Studies, University of California, San Diego (M., “Strategic Uses of Economic Interdependence: Engagement Policies on the Korean Peninsula and Across the Taiwan Strait” in Journal of Peace Research (2006), 43:5, p. 523-541, Sage Publications)

Economic engagement - a policy of deliberately expanding economic ties with an adversary in order to change the behavior of the target state and improve bilateral political relations

#### ‘Its’ is a possessive pronoun showing ownership

**Glossary of English Grammar Terms, 2005** – (“Term: Possessive Pronoun,”

http://www.usingenglish.com/glossary/possessive-pronoun.html)

Mine, yours, his, hers, its, ours, theirs are the possessive pronouns used to substitute a noun and to show possession or ownership.

EG. This is your disk and that's mine. (Mine substitutes the word disk and shows that it belongs to me.)

#### **B. Violation – the plan only lifts sanctions – that’s distinct**

#### **C. Voting Issue**

#### **1. Limits – a government limit is the only way to keep the topic manageable – otherwise they could use any 3rd party intermediary, lift barriers to private engagement, or target civil society – it makes topic preparation impossible**

#### **2. Negative ground – formal governmental channels are key to predictable relations disads and counterplans that test ‘engagement’**

#### **3. effects topicality is a voter – the aff could claim advantages off any part of the internal link chain that makes them topical – kills predictability and limits**

### Trade adv

1. Alt causes

#### Trucking and foreign-born worker restrictions, Buy American, currency revaluation

**Cooley, 09** (The Paganelli-Bull professor of economics and Richard R. West dean of the NYU Stern School of Business – Forbes Thomas, Why We Can't Get Along, <http://www.forbes.com/09/03/31/g20-gordon-brown-geithner-china-opinions-columnists-stimulus.html>) QUINN

The United States has been pretty egregious in its protectionism. It threw down the gauntlet to Mexico over the trucking industry, inserted self-defeating Buy American provisions in the stimulus package and increased restrictions on foreign-born workers, to cite just a few examples. We are not the worst offender, nor are we approaching the Smoot-Hawley foolishness of the 1930s. But rather than show leadership on such an important issue, we proclaim one view but act otherwise.

We have been singularly inept in dealing with the most important emergent economic power, the Chinese. We got off to the wrong start immediately in January when Timothy Geithner, the Treasury Secretary, told U.S. lawmakers that President Barack Obama, "backed by the conclusions of a broad range of economists--believes that China is manipulating its currency."

The criticism provoked a backlash that has increased in intensity**.** China is the largest buyer of U.S. Treasury bonds, and they have begun voicing concerns about the safety of those investments. The massive amounts of U.S. debt issued have pressured bond prices and also threatened the strength of the dollar, which could further reduce the value of holding Treasuries. The dramatic expansion of the Federal Reserve's balance sheets also worries them. Last week, the Chinese showed mettle by suggesting that the dollar should no longer be the world's reserve currency. And Geithner gaffed again, saying this was "worth thinking about" (dollar falls) ... and then saying, "probably not" (dollar recovers).

#### Trade Barriers, Bailouts, Subsidies

**Cooley, 09** (The Paganelli-Bull professor of economics and Richard R. West dean of the NYU Stern School of Business – Forbes Thomas, Why We Can't Get Along, <http://www.forbes.com/09/03/31/g20-gordon-brown-geithner-china-opinions-columnists-stimulus.html>) QP

Many countries have raised tariffs, restricted imports, blocked takeovers by foreign companiesand reinstated subsidies. They have jumped to the defense of home industries by filing complaints with the world trade organization over dumping--the practice of flooding another country with goods at below-market prices. More importantly, bailouts and subsidies are inherently protectionist because they prop upoperations of uncompetitive or insolvent firms at the expense of more efficient producers who are often foreign.

#### Financial Crisis

**Cooley, 09** (The Paganelli-Bull professor of economics and Richard R. West dean of the NYU Stern School of Business – Forbes Thomas, Why We Can't Get Along, <http://www.forbes.com/09/03/31/g20-gordon-brown-geithner-china-opinions-columnists-stimulus.html>) QP

Gordon Brown was on the stump in the U.S. and around the world last week in advance of the G-20 meetings taking place in London. He has argued fervently for a multilateral approach to the many problems that confront the world economy and proposed an ambitious set of goals for the G-20 meetings. Why does it seem like he is tilting at windmills? Perhaps it's because the current world economic crisis, far from uniting us in a common struggle to solve common problems, is instead fostering a "coliseum" culture in which the U.S., China and Europe are all giving each other the back of their hand.

The level and passion of the criticism is rising, and rather than collaboration and multilateralism we are seeing a hardening of positions and a growing resentment of the U.S.A big part of the problem has been the United States' arrogance in lecturing the rest of the world about fiscal and monetary policy and our hypocrisy in putting in place beggar-thy-neighbor trade policies as we try to revive our economy. This swaggering approach to our allies was supposed to have ended with the Bush administration, but it has been replaced with a self-righteous assertiveness that the rest of the world is not buying. There is no doubt that this summit will result in a reaffirmation of the commitment of the G-20 to fight protectionism and increase cooperation. They will talk the talk. But they did the same at the November summit in Washington, and that resolve didn't survive the plane ride home.

2. No Escalation

#### No hostile blocs – global sectoral cooperation solves\*\*

**Baldwin, 06 (Professor of International Economics, Graduate Institute of International Studies – ‘6**

Richard, Multilateralising Regionalism: How to make regionalism less damaging to the multilateral trade system, <http://www.rieti.go.jp/en/events/bbl/06121501.html>) QP

Projecting forward: East Asia will undergo big changes, as 2010 is the deadline for most of the agreements. Now there is little trade preference discrimination as it has been driven by unilateralism, but if the agreements which have been signed get implemented there will be a lot of discrimination appearing. This will lead to a world with three **"**fuzzy," "leaky" trade blocs: North America, Europe, and East Asia.

Fuzzy because members of the blocs have FTAs with many other countries, and leaky because the trade blocs do not exist in isolation; there are channels of free trade linking all the blocs.Moreover, the blocs have fuzzy, leaky sub-trade blocs like fractals, so I predict that applied tariffs will be near zero for all the world's major trade flows by 2010. The point of all of this is that if you can find the solution to tame one of these blocs or sub blocs, the same solution would apply to the world.

I will give two examples of how regionalism has been multilateralised. First is the Pan-European Cumulation System (PECS) in 97. Spaghetti bowls have two problems: different Rules of Origin (ROOs), and bilateral cumulation. PECS imposed a common set of ROOs on the EU, the European Free Trade Association (EFTA), and the Central and East European countries (CEECs), and it imposed diagonal cumulation. So, if a product entered into PECS it could not lose origin status, making it easy to do outsourcing. PECS is essentially a customs union, but of ROOs, not tariffs.

Why did this get done? EU companies that had originally asked for and benefited from the complex ROOs - as China emerged and companies were offshored to Eastern Europe - now found themselves in the spokes and being harmed. They asked for this to be fixed.I call this "spaghetti bowls as building blocks." The complexity, together with fragmentation and offshoring leads to a political economy force from companies for governments to tame the tangle.

As global unbundling continues, the "spaghetti bowls as building blocks" pressures will mount.It will be impractical to do a PECS worldwide because the three major ROOs - PECS, NAFTA, and ASEAN - are not compatible and never will be. An alternative is the 96 Information Technology Agreement (ITA), which is my second example of multilateralising regionalism, this time on a sectoral basis but globally; rather than all the sectors but regionally.

By the mid-90s, tariffs on IT products worldwide were approximately zero, based on an assortment of unilateral, regional, and multilateral commitments, and there were ROOs. Also, this industry was particularly highly fragmented, so the industry firms asked the governments to tame the tangle.Since it was impossible to negotiate ROOs between Asia, the U.S., and Europe, the only solution was to bind the MFN tariffs to zero, thereby making the noodle bowl problem go away. Again, the companies that had originally asked for ROOs asked for it to be fixed. It started with 80% of world production and is expanding.

#### Trade wars don't escalate

**Bearce ‘3 (David, Associate Prof. Pol. Sci. @ U. Pittsburgh, International Studies Quarterly, ìGrasping the Commercial Institutional Peaceî, 47:3, Blackwell-Synergy) QP**

Even as we accept that such trade dispute settlement mechanisms help resolve economic conflict, it is not clear that this finding should have any strong application to the dependent variable of inter-state military conflict.On this point, it is important to distinguish between different types of inter-state conflict—economic versus military ([McMillan, 97:39](http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/cgi-bin/fulltext/118869067/main.html,ftx_abs#b64))—and recognize that disputes about banana tariffs, for example, are not likely to escalate into military confrontations.While military conflict often has economic antecedents, there is little evidence that trade wars ever become shooting wars.In terms of inter-state disagreements with real potential for military conflict, scholars highlight territorial disputes ([Vasquez, 93; Hensel, 00; Huth, 00](http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/cgi-bin/fulltext/118869067/main.html,ftx_abs#b96)). The trade dispute settlement mechanismsembedded in regional commercial institutions simply have no jurisdiction or power to resolve highly contentious territorial disagreements.

#### No protectionism- international empirics prove.

**Dadush et al 11** (May. Uri, senior associate and director in Carnegie’s new International Economics Program, currently focuses on trends in the global economy and the global financial crisis, previously served as the World Bank’s director of international trade and before that as director of economic policy. He also served as the director of the Bank’s world economy group, leading the preparation of the Bank’s flagship reports on the international economy, Shimelse Ali, economist, Carnegie’s International Economics Program, Rachel Esplin Odell, junior fellow in Carnegie’s Asia Program, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, “Is Protectionism Dying?”, <http://www.carnegieendowment.org/files/is_protectionism_dying.pdf> Pismarov)

Despite a limited increase in the incidence of protectionist measures during the recent financial and economic crisis, the effects on global trade appear small—the world, remarkably, did not resort to protectionism. In addition to the concerted stimulus measures, financial rescues, and the strengthening of lender-of-last-resort facilities that restricted the duration and depth of the economic downturn, the World Trade Organization’s disciplines, enforceable through its dispute settlement mechanism, no doubt played an important role .in staving off trade protection But this is only one part of the story. The increased resistance to protectionism is the result of a complex, mutually reinforcing set of legal and structural changes in the world economy that have made a return to protection more: costly and disruptive and have established new vested interests in open markets. These changes include National disciplines: Along with autonomous liberalization and a generally robust rule of law in the largest trading countries—which improve the • confidence of importers and exporters—national trade tribunals help prevent protectionism by providing a mechanism whereby individual firms can contest protectionist measures that impact their company. Many national governments have also developed explicit or implicit mechanisms for countering protectionism and ensuring that trade policy reflects the general interest Regional and bilateral agreements: In addition to codifying further tariff reductions, regional trade agreements—now covering over half of world • trade—contain provisions establishing dispute settlement mechanisms that parties can use to contest violations of the agreement and thereby defend against protectionism. Furthermore, such agreements have often established regular high-level dialogues on trade disputes, treaty implementation, and further liberalization, providing a mechanism for resolving serious violations of the agreement even if its formal juridical mechanisms are not utilized Facts on the ground”: The political resistance to backsliding on liberalization is stronger because trade has become more prevalent and inextricably woven into production and consumption patterns. The change in the political economy of protectionism is manifested in the increased interest of retailers and consumers in imports, the internationalization of production, and the rise of intra firm trade. Limiting trade in any one sector not only hurts those consumers, retailers, and firms that depend on imports for inputs, but also has repercussions for firms that operate both vertically (within a sector) and horizontally (across sectors) that depend on complex global production chains.

### Ag adv

#### Ag collapsing now

**Gillis 11**

Justin Gillis, Editor @ NYT, 6-11-2011, “A Warming Planet Struggles to Feed Itself,” Factiva

Sitting with a group of his fellow wheat farmers, Francisco Javier Ramos Bours voiced a suspicion. Water shortages had already arrived in recent years for growers in his region, the Yaqui Valley, which sits in the Sonoran Desert of northwestern Mexico. In his view, global climate change could well be responsible. “All the world is talking about it,” Mr. Ramos said as the other farmers nodded. Farmers everywhere face rising difficulties: water shortages as well as flash floods. Their crops are afflicted by emerging pests and diseases and by blasts of heat beyond anything they remember. In a recent interview on the far side of the world, in northeastern India, a rice farmer named Ram Khatri Yadav offered his own complaint about the changing climate. “It will not rain in the rainy season, but it will rain in the nonrainy season,” he said. “The cold season is also shrinking.”

#### No impact – Cuba sustainable ag spilling over in quo

**Ergas, 13** – graduate student in sociology at the University of Oregon (Christina, Monthly Review, March, “Cuban Urban Agriculture as a Strategy for Food Sovereignty” http://monthlyreview.org/2013/03/01/cuban-urban-agriculture-as-a-strategy-for-food-sovereignty)//VP

¶ The agricultural revolution in Cuba has ignited the imaginations of people all over the world. Cuba’s model serves as a foundation for self-sufficiency, resistance to neocolonialist development projects, innovations in agroecology, alternatives to monoculture, and a more environmentally sustainable society. Instead of turning towards austerity measures and making concessions to large international powers during a severe economic downturn, Cubans reorganized food production and worked to gain food sovereignty as a means of subsistence, environmental protection, and national security.1 While these efforts may have been born of economic necessity, they are impressive as they have been developed in opposition to a corporate global food regime.¶ In Sustainable Urban Agriculture in Cuba, Sinan Koont indicates that most of the global South has lost any semblance of food sovereignty—the ability to be self-sufficient, to practice a more sustainable form of agriculture, and to direct farming toward meeting the needs of people within a country, rather than producing cash crops for export (187). The World Bank and International Monetary Fund imposed structural adjustment programs and free trade agreements on the so-called third world. These policies increased the influence of multinational corporations, such as Monsanto and Cargill, in global food production. They also encouraged large-scale monocultures, whereby food production is specialized by region for international trade. These policies threatened the national food security of countries in several interrelated ways.2¶ First, economically vulnerable countries are subject to the vagaries of the international marketplace, fluctuating food prices, and heavily subsidized produce from the global North that undermine the ability of the former to compete. Second, in a for-profit economic system, certain crops, like sugarcane, potato, and corn, are planted to produce biofuels, primarily ethanol, instead of food for poor populations. Rich nations that can afford to buy crops for biofuels inflate market prices for food, and when droughts or floods destroy whole harvests, then scarce food still goes to the highest bidder. Third, nations that specialize in cash crops for export must import food, increasing overall insecurity and dependency on trade networks. These nations are more vulnerable to changes in the costs of petroleum, as it influences expenses associated with transportation, fertilizers, pesticides, and the overall price of food. In countries with higher per capita incomes, increasing food costs are an annoyance for many people but not necessarily life threatening. In countries with high rates of poverty, price increases can be devastating. All of the above problems converged during the 2007–2008 food crisis that resulted in riots in Egypt, Haiti, Indonesia, Mexico, and Bangladesh, just to name a few.¶ People worldwide have been affected by these policies and have fought back. Some nations have taken to task corporations like Monsanto, as in the case of India’s response to genetically modified eggplant, which involved a boycott of Monsanto’s products and demands for the eradication of genetically modified foods.3 There are burgeoning local food movements, even in the United States, that despite numerous challenges attempt to produce food outside the current large-scale agricultural paradigm.4 There are also international movements that are working to change agricultural policies and practices. For example, La Vía Campesina is an international movement comprised of peasants, small-scale farmers, and their allies. Their primary goals are to stop neoliberal policies that promote oligopolistic corporate control over agriculture and to promote food sovereignty.¶ In conjunction with these movements, Cuba has made remarkable strides toward establishing a system of food sovereignty. One of their most notable projects in this regard is their institutionalized and organized effort to expand agroecological practices, or a system of agriculture that is based on ecological principles and environmental concerns. Cuba has largely transformed food production in order to pursue a more sustainable path. These practices are not limited to the countryside.¶ Cuba is the recognized leader of urban agriculture.5 As Koont highlights, the Cuban National Group for Urban Agriculture defines urban agriculture as the production of food within the urban and peri-urban perimeter, using intensive methods, paying attention to the human-crop-animal-environment interrelationships, and taking advantage of the urban infrastructure with its stable labor force. This results in diversified production of crops and animals throughout the year, based on sustainable practices which allow the recycling of waste materials (29). In 2007, urban agriculture comprised approximately 14.6 percent of agriculture in Cuba. Almost all of urban agriculture is organic.¶ Cuba’s environmental protections and agricultural innovations have gained considerable recognition. The 2006 Sustainability Index Report, put together by the World Wildlife Fund by combining the United Nations Human Development Index and Ecological Footprint measures (or natural resource use per capita), contends that the only nation in the world that is living sustainably is Cuba.6 The island nation is particularly lauded for its strides in urban food production.7 Sustainable Urban Agriculture in Cuba is the first book to take a comprehensive look at this practice around the entire island.¶ Koont indicates that the significance of urban agriculture in Cuba is that although Cuba is not completely food self-sufficient, it is the only example the world has of a country that produces most of its food locally, employing agroecological techniques for production. Furthermore, most of the food produced is for local consumption. As a result, Cuba has one of the shortest producer-to-consumer chains in the world. In this book, Koont documents the impressive transformations that have taken place within this nation.¶ While Cuba imports the majority of its calories and protein, urban agriculture has increased food security and sovereignty in the area of vegetable production. In 2005, Cuba was “importing 60 percent to 70 percent of what it consumes [mostly so-called bulk foods] at an estimated cost of $1.5 billion to $2 billion annually.”8 However, urban agriculture within and around Havana accounts for 60–90 percent of the produce consumed in the city and utilizes about 87,000 acres of land.9 Cubans employ various forms of urban agriculture, including gardens, reforestation projects, and small-scale livestock operations. In 2010, 75 percent of the Cuban population lived in cities—a city is defined as such if the population is in excess of 1,000 persons.10 Thus, urban food production is the most practical and efficient means to supply the population with food.¶ These transformations did not suddenly materialize. Koont provides a useful overview of the historical circumstances that contributed to changes in food production in Cuba. After the 1959 revolution and the subsequent imposition of the U.S. embargo, Cuba became reliant on the Soviet Union. Cubans used large-scale, industrial, monoculture to produce sugar, which was exchanged for Soviet petroleum and currency. The economy was largely tied to high-yield sugar production. In a vicious cycle, this type of agriculture required importing agrochemical fertilizers, pesticides, herbicides, and oil to run heavy machinery. In 1989, three times more arable land in Cuba was utilized to produce sugar for export than food for national consumption. Most of the Cuban diet came from imported food.11¶ When the Soviet Union collapsed in the early 1990s, Cubans and their economy suffered greatly. Cubans no longer had access to the inputs required to maintain large-scale agriculture, given how dependent such agriculture is on oil. To make matters worse, the end of trade between the Soviet Bloc and Cuba resulted in a loss of access to food, which reduced Cubans’ protein intake by 30 percent.12 The system of agriculture that was in place was not sustainable or organized for self-sufficiency. Cubans refer to the ensuing period of resource scarcity as the Special Period in Peace Time. This period included shortages of food, fuel, and medicine. Faced with food scarcity and malnutrition, Cubans had to revamp their food production systems, which included collectively producing a variety of crops in the most efficient manner possible. Additionally, the necessary mission of Cuban politicians, ecologists, farmers, scientists, biologists, and farm workers was to mend the ecological cycles of interdependence that large-scale, exploitative agriculture destroyed.13¶ In spite of these hardships, Cuban society was equipped to contend with the ensuing crisis, given the country’s specific commitments and agroecological projects that were already in operation. The Cuban government and leadership worked to provide institutional support to re-direct food production and to enable the development of an extensive urban agricultural project. Governmental policies, following the 1959 revolution, that prioritized extending education, science, and technology served as a springboard for these new agricultural projects. First, the revolutionary government established organizations to address social problems and concerns. These organizations served as supply and distribution networks for food and centers for research that examined farmers’ traditional knowledge, continuing education programs that taught agroecological practices, distribution of technological innovations, and evaluation of existing programs and operations. Second, the government prioritized human resources and capabilities. Thus, the Cuban government invested in human capital by making education more widely available and accessible at all levels. Making use of the organizational infrastructure and investing in the Cuban people made the agroecological transition possible during the economic crisis in the early 1990s.¶ Koont examines how the early agroecological projects, prior to the Special Period, served as a basis for future development and expansion of the revolutionary transformation of agriculture in Cuba. Science is publicly owned and directed toward furthering human development, rather than capital accumulation. Cuba had the human resources to address food scarcity, given that they had 11 percent of the scientists in Latin America. Scientists were already experimenting with agroecology, in order to take advantage of ecological synergisms, utilizing biodiversity and biological pest control. These efforts were focused on diminishing the need for inputs such as artificial fertilizers and pesticides. Other projects included integrating animals into rotational grazing systems with crops and diversifying with polycultures. Cubans also began recycling sugarcane waste as cattle feed; the cows, in turn, excrete waste that is applied to soil as fertilizer, thereby restoring ecological interdependence. By combining manure with worm castings, Cubans were able to fertilize most of their crops organically without having to import fertilizer from long distances. Their experimentation also included creating urban organopónicos, which were constructed four years before the Soviet collapse. Organopónicos are raised beds of organic materials confined in rectangular walls where plants are grown in areas with poor soil quality. Additionally, personal household plots had long existed within urban areas.14 Altogether these experiments and projects served as the foundation to pursue greater self-sufficiency, a system of urban agriculture, and a more sustainable form of food production.¶ The pursuit of food sovereignty has yielded many benefits. Urban agriculture has increased food production, employment, environmental recovery and protection, and community building. Perhaps the most impressive strides are in the area of food security. In the early 1990s, during the Special Period, Cubans’ caloric intake decreased to approximately 1,863 calories a day. In the midst of food scarcity, Cuba ramped up food production. Between 1994 and 2006, Cubans increased urban output by a thousand fold, with an annual growth rate of 78 percent a year. In 2001, Cubans cultivated 18,591 hectares of urban land; in 2006, 52,389 hectares were cultivated. As a result of these efforts, the caloric intake for the population averaged 3,356 calories a day in 2005. During the economic crisis, unemployment sharply increased. However, the creation of extensive urban agricultural programs, which included centers of information and education, provided new jobs that subsumed 7 percent of the workforce and provided good wages.¶ Urban agriculture and reforestation projects also constituted important gains for the environment. Shifting food production away from reliance on fossil fuels and petrochemicals is better for human health and reduces the carbon dioxide emissions associated with food production. Urban reforestation projects provide sinks for air pollution and help beautify cities. Finally, local production of food decreases food miles. It also requires both local producers and consumers. Therefore, community members get to know each other and are responsible for each other throu gh the production and consumption of food.¶ Sustainable Urban Agriculture in Cuba is a detailed documentation of the agroecological transformation in Cuba. Koont delivers a significant amount of information regarding the mechanics of urban agriculture. He highlights the enabling factors of urban agriculture in Cuba, which are the government’s creation of the organizational infrastructure and their investment in human capital. He also provides an assessment of the results from urban agriculture. The results he discusses are gains made in food production, increased employment, environmental recovery and protection, and community building.¶ However, the majority of the book reads like a dry technical manual or guide to urban agriculture, something akin to official Cuban government documents. There are many bulleted lists throughout each chapter that outline types of crops grown, strategies, key features of urban agriculture in Cuba, collaborating organizations, evaluation criteria, tons of produce in each province, program objectives, and the lists go on. While the book contains a significant amount of information regarding process, extent, technology, education, and evaluation surrounding urban agriculture in Cuba, it does little in the way of setting up a theoretical framework and thoroughly exploring the significance of Cuba’s model of urban agriculture for the world. The introduction and the final chapter of the book are the two chapters that touch on Cuba’s relevance and implications. In addition, Koont offers minimal critical analysis of the challenges that Cubans still face in their quest for food sovereignty.¶ Despite these shortcomings, Koont provides a much-needed detailed account of the strides made in Cuban urban agriculture. Cuba’s example has clear implications for food sovereignty and security for the rest of the world. With the very real threat of climate change, potential energy crises, market fluctuations, worldwide droughts, or other economic and environmental problems that may force nations to relocalize food production, this example can serve as a template for future food sovereignty. We can continue to learn from Cuba as they generate new technologies and innovations in organic urban agriculture into the future. In addition, the Cuban example serves as a testament to the potential for a society’s resilience and is worth investigating not just for their innovations, but for inspiration.

#### Virulent diseases cannot cause extinction because of burnout theory

**Gerber 5** (Leah R. Gerber, PhD. Associate Professor of Ecology, Evolution, and Environmental Sciences, Ecological Society of America, "Exposing Extinction Risk Analysis to Pathogens: Is Disease Just Another Form of Density Dependence?" August 2005, Jstor)

The density of it population is an important parameter for both PVA and host-pathogen theory. A fundamental principle of epidemiology is that the spread of an infectious disease through a population is a function of the density of both susceptible and infectious hosts. If infectious agents are supportable by the host species of conservation interest, the impact of a pathogen on a declining population is likely to decrease as the host population declines. A pathogen will spread when, on average, it is able to transmit to a susceptible host before an infected host dies or eliminates the infection (Kermack and McKendrick 1927, Anderson and May l99l). If the parasite affects the reproduction or mortality of its host, or the host is able to mount an immune response, the parasite population may eventually reduce the density of susceptible hosts to a level at which the rate of parasite increase is no longer positive. Most epidemiological models indicate that there is a host threshold density (or local population size) below which a parasite cannot invade, suggesting that rare or depleted species should be less subject to host-specific disease. This has implications for small, yet increasing, populations. For example, although endangered species at low density may be less susceptible to a disease outbreak, recovery to higher densities places them at increasing risk of future disease-related decline (e.g., southern sea otters; Gerber ct al. 2004). In the absence of stochastic factors (such as those modeled in PVA), and given the usual assumption of disease models that the chance that a susceptible host will become infected is proportional to the density of infected hosts (the mass action assumption) a host specific pathogen cannot drive its host to extinction (McCallum and Dobson 1995). Extinction in the absence of stochasticity is possible if alternate hosts (sometimes called reservoir hosts) relax the extent to which transmission depends on the density of the endangered host species.

#### Disease spread is inevitable.

**Bower & Chalk ’03** **(Jennifer Bower, Science & Tech Policy Analyst, Peter Chalk, Political Scientist, “Vectors Without Borders,” summer 2003,**

**http://www.rand.org/publications/randreview/issues/summer2003/vectors.html)**

In the latter half of the 20th century, almost 30 new human diseases were identified. The spread of several of them has been expedited by the growth of antibiotic and drug resistance. Globalization, modern medical practices, urbanization, climate change, sexual promiscuity, intravenous drug use, and acts of bioterrorism further increase the likelihood that people will come into contact with potentially fatal diseases.

#### Disease outbreaks solidify the BWC.

Stephen **Kaufman**, IIP Staff Writer December 10, **2010**. Biological Weapons Pact Offers Cooperation Against Pandemics, http://geneva.usmission.gov/2010/12/10/biological-weapons-pact-offers-cooperation-against-pandemics/

Kennedy said the parties to the BWC want the arms control and nonproliferation agreement to be used to bring together the scientific and health communities, law enforcement professionals and governments in assisting states to develop an integrated approach to any kind of prevention and treatment program for pandemic diseases. “It’s linking up international assistance, and it’s providing the expertise that could conduct the investigations to determine the outbreak. So it’s a whole host of tools at our disposal,” Kennedy said. Along with highlighting the overlap between deliberate and nondeliberate pandemics, the meeting in Geneva discussed the World Health Organization’s (WHO) 2005 International Health Regulations, which require countries to cooperate in the prevention and treatment of diseases. The WHO and BWC, both located in Geneva, have different mandates, but their roles complement one another, Kennedy said. The BWC also established a network of national points of contact in the event of a disease outbreak. Kennedy said there is still a need to help countries better react to pandemic situations by helping them develop their capacities, laws and practices. “It’s plugging gaps. It’s linking up and sharing information, and getting those networks in place” at the local, national and international levels, she said. “This is achieved through multilateral diplomacy, providing technical assistance to countries and conducting workshops with the help of partner states.” She said the December 6-10 meetings “put us on a very good trajectory” for the Seventh BWC Review Conference, scheduled for Geneva, December 5-22, 2011. The BWC also plans to hold a preparatory conference in April 2011, as well as a series of regional workshops, including in Kenya, Nigeria and Jordan, and additional experts meetings and seminars around the world, she said. The Obama administration is pleased by the level of global interest and hopes soon to see “every single state signed up and fully active in the convention.” “That’s certainly our overarching goal, and I think we’re making progress,” Kennedy said. “This is an arms control regime … and the implementation has great benefits for every country around the world.”

#### Effective BWC solves bioterror and the terminal consequences of their disease claims

Graham S. **Pearson**, Visiting Professor of International Security, Department of Peace Studies, University of Bradford, June **2001**. The Regime To Prevent Biological Weapons: Opportunities For A Safer, Healthier, More Prosperous World, http://www.brad.ac.uk/acad/sbtwc/other/BTWCrgime.pdf

When a wider perspective is considered, it is evident that the BTWC Protocol regime to strengthen the effectiveness and improve the implementation of the BTWC needs to be considered in the context of an international scene in which there is increasing transparency about the nature of activities and facilities within countries which is facilitated by the information increasingly being made available on the internet and the recognition by more and more countries that they share common goals for a safer, more prosperous world -- a world in which there is greater recognition that the dangers from dual-use materials and technology in general and biological agents and toxins in particular know no frontiers and that an outbreak in one country can spread all too quickly to its neighbours and, indeed, around the world through international travel and trade. The compliance elements of the Protocol regime -- declarations, visits, investigations -- are complemented by the provisions to promote scientific and technological exchange for peaceful purposes as these provisions help States Parties to develop their infrastructure -- and thereby reap benefits in international trade and commerce as well as increasing transparency and enhancing confidence in compliance. The BTWC Protocol regime will thus enhance international security and counter bioterrorism as well as also contribute directly to achieving a safer, healthier, more prosperous world bringing benefits to all countries, both developed or developing.

#### Extinction – different type of agent than their disease argument assumes

**Ochs** MA in Natural Resource Management **02** –from Rutgers University and Naturalist at Grand Teton National Park [Richard, “BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS MUST BE ABOLISHED IMMEDIATELY,” Jun 9, http://www.freefromterror.net/other\_articles/abolish.html]

Of all the weapons of mass destruction, the genetically engineered biological weapons, many without a known cure or vaccine, are an extreme danger to the continued survival of life on earth. Any perceived military value or deterrence pales in comparison to the great risk these weapons pose just sitting in vials in laboratories. While a "nuclear winter” resulting from a massive exchange of nuclear weapons, could also kill off most of life on earth and severely compromise the health of future generations, they are easier to control. Biological weapons, on the other hand, can get out of control very easily, as the recent anthrax attacks has demonstrated. There is no way to guarantee the security of these doomsday weapons because very tiny amounts can be stolen or accidentally released and then grow or be grown to horrendous proportions. The Black Death of the Middle Ages would be small in comparison to the potential damage bioweapons could cause. Abolition of chemical weapons is less of a priority because, while they can also kill millions of people outright, their persistence in the environment would be less than nuclear or biological agents or more localized. Hence, chemical weapons would have a lesser effect on future generations of innocent people and the natural environment. Like the Holocaust, once a localized chemical extermination is over, it is over. With nuclear and biological weapons, the killing will probably never end. Radioactive elements last tens of thousands of years and will keep causing cancers virtually forever. Potentially worse than that, bio-engineered agents by the hundreds with no known cure could wreck even greater calamity on the human race than could persistent radiation. AIDS and ebola viruses are just a small example of recently emerging plagues with no known cure or vaccine. Can we imagine hundreds of such plagues? HUMAN EXTINCTION IS NOW POSSIBLE.

# 2nc

#### Engagement towards a government must be conditional, the plan isn’t.

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

Many different types of engagement strategies exist, depending on who is engaged, the kind of incentives employed and the sorts of objectives pursued. Engagement may be conditional when it entails a negotiated series of exchanges, such as where the US extends positive inducements for changes undertaken by the target country. Or engagement may be unconditional if it offers modifications in US policy towards a country without the explicit expectation that a reciprocal act will follow. Generally, conditional engagement is geared towards a government; unconditional engagement works with a country’s civil society or private sector in the hopes of promoting forces that will eventually facilitate cooperation.

#### Delegation shifts blame with no risk to solvency

**Almendares’ 12** (Nicholas Almendares – Professor of politics @ NYU, “Blame-Shifting, Judicial Review, and Public Welfare”, 2012) MaxL

Delegating authority to bureaucrats raises two principal concerns. The first is how to ensure that the bureaucrats use this authority to serve the best interests of the public. The second is how to prevent the legislature, namely Congress, from using delegation to promote its own interests to the detriment of the public’s. This latter phenomenon is referred to as blameshifting: rather than enacting an unpopular policy itself, Congress enacts a vague or broad delegation, shifting responsibility and blame onto the agency for the policy. On the conventional account, blame-shifting is thought to enable policies that make the public worse off, allowing for more special interest legislation that benefits a select group at the public’s expense, which has led to calls for a strengthened nondelegation doctrine to bar the sorts of delegations that make blame-shifting possible. I argue that the conventional account of blame-shifting is founded on inconsistent premises. For example, it has not adequately explained how it is that voters are able to punish legislators for passing statutes they dislike while being seemingly incapable of punishing delegations about which they feel the same. In its place, I propose a reconstructed account of delegation where such broad delegations of policymaking authority are part of a strategy that allows the public to take advantage of the agency’s expertise. While something resembling blame-shifting can occur within this reconstructed account, these broad delegations of authority overall make the public better off. Contrary to the conventional account, then, I find little reason to institute a stricter nondelegation doctrine. With this new account of delegation in mind, I then consider the potential benefits of judicial review of agency policy. In particular, I find that hard look review, where the courts evaluate the merits of the agency’s policy, makes the public better off only under demanding conditions that are unlikely to be met. In some cases, it can make the public worse off especially when the legislature delegates broad, relatively unconstrained authority to the agency. This conclusion is somewhat counterintuitive, as we might expect judicial review of agency policymaking to be most important in cases of broad delegation, and a result of the limited technical information available to the court

#### And, here’s proof of distinction between the CP and the Plan.

**Schoenbrod 93**, David- Professor of Law, New York Law School, Adjunct Scholar, Cato Institute, Former Staff Attorney and Co-director, Project on Urban Transportation, Natural Resources Defense Council, Former Director of Program Development, Bedford Stuyvesant Restoration Corporation, Former Staff Attorney, Association of the Bar, City of New York Committee on Electric Power and the Environment, Former Professor, Yale Law School, and Member, American Tree Farmers’ Association, (Power Without Responsibility) p. 9-10

Understanding how such pervasive consequences flow from a seemingly technical change in the lawmaking process requires defining the fine but fundamental difference between a statute that makes law and one that delegates. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, a law is "a rule of conduct imposed by authority"; therefore, a statute makes law when it states a rule of conduct. For example, a statute that prohibits power plants from emitting pollution above a certain rate or that prohibits orange growers from shipping more than a certain pro-portion of their crop makes law, because the statute itself defines what conduct is illegal. In contrast, a statute delegates when it empowers an agency to state the rules governing such emissions or shipments, even if the statute instructs the agency in some detail about what goals to achieve or what procedures to follow in making the rules. Even though all statutory laws require some interpretation, statutes that state laws differ in a critical way from statutes that delegate. In making laws, Congress has to allocate both rights and duties in the very course of stating what conduct it prohibits, and so must make manifest the benefits and costs of regulation.

#### The means all parts

**Merriam-Websters, 8** [Online Collegiate Dictionary, http://www.m-w.com/cgi-bin/dictionary]

4 -- used as a function word before a noun or a substantivized adjective to indicate reference to a group as a whole <the elite>

#### “Federal Government” is all three branches

**Truman Library, No Date** (Harry S. Truman: Library and Museum- One of thirteen presidential libraries, “Three Branches of Government”, <http://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/teacher_lessons/3branches/1.htm>) MaxL

Our federal government has three parts. They are the Executive, (President and about 5,000,000 workers) Legislative (Senate and House of Representatives) and Judicial (Supreme Court and lower Courts).

#### Delegation avoid political blame

**Krent ’94** Harold J. Krent, Professor of Law, Chicago-Kent College of Law; Columbia Law Review “Book Review: Delegation and Its Discontent; March 1994 ” http://www.jstor.org/stable/1123205 ?seq=1 [Schaaf]

In a related argument, Schoenbrod debunks the view that the independence of agencies generates social benefits. Although individual agency officials may be protected by civil service laws and do not rely on campaign contributions, agencies as a whole, he argues, are more subject to influence by concentrated interests than members of Congress (pp. 124-25). Agencies can be captured, at least in part, by the industries they are to regulate, for those industries have great organizational and resource advantages over the public as a whole. At times, Schoenbrod notes, only industry groups participate in agency rule-making (p. 109), and special interest groups enjoy access to agency officials to discuss a wide range of issues (p. 112). Indeed, the apparent independence of agencies makes delegation a more attractive option for legislators, because it insulates them from the blame attached to agency policies even when those policies directly result from legislative direction, whether formal or informal. And the independence of agencies from the President also encourages delegation because Congress need not fear executive branch hegemony over the delegated authority.2

#### Delegation allows for blame shifting

**Bryner, ’87** [Gary, Ph. D in Govt, Poli Sci @ BYU, “Bureaucratic Discretion: Law and Policy in Federal Regulatory Agencies,” p.5-6]

Bureaucratic discretion is also defended as a practical response to the inability of traditionally separated governmental powers to deal effectively with the policy challenges confronting them. James Landis defended the broad grants of discretionary authority to administrative agencies not as "simply an extension of executive power" but a "full audit of authority nec­essary for |them| in order to plan, to promote, and to police," thus represent­ing "an assemblage of rights normally exercisable by government as a whole." "The administrative process." he argued, is an "answer to the inadequacy of the judicial and the legislative processes.'"\* Discretion is especially important in regulatory agencies, as it permits administrative officials to be flexible and adaptable in tailoring their efforts to specific situations. Laws cannot be written to anticipate and address all of the possible situations within an agency's jurisdiction. They must permit a consideration of economic, regional, cultural, personal and other differences among those who fall within (he agency's regulatory reach. Discretion per­mits the regulators to tailor their efforts to particular circumstances and con­cerns, produce regulatory actions that arc reasonable and fair, and effectively accomplish policy objectives.” Discretion Is a fundamental clement of modern administrative theory and is consistent with important norms of pluralism and democracy. It is also consistent with political incentives and serves as an attractive way for legisla­tors to delegate responsibility for difficult decisions to bureaucrats. Credit can be claimed for legislative action, blame can be deflected when specific efforts clash with politically powerful interests, and constituents can be culti­vated by intervening in unpopular agency actions.

#### Congress avoids blame for agency action

**Frieden 92.** [Jeffry, Economic Integration and the Politics of Monetary Policy in the United States, Occasional Paper Series, 93-2, October 1992, <http://www.cappp.ucla.edu/papers/cappp932.txt>]

For all intents and purposes, Congress virtually neglected monetary and exchange rate policy for nearly forty years after the New Deal reforms.[50] A number of reasons for this might be adduced. One possibility--often mentioned in the analogous literature on trade policy as well as in discussions of central bank autonomy--is that Congress recognized the efficiency gains to be made by delegating responsibility to an independent agency. Not only could the agency pursue welfare-improving policies without having to pay attention to political pressures, but Congress was provided with an ideal scapegoat to avoid direct blame. In this view the Fad was in fact implementing true Congressional preferences, just in a way that protected Congress from responsibility for unpopular monetary policies.[51

#### Legislatures are selfish – delegations is a tool they use to claim credit and shift blame

**Schoenbrod 99**, David (Trustee Professor of Law, New York Law School) ‘99 “DELEGATION AND DEMOCRACY: A REPLY TO MY CRITICS” CARDOZO LAW REVIEW [Vol. 20:731 1999] http://www.constitution.org/ad\_state/schoenbrod.htm

Delegation skews Congress’s political incentives toward granting federal agencies comprehensive jurisdiction over large areas of policy, much of which could be left to state and local government. For example, air pollution was being reduced at a relatively steady rate from at least the beginning of the twentieth century.[[127]](http://www.constitution.org/ad_state/schoenbrod.htm#127) The data do not show any uptick in the rate of improvement when the federal government took over in 1970.[128] Schuck seems to think that Congress acts in the public interest when it decides to delegate. As he sees the legislative process, the “legislative staffs, the White House, regulated firms, ‘public interest’ groups, state and local governments, and others [fight over the scope and terms of the delegation.]”[[129]](http://www.constitution.org/ad_state/schoenbrod.htm#129) He implies that the balance struck in the legislative fight produces something like the right result. Schuck distrusts legislators to make laws but trusts them in deciding whether to delegate. I distrust them when they make laws and distrust them more when they delegate. Legislators have selfish interests in deciding whether to delegate and so have a conflict of interest. Through delegation, they can claim credit, shift blame, and increase the demand for casework as a means for them to exact campaign contributions and other favors. The stake-holders from the private sector, in contrast, aim to get the law they want, wherever it is made. For them, delegation is only a possible means to that end. The balance on delegation that might be produced by the tugging and hauling between the competing private stakeholders is knocked out of wack by the heavy hands of those with the biggest stakes in delegation and the power to do it, the legislators. Not only does Schuck blink at the selfish interests of the legislators, he also puts too much faith in the idea that all the relevant interests are represented. Just because many well organized interest groups are active in the contest does not guarantee a good outcome as the well organized interests are only a part of the overall public interest. The unorganized interests are the ones most prone to be harmed by delegation.

#### Agencies more influenced than Congress, but act as a shield for legislative blame

**Krent ’94** Harold J. Krent, Professor of Law, Chicago-Kent College of Law; Columbia Law Review “Book Review: Delegation and Its Discontent; March 1994 ” http://www.jstor.org/stable/1123205 ?seq=1 [Schaaf]

In a related argument, Schoenbrod debunks the view that the independence of agencies generates social benefits. Although individual agency officials may be protected by civil service laws and do not rely on campaign contributions, agencies as a whole, he argues, are more subject to influence by concentrated interests than members of Congress (pp. 124-25). Agencies can be captured, at least in part, by the industries they are to regulate, for those industries have great organizational and resource advantages over the public as a whole. At times, Schoenbrod notes, only industry groups participate in agency rule-making (p. 109), and special interest groups enjoy access to agency officials to discuss a wide range of issues (p. 112). Indeed, the apparent independence of agencies makes delegation a more attractive option for legislators, because it insulates them from the blame attached to agency policies even when those policies directly result from legislative direction, whether formal or informal. And the independence of agencies from the President also encourages delegation because Congress need not fear executive branch hegemony over the delegated authority.2

#### Specifically it handles economic sanctions through the EEB

**All Gov 13** –-to-date news about more than 340 departments and agencies of the U.S. government, (“Department of State,” 2013, <http://www.allgov.com/departments/department-of-state?detailsDepartmentID=575>) //RGP

\*\*\*Retag for different affs

Bureau of Economic, Energy and Business Affairs: The State Department’s Bureau of Economic, Energy and Business Affairs (EEB) is one of the federal government’s leading voices for promoting US economic interests across the globe. EEB implements policies involving international trade, investment and finance, economic development and sanctions, debt policy, terrorist financing, energy security, telecommunications and transportation. It also actively promotes opportunities for American businesses. Since 9/11 the bureau has increasingly supported the government’s Global War on Terrorism (GWOT) while carrying out its economic mission. This includes promoting US sanctions against Iran, which has continued to do business with numerous American corporations—including those with close ties to the Bush administration. In fact, annual US trade with Iran actually doubled under President Bush.

#### Third, lumber and aircraft

**Canadian Press Newswire ‘1 (Nahlah Ayed, ìStakes are high for Canada as host of summit of the Americas, 3-30, L/N) QP**

On the sidelines, Canada is also sure to try to work out some of its own bilateral problems with key members of the Americas. Two major sore points are the softwood lumber disagreement with the United States, and an escalating trade war with Brazil over subsidization of the aircraft industry.

#### No blocs – no economic incentive for global fragmentation

**Naya, 02 - Professor of Economics, University of Hawaii- ‘2**

Seiji, Harnessing Regionalism for Economic Growth and Development in Asia and the Pacific, <http://www.adb.org/documents/events/02/adf/naya_paper.pdf>) QP

17. One danger of the regionalism trend is that we could be heading for a three-bloc world. Paul Krugman has noted theoretically that this would be the worst outcome for global welfare, and many others believe that such an eventuality could lead to the downfall of the WTO. I believe that this view is overly pessimistic. First, while subregional and regional arrangements do tend to be geographically based, many of those accords are inter-regional. Second, even if three general blocs did emerge (Europe-African, the Americas, Asia), why would the world suddenly withdraw behind their fortresses? The economics behind such a move are weak and politicaleconomy aspects even weaker. Third, the new regionalism trend seems to be outward-oriented overall, suggesting that the risks to the international system are not large.

#### No protectionism- international empirics prove.

**Dadush et al 11** (May. Uri, senior associate and director in Carnegie’s new International Economics Program, currently focuses on trends in the global economy and the global financial crisis, previously served as the World Bank’s director of international trade and before that as director of economic policy. He also served as the director of the Bank’s world economy group, leading the preparation of the Bank’s flagship reports on the international economy, Shimelse Ali, economist, Carnegie’s International Economics Program, Rachel Esplin Odell, junior fellow in Carnegie’s Asia Program, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, “Is Protectionism Dying?”, <http://www.carnegieendowment.org/files/is_protectionism_dying.pdf> Pismarov)

Despite a limited increase in the incidence of protectionist measures during the recent financial and economic crisis, the effects on global trade appear small—the world, remarkably, did not resort to protectionism. In addition to the concerted stimulus measures, financial rescues, and the strengthening of lender-of-last-resort facilities that restricted the duration and depth of the economic downturn, the World Trade Organization’s disciplines, enforceable through its dispute settlement mechanism, no doubt played an important role .in staving off trade protection But this is only one part of the story. The increased resistance to protectionism is the result of a complex, mutually reinforcing set of legal and structural changes in the world economy that have made a return to protection more: costly and disruptive and have established new vested interests in open markets. These changes include National disciplines: Along with autonomous liberalization and a generally robust rule of law in the largest trading countries—which improve the • confidence of importers and exporters—national trade tribunals help prevent protectionism by providing a mechanism whereby individual firms can contest protectionist measures that impact their company. Many national governments have also developed explicit or implicit mechanisms for countering protectionism and ensuring that trade policy reflects the general interest Regional and bilateral agreements: In addition to codifying further tariff reductions, regional trade agreements—now covering over half of world • trade—contain provisions establishing dispute settlement mechanisms that parties can use to contest violations of the agreement and thereby defend against protectionism. Furthermore, such agreements have often established regular high-level dialogues on trade disputes, treaty implementation, and further liberalization, providing a mechanism for resolving serious violations of the agreement even if its formal juridical mechanisms are not utilized Facts on the ground”: The political resistance to backsliding on liberalization is stronger because trade has become more prevalent and inextricably woven into production and consumption patterns. The change in the political economy of protectionism is manifested in the increased interest of retailers and consumers in imports, the internationalization of production, and the rise of intra firm trade. Limiting trade in any one sector not only hurts those consumers, retailers, and firms that depend on imports for inputs, but also has repercussions for firms that operate both vertically (within a sector) and horizontally (across sectors) that depend on complex global production chains.

#### No extinction

**Posner 5**—**Senior Lecturer, U Chicago Law. Judge on the US Court of Appeals 7th Circuit. AB from Yale and LLB from Harvard. (Richard, Catastrophe, http://goliath.ecnext.com/coms2/gi\_0199-4150331/Catastrophe-the-dozen-most-significant.html)**

Yet the fact that Homo sapiens has managed to survive every disease to assail it in the 200,000 years or so of its existence is a source of genuine comfort, at least if the focus is on extinction events. There have been enormously destructive plagues, such as the Black Death, smallpox, and now AIDS, but none has come close to destroying the entire human race. There is a biological reason. Natural selection favors germs of limited lethality; they are fitter in an evolutionary sense because their genes are more likely to be spread if the germs do not kill their hosts too quickly. The AIDS virus is an example of a lethal virus, wholly natural, that by lying dormant yet infectious in its host for years maximizes its spread. Yet there is no danger that AIDS will destroy the entire human race. The likelihood of a natural pandemic that would cause the extinction of the human race is probably even less today than in the past (except in prehistoric times, when people lived in small, scattered bands, which would have limited the spread of disease), despite wider human contacts that make it more difficult to localize an infectious disease.

#### Intervening actors check

**Zakaria, 09—Editor of Newsweek, BA from Yale, PhD in pol sci, Harvard. He serves on the board of Yale University, The Council on Foreign Relations, The Trilateral Commission, and Shakespeare and Company. Named "one of the 21 most important people of the 21st Century" (Fareed, “The Capitalist Manifesto: Greed Is Good,” 13 June 2009, http://www.newsweek.com/id/201935)**

Note—Laurie Garrett=science and health writer, winner of the Pulitzer, Polk, and Peabody Prize

It certainly looks like another example of crying wolf. After bracing ourselves for a global pandemic, we've suffered something more like the usual seasonal influenza. Three weeks ago the World Health Organization declared a health emergency, warning countries to "prepare for a pandemic" and said that the only question was the extent of worldwide damage. Senior officials prophesied that millions could be infected by the disease. But as of last week, the WHO had confirmed only 4,800 cases of swine flu, with 61 people having died of it. Obviously, these low numbers are a pleasant surprise, but it does make one wonder, what did we get wrong? Why did the predictions of a pandemic turn out to be so exaggerated? Some people blame an overheated media, but it would have been difficult to ignore major international health organizations and governments when they were warning of catastrophe. I think there is a broader mistake in the way we look at the world. Once we see a problem, we can describe it in great detail, extrapolating all its possible consequences. But we can rarely anticipate the human response to that crisis. Take swine flu. The virus had crucial characteristics that led researchers to worry that it could spread far and fast. They described—and the media reported—what would happen if it went unchecked. But it did not go unchecked. In fact, swine flu was met by an extremely vigorous response at its epicenter, Mexico. The Mexican government reacted quickly and massively, quarantining the infected population, testing others, providing medication to those who needed it. The noted expert on this subject, Laurie Garrett, says, "We should all stand up and scream, 'Gracias, Mexico!' because the Mexican people and the Mexican government have sacrificed on a level that I'm not sure as Americans we would be prepared to do in the exact same circumstances. They shut down their schools. They shut down businesses, restaurants, churches, sporting events. They basically paralyzed their own economy. They've suffered billions of dollars in financial losses still being tallied up, and thereby really brought transmission to a halt." Every time one of these viruses is detected, writers and officials bring up the Spanish influenza epidemic of 1918 in which millions of people died. Indeed, during the last pandemic scare, in 2005, President George W. Bush claimed that he had been reading a history of the Spanish flu to help him understand how to respond. But the world we live in today looks nothing like 1918. Public health-care systems are far better and more widespread than anything that existed during the First World War. Even Mexico, a developing country, has a first-rate public-health system—far better than anything Britain or France had in the early 20th century.

#### Disease spread won’t cause extinction

****Peters and Chrystal in ‘3**** (Dr. Clarence, Director of Biodefense and Emerging Infectious Diseases @ UT, and Dr. Ronald, Chairman of Genetics Medicine @ Cornell, FDCH Political Transcripts, “U.S. REPRESENTATIVE CHRISTOPHER COX (R-CA) HOLDS HEARING ON COUNTERING THE BIOTERRORISM THREAT”, 3-15, L/N) IDK

PETERS: I think we have one example from the movement ofthe Conquistadors to the New World. Theybrought measles, smallpox and a variety of other diseases with them. They didn't wipe out the Indians, but they destroyed their civilization and were instrumental in the Spaniards being able to conquer the New World with relatively few people. I think we have something going on right now with SARS that we don't know exactly what the end of it's going to be, but we already know that Asian economies are suffering tremendously. My prediction is that they will not be able to control it in China. If that's true, then we will be dealing with repeated introductions in this countryfor the indefinite future so that we may see a change in our way of life where we are taking temperatures in airports, in addition to taking your shoes off and putting them through the X-ray machine. And we may see emergency rooms rebuilt so that if you have a cough you go in one entrance and go into a negative pressure cubicle until your SARS test comes back. So I think that whilewiping out human life is extremely unlikely, we have unengineered examples of bugs that have made great impacts on civilizations. COX: Dr. Crystal? CRYSTAL:The natural examples of what you suggested were, as hundreds of years ago, with smallpox and also with the plague. The plague wiped out one-third of the civilization.We now have treatments for ordinances (ph) like the plague because they were engineered to be resistant. And if they infected a number of people and had the capability of being spread rapidly from individual to individual, it would cause enormous havoc. I agree with the panel --I don't think it would wipe out civilization, but the consequences to our society would be enormous.

#### Quarantine solves the impact

Altman 2k5 (Lawrence, NYT Staff Writer, " C.D.C. Proposes New Rules in Effort to Prevent Disease Outbreak," Nov 23, http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?sec=health&res=9802E7DF1631F930A15752C1A9639C8B63, AD: 6/30/09) jl

Federal officialsyesterdayproposedthe first significantchanges in quarantine rules in 25 years in an effort to broaden the definition of reportable illnesses, to centralize their reporting to the federal government and to require the airline and shipping industries to keep passenger manifests electronically for 60 days. The proposals would also clarify the appeals process for people subjected to quarantines to allow for administrative due process and give health officials explicit authority to offer vaccination, drugs and other appropriate means of prevention on a voluntary basis to those in quarantine. The proposals could cost the beleaguered airline industry hundreds of millions of dollars, officials of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention said. The officials are inviting public comment on the proposals, which are to be published in the Federal Register on Nov. 30, they told reporters in a telephone news conference.The proposals are part of a broader Bush administration plan to improve the response to current and potential communicable disease threats that may arise anywhere in the world. If adopted, the new regulations ''will allow the C.D.C. to move more swiftly'' when it needs to control outbreaks, said Dr. Martin Cetron, who directs the agency's division of global migration and quarantine.The outbreak of severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) in 2003 underscored how fast a disease could spread through the world and the need to modernize and strengthen quarantine measures by pointing out gaps in health workers' ability to respond quickly and effectively, Dr. Cetron said.

#### **The Cuban sustainable urban agriculture is a global model that’s spurring worldwide adoption- movements are beginning to pick up steam against agrigiants like Monsanto and organic farming is become more widespread- with Cuba as a model – that’s Ergas**

#### Other countries are beginning to adopt the Cuban model now

**Friedman-Rudovsky, 12** – received a Fulbright fellowship for photography of Bolivia’s social movements and a contributor to The New York Times (Noah, “Urban Agriculture in Cuba (Photo Essay)”, NACLA (North American Congress on Latin America), 10/18/12, https://nacla.org/news/2012/10/18/urban-agriculture-cuba-photo-essay)//VP

Cubans see their urban agriculture movement as a possible solution as the world begins to grapple with increasing prices and demand for food and fuel. Many other countries have begun to use the Cuban experience as a model as locally grown, organic produce becomes more popular worldwide. In 2007, Fidel Castro warned in the first published essay after his illness: "More than three billion people in the world are being condemned to a premature death from hunger and thirst" by diverting food crops to biofuels. In the past four years, food prices have indeed skyrocketed and a 2011 report by Oxfam identifies biofuel production as a principal cause of food insecurity. Some Cubans see their urban agriculture movement as a possible solution as the world begins to grapple with increasing prices and demand for food and fuel: "There is an ecological trend, a green philosophy. This is an urgent call, an immediate future; the large urban centers, with the problems of oil production and the transport of goods, this could be a worldwide solution as it has been in Cuba. We have the advantage of having gone through what other countries may experience in 50 years,” says Miguel Salcines Lopez, President of Havana’s largest urban agriculture cooperative, Vivero Alamar. Beginning with the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1989, Cuba entered a period of extreme shortages that came to be known as "The Special Period." With imports such as food, fuel, pesticides, and fertilizers disappearing almost overnight, Cubans began to grow their own produce wherever they could—balconies, empty lots, and roof-tops. Initially these were grassroots initiatives born of necessity, but over the next decade they would become a central tenet of state planning and a pillar for the island's economy. A homage to the history of Cuban urban agriculture in the home of Oscar Aleman Perez in Havana. In the 1970s and '80s, Raul Castro, as Defense Minister, encouraged the development of urban agriculture and oversaw experimental organic farming in military facilities. In those days, the organoponicos, as they came to be known, were introduced in preparation for a possible worldwide embargo of Cuba; today they are a training ground and growth area for Raul Castro's economic reforms that allow for more small business. In 1994, the Ministry of Agriculture institutionalized urban agriculture initiatives under one umbrella. Projects from informal family gardens (huertos), to large cooperatives (organoponicos), to state-owned gardens would all receive assistance from the ministry, which sought to provide free land to residents for gardens, through support in the start-up phase, providing seed banks, and overseeing hundreds of horticultural clubs for information exchange. Many Cubans assumed that as the shortages of the 1990s faded, so too would urban agriculture, but instead it has expanded in the last decade. Indeed, many other countries have begun to use the Cuban experience as a model as locally grown, organic produce becomes more popular worldwide. Of the recently released linamientos, or guidelines, for economic and social reforms in Cuba, 12 refer to urban agriculture. Number 174 states the necessity of increasing agricultural initiatives that can substitute for food imports, “with emphasis in the execution of the urban agriculture program, which should be extended to the entire country.”

#### Cuban ag is being modeled now – Cuban farmers are travelling to other countries to spread it

**Clausen, 07 –** teaches sociology and environmental studies at Fort Lewis College in Durango, CO. Her research in environmental sociology focuses on fisheries and marine degradation**.** (Rebecca, “Healing the Rift” Monthly Review, May, http://monthlyreview.org/2007/05/01/healing-the-rift)//VP

The rift in social metabolism of food production under capitalism is aggravated by private ownership of land, the strict division between mental and manual labor, and the unjust distribution of the fruits of labor. Cuba’s model of agriculture systematically transcends these alienating conditions, reconnecting farmers to the land through cooperative production, participatory decision making, and diversified distribution. Can this vision for ecological sustainability and social equality extend beyond the island of Cuba? Cuban farmers are traveling to Latin American and Caribbean nations to assist farmers in setting up similar types of food production systems. Indeed, Cuba’s fastest growing export is currently ideas. Cuba hosts many visiting farmers and agricultural technicians from throughout the Americas and elsewhere. Cuban agronomists are currently teaching agroecological farming methods to Haitian farmers, as well as assisting Venezuela with their burgeoning urban agriculture movement.

#### Cuba’s agricultural system is a model for the globe

Barclay 3- writer and reporter

(Eliza Barclay, “Cuba's security in fresh produce,” Food First, September 12th, 2003, pg. http://www.foodfirst.org/node/1208)//HA

The news of Cuba's success has been slowly leaking out since the early 1990s, and the country is beginning to take on legendary status as a model for sustainable agriculture and local food production in the eyes of environmental advocates, farmers, and development specialists. Already lauded for years by the steady stream of sustainable farming gurus from around the world who have made the pilgrimage to observe the success of organic and local food production, Cuba's experiment with sustainable agriculture has succeeded beyond its trial period. American farmers have been shuttled to Cuba in "fact-finding missions" and "reality tours" by crafty NGOs who have obtained the highly coveted U.S. Department of Treasury Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) licenses allowing them to sponsor travel to Cuba for educational purposes. Whether many of these trips will be allowed to continue is unclear; in March 2003, OFAC announced the end of people-to-people exchanges. Most groups who have had the appropriate licenses are scheduled to lose them by December 2003. But a rapidly approaching future of shifting economic opportunities poses serious questions and potential risks to this Cuba’s model, regarded as precious by so many of its advocates.