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### 1AC Russia

#### Cuba is a flashpoint for Russian Tensions—plan solves

Lee 08

Rens Lee President of Global Advisory Service, Stanford PhD, Foreign affairs, Rethinking the Embargo, November, December 2008 <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/64618/rens-lee/rethinking-the-embargo>, JLB

Jorge Castañeda ("Morning in Latin America," September/October 2008) argues for rethinking the United States' Cuba policy because it has not worked and is increasingly irrelevant. Yet there are also compelling economic and security reasons for ending the isolation of Cuba now, without imposing preconditions or waiting for a democratic transition. Current U.S. policy makes Cuba a target of opportunity for a resurgent and increasingly hostile Russia. Russian Prime Minister Vladimir Putin talks openly about "restoring [Russia's] position in Cuba," and hints are surfacing in Moscow that Russia might reestablish a military and intelligence presence on the island in response to the planned U.S. missile defense shield in eastern Europe. Points of cooperation under consideration include using Cuba as a refueling stop for long-range bombers and for reconnaissance ships and aircraft and reopening a gigantic Soviet-era electronic monitoring and surveillance facility near Havana. A state visit to Havana in July by the hard-line Russian deputy prime minister, Igor Sechin (a reported former KGB agent and a member of Putin's inner circle), and the head of Russia's Security Council, Nikolai Patrushev, could presage a new strategic dialogue between Moscow and Havana, even though the visit was officially touted as investment-related.¶ Also, it is hardly coincidental that the warming of Cuban-Russian ties and the discussion of a renewed military relationship have followed closely on the accession of Raul Castro as the de facto Cuban leader. Moscow has historically regarded Raul's brother Fidel as emotionally volatile, a view stemming from Fidel's erratic behavior during the Cuban missile crisis, when, in the Soviets' view, Fidel was trying to provoke a U.S.-Soviet nuclear conflict. With Raul -- who resembles a Soviet-style apparatchik -- in charge, Russia may feel more comfortable deploying strategic or intelligence assets on the island.

#### taking steps to reduce the probability of war is key

Baum ‘12

Seth Baum, Executive Director of the Global Catastrophic Risk Institute,

Nuclear War Group Discusses Ongoing Risk Of US-Russia Nuclear War, 12/30/2012, Global Catastrophic Risk Institute, <http://gcrinstitute.org/nuclear-war-group-discusses-ongoing-risk-of-us-russia-nuclear-war/>, JLB

The key statistic here is the probability of US-Russia nuclear war per unit time. The 1% annual probability previously estimated by Martin Hellman [2] corresponds to approximately 10% per decade, 63% per century, and very close to 100% per millennium – that is, if the annual probability stays the same over time. [3] The point is, unless we do something to make it less likely that a US-Russia nuclear war would occur during any given year, then eventually the war is virtually guaranteed to occur. Note that this logic also applies to other types of events, including other possible global catastrophes, not just US-Russia nuclear war. With the Cold War over, it may seem to many Americans that the annual probability of US-Russia nuclear war is quite low. But this sentiment is not universally shared. For example, earlier in 2012, then-Presidential candidate Mitt Romney referred to Russia as the US’s “number one geopolitical foe”. Previously, US Senator John McCain wrote on Twitter “Dear Vlad, The #ArabSpring is coming to a neighborhood near you”. These comments suggest ongoing American concerns about Russia. Meanwhile Russia’s ongoing concerns about the US may be even greater. Many in Russia retain the Cold War view of the US as seeking global domination. Two big factors are the ongoing expansion of NATO into eastern Europe and NATO’s involvement in the 2008 South Ossetia (Georgia) war, the latter of which came close to having US and Russian troops firing at each other. Indeed, Putin thanked Romney for Romney’s “number one geopolitical foe” comment because it draws attention to and helps confirm Putin’s concerns about NATO plans for a missile defense shield in Eastern Europe.

US-Russia nuclear miscalc over external crises is likely—risks extinction

**Barrett et al. 13** (Anthony M. Barrett- Global Catastrophic Risk Institute, Seth D. Baum- Center for Research on Environmental Decisions, Columbia University, Kelly R. Hostetler- Department of Geography, Pennsylvania State University, 2013, “Analyzing and Reducing the Risks of Inadvertent Nuclear War Between the United States and Russia”, http://sethbaum.com/ac/fc\_NuclearWar.pdf)

War involving significant fractions of the U.S. and Russian nuclear arsenals, which are by far the largest of any nations, could have globally catastrophic effects such as severely reducing food production for years, 1,2,3,4,5,6 potentially leading to collapse of modern civilization worldwide and even the extinction of humanity. 7,8,9,10 Nuclear war between the US and Russia could occur by various routes, including accidental or unauthorized launch; deliberate first attack by one nation; and inadvertent attack. In an accidental or unauthorized launch or detonation, system safeguards or procedures to maintain control over nuclear weapons fail in such a way that a nuclear weapon or missile launches or explodes without direction from leaders. In a deliberate first attack, the attacking nation decides to attack based on accurate information about the state of affairs. In an inadvertent attack, the attacking nation mistakenly concludes that it is under attack and launches nuclear weapons in what it believes is a counterattack. 11,12 (Brinkmanship strategies incorporate elements of all of the above, in that they involve deliberate manipulation of the risk of otherwise unauthorized or inadvertent attack as part of coercive threats that “leave something to chance,” i.e., “taking steps that raise the risk that the crisis will go out of control and end in a general nuclear exchange.” 13,14 ) Over the years, nuclear strategy was aimed primarily at minimizing risks of intentional attack through development of deterrence capabilities, though numerous measures were also taken to reduce probabilities of accidents, unauthorized attack, and inadvertent war. 15,16,17 For purposes of deterrence, both U.S. and Soviet/Russian forces have maintained significant capabilities to have some forces survive a first attack by the other side and to launch a subsequent counter-attack. However, concerns about the extreme disruptions that a first attack would cause in the other side’s forces and command-and-control capabilities led to both sides’development of capabilities to detect a first attack and launch a counter-attack before suffering damage from the first attack. 18,19,20 Many people believe that with the end of the Cold War and with improved relations between the United States and Russia, the risk of East-West nuclear war was significantly reduced. 21,22 However, it has also been argued that inadvertent nuclear war between the United States and Russia has continued to present a substantial risk. 23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30,31,32,33 While the United States and Russia are not actively threatening each other with war, they have remained ready to launch nuclear missiles in response to indications of attack. 34,35,36,37,38 False indicators of nuclear attack could be caused in several ways. First, a wide range of events have already been mistakenly interpreted as indicators of attack, including weather phenomena, a faulty computer chip, wild animal activity, and control-room training tapes loaded at the wrong time. 39 Second, terrorist groups or other actors might cause attacks on either the United States or Russia that resemble some kind of nuclear attack by the other nation by actions such as exploding a stolen or improvised nuclear bomb, 40,41,42 especially if such an event occurs during a crisis between the United States and Russia. 43 A variety of nuclear terrorism scenarios are possible. 44 Al Qaeda has sought to obtain or construct nuclear weapons and to use them against the United States. 45,46,47 Other methods could involve attempts to circumvent nuclear weapon launch control safeguards or exploit holes in their security. 48,49 It has long been argued that the probability of inadvertent nuclear war is significantly higher during U.S.-Russian crisis conditions, 50,51,52,53 with the Cuban Missile Crisis being a prime historical example of such a crisis. 54,55,56,57,58 It is possible that U.S.-Russian relations will significantly deteriorate in the future, increasing nuclear tensions. 59 There are a variety of ways for a third party to raise tensions between the United States and Russia, making one or both nations more likely to misinterpret events as attacks. 60,61,62,63

### Plan

**The United States federal government should normalize its economic relations with the Republic of Cuba.**

### 1AC OFAC

#### OFAC is overstretched—the plan is key to effective sanctions

Johnson, Spector and Lilac 10 - Andy Johnson, Director, National Security Program, Kyle Spector, Policy Advisor, National Security Program, Kristina Lilac, National Security Program, Senior Fellows of The Third Way Institute, (“End the Embargo of Cuba”, Article for The Third Way Institute, 9/16/10, <http://content.thirdway.org/publications/326/Third_Way_Memo_-_End_the_Embargo_of_Cuba.pdf>, Accessed 7/02/13, AW)

Keeping the embargo in place requires that the US government devote time and resources to fighting a Cold War -8 era threat. Senator Chris Dodd argued in a 2005 op ed that the US spends “extraordinary resources” each year to enforce the sanctions instead of devoting such resources to the fight against terrorism. 4 While the financial resources dedicated to enforcing the embargo may be limited compared to resources dedicated to other causes, lifting the Cuban embargo could put the US in a better position to fight terrorist organizations by freeing up resources currently enforcing the embargo. For example, the Treasury Department’s Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC), which governs travel and trade between the US and Cuba, is also responsible for maintaining sanctions against truly problematic countries, including Iran and North Korea. OFAC also is responsible for responding to economic threats posed by terrorist organizations and narcotics traffickers. By ending OFAC’s need to regulate the Cuban embargo, OFAC could instead devote those resources to respond to the current threats posed by rogue states and terrorist networks

#### **That revamps sanctions on Iran** – previous lack of focus and disorganization

Maberry and Jensen 13 – J. Scott Maberry, J.D, Georgetown University Law Center, International Trade partner in the Government Contracts, Investigations & International Trade Practice Group, Mark L. Jensen, J.D, Harvard Law School, International Trade associate in the Government Contracts, Investigations & International Trade Practice Group, (“OFAC gets hot, bothered on Iran and Cuba: how economic sanctions work today”, Report for Sheppard Mullin Richter & Hampton LLP, 5/7/13, <http://www.lexology.com/library/detail.aspx?g=8657e6ce-454a-4eaf-ba8b-d225ea59ecdd>, Accessed 7/9/13, AW)

People who practice U.S. economic sanctions law like to talk about how sanctions are policy-oriented, or an engine of U.S. foreign policy. Whereas some laws may be more opaquely political, economic sanctions and embargoes seem to express most bluntly how international leverage works through regulation. And yet, a few recent regulatory developments show that the direction that sanctions take is not always predictable. The U.S. Department of Treasury, Office of Foreign Assets Control (“OFAC”) has had a raucously busy year. A torrent of development in laws and regulations on Iran served as the unsurprising focus of this year’s OFAC symposium, held on March 19, 2013, in Washington D.C. Among the developments were sanctions imposed on non-U.S. banks, a new executive order related to the purchase of petroleum and petrochemical products from Iran, an expanded scope of the Iran Transactions and Sanctions Regulations to companies “owned or controlled” by U.S. companies, and a new statute that targets sectors of the economy related to goods and services to Iran, including secondary financial transactions in energy, shipping, shipbuilding, precious metal, and graphite. See our recent posts on Iran here and here. Perhaps the most striking aspect of the Iran sanctions program is its proliferation into not only additional laws and regulations, but also additional regulatory regimes. The Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (“CISADA”), the National Defense Authorization Act for 2012 (“NDAA”), and Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 (“ITR”), have created a polyglot system focused on individual sectors of the economy. OFAC presenters at the March symposium gave the sense of a proliferation of laws that is undoubtedly aimed at accomplishing U.S. foreign policy goals. But the laws are paradoxically both targeted (at industries, vessels, banks) and incredibly expansive in jurisdiction. The system is the embodiment of the powerful yet somewhat disorganized U.S. government piling on everything it can to economically overwhelm Iran. The Iran program also serves as a good case study of how far and wide economic sanctions can be made to reach. If legislation of past years has proved anything, it is that the U.S. Congress appears ready to use any and all means within its legislative authority to sanction Iran. Insofar as Congress is able to map out the reach of the U.S. financial system and economy further, it seems likely that additional sanctions will be applied.

#### **Sanctions solve Iran prolif** – multilateral coalitions – international position of strength

DeLeon et al 12 - Rudy deLeon, National and International Security, John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University, Recipient of The Defense Civilian Distinguished Service Award in 1994, 1995, and 2001, National Intelligence Distinguished Service Medal in 2001, Former US Senior Department of Defense Official, Senior Vice President of National Security and International Policy at American Progress, with Brian Katulis, Peter Juul, Matt Duss and Ken Sofer, (“Strengthening America’s Options on Iran”, Report for The Center for American Progress, April 2012, <http://www.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/issues/2012/04/pdf/iran_10questions_INTRO.pdf>, Accessed 7/10/13, AW)

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*NOTE: P5+1 is comprised of: United States, Russia, China, United Kingdom, France and Germany\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

Indeed, amid an array of political transitions and military conflicts around the globe, the prospect of Iran acquiring nuclear weapons has galvanized a global debate on how to stop the regime in Tehran from getting the bomb. This debate has spilled over into the domestic politics of the world’s great powers, becoming a talking point in the 2012 U.S. presidential election and the subject of behind-the-scenes discussion during China’s transition to its next generation of political leadership at their Party Congress this fall. In the Middle East and Central Asia, Iran’s nuclear program has implications for the ongoing civil war in Syria, a political transition beset by economic troubles in Egypt, and U.S. and NATO ground combat operations in Afghanistan entering their 10th year. Oil price surges worldwide threaten economic recoveries around the globe—recoveries Iran could thwart in a number of ways depending on how it reacts to global pressure to come clean on its nuclear program. Events are quickly producing a decision point: A concerned Israel warns the diplomatic community that its window for military options to delay or deny Iran’s potential weapon is not unlimited due to the progress Iran has made in hardening its nuclear facilities beyond Israeli capability to penetrate them. At the same time, a vigorous roster of nations is tightening the burden of economic sanctions against Iran—isolating the country’s already feeble economy, which survives only because of its vast oil reserves. Iran—a longtime supporter of terrorism, both directly and through its proxies, with a track record of dissimulation on its nuclear ambitions—has no reservoir of credibility or good will, and its repeated professions that its nuclear program is peaceful deserve no benefit of the doubt. Of course Iran could quickly defuse the crisis and allow the inspectors of the International Atomic Energy Agency full access to all facilities of interest so it can measure and catalogue Iran’s capability to produce highly enriched uranium (the essential element required for weapons production), and Iran could come clean on its known nuclear weapons research. As IAEA Director General Yukio Amano affirms, Iran needs “to cooperate fully with the [International Atomic Energy] Agency on all outstanding issues, particularly those which give rise to concerns about the possible military dimensions to Iran’s nuclear program, including by providing access without delay to all sites, equipment, persons and documents requested by the Agency.” It is Iran’s lack of response that fuels concerns about their nuclear ambitions. Importantly, there is a strong bipartisan consensus in America and within the inter national community on this single point—an Iranian nuclear weapon would destabilize the one of the world’s most important oil-producing regions at a critical point in the global economic recovery, would harm Israel’s security, and would severely undermine the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. Unfortunately, much of the political debate in this U.S. election year now distracts from these central realities. Today the United States is leading a successful three-year global effort to isolate Iran diplomatically and implement a broad range of strict economic sanctions targeted at undermining its nuclear program. The Obama administration’s initial outreach to the Iranian regime in 2009 did not achieve immediate constructive results, but the demonstration of American good faith forged greater international unity around the problem and served as an important force multiplier for subsequent successful efforts to pressure the regime. Now, as talks with the P5+1 approach, Iran must choose how to respond to the growing global concerns about its nuclear program and make the choice to live up to its international obligations or face increased international isolation. During the 2008 campaign, candidate Obama defended his proposed engagement policy by explaining that “we’re [not] going to be able to execute the kind of sanctions we need without some cooperation with some countries like Russia and China that...have extensive trade with Iran but potentially have an interest in making sure Iran doesn’t have a nuclear weapon.” Affirming his goal of “tough, direct diplomacy with Iran,” Obama acknowledged that diplomacy “may not work, but if it doesn’t work, then we have strengthened our ability to form alliances to impose tough sanctions.” Over the past three years, this is precisely what the Obama administration achieved. The engagement policy has served as an important force multiplier for efforts to pressure the Iranian government. By giving Iran repeated opportunities to meet its international responsibilities, this administration has been able to forge a far stronger and more enduring international coalition to pressure Iran. Far from strengthening the Iranian regime, as some critics have alleged, Obama’s engagement effort has in fact further isolated it. The United States and its partners in the P5+1 group are operating from a position of strength that would have been hard to imagine four short years ago. U.S. policy on Iran should not be determined by partisan politics and easy sound bites. Nor will U.S. policy objectives be quickly accomplished. Instead, this crisis requires policymakers and all citizens to challenge their own preconceived notions and make decisions based on facts while preparing fully for all contingencies.

#### Iran is trying to proliferate now

Tirone 7/17

(Jonathan, 2013, “Iran’s North Korea Links Draw Scrutiny at Nuclear-Weapon Meeting,” Bloomberg reporter, <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-07-17/iran-s-north-korea-links-draw-scrutiny-at-nuclear-weapon-meeting.html>, jkim)

The possibility that North Korea is sharing nuclear-weapon test data with Iran cannot be ruled out and is a proliferation risk, the former chief of a U.S. atomic-bomb laboratory said today at a meeting in Vienna.

“Sharing test information is a very dangerous thing to do,” Siegfried Hecker, director emeritus at the Los Alamos, New Mexico, nuclear-weapons lab and a researcher at Stanford University, told a meeting of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test Ban Treaty Organization in the Austrian capital. He called the potential sharing “very troublesome.”

North Korea has tested three nuclear weapons with the most recent detonation on Feb. 12. Iran, under investigation for a decade over alleged nuclear-weapons work, maintains “strong” weapons ties with the secretive Asian regime, according to U.S. intelligence reports, which add that North Korea “retains the potential for exporting nuclear materials or technology.”

“Iran doesn’t need a nuclear weapon and has never claimed it would need to test in the future,” Seyed Hosseini, Iran’s deputy envoy to the CTBTO, said following Hecker’s remarks. “There is no diversion for military purposes.”

Hecker, 69, toured North Korean nuclear facilities in 2010 and was first to report on the country’s uranium-enrichment program. Pakistani scientist Abdul Qadeer Khan, who sold atomic equipment to both North Korea and Iran, may have also provided data on his country’s nuclear-weapon tests, Hecker said.

Recognized nuclear-weapons states like Russia and the U.S. have detonated thousands of atomic bombs to increase the reliability and yield of their devices. Data on weapon effectiveness are closely held secrets. The nuclear-test-ban treaty wants to restrict proliferation by eliminating the ability of countries to experiment with new bomb designs.

‘Nuclear Option’

“Iran has put all the things in place to build a bomb without taking a decision to do so,” said Hecker. “They want the nuclear option.”

In order to keep that option without conducting a nuclear test of its own, Iran will need data from other nuclear-weapons countries, Hecker said, adding that North Korea will have to conduct additional testing in order to build a miniaturized nuclear device capable of fitting on a missile.

“They have a tunnel that’s ready to go if they want to test again,” Hecker said, pointing to satellite imagery showing a test facility south of February’s blast.

#### OFAC is unique – involves allied cooperation

DoT 05 – United States Department of Treasury, (“OFAC”, Report Written for the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council, June 2005, <http://www.treasury.gov/resource-center/sanctions/OFAC-Enforcement/Documents/ofac_sec_frb.pdf>, Accessed 7/9/13, AW)

OFAC administers and enforces economic and trade sanctions based on U.S. foreign policy and national security goals against targeted foreign countries, terrorists, international narcotics traffickers, and those engaged in activities related to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. OFAC acts under the President’s wartime and national emergency powers, as well as under authority granted by specific legislation, to impose controls on transactions and freeze assets under U.S. jurisdiction. Many of the sanctions are based on United Nations and other international mandates, are multilateral in scope, and involve close cooperation with allied governments. OFAC requirements are separate and distinct from the BSA, but both OFAC and the BSA share a common national security goal. For this reason, many financial institutions view compliance with OFAC sanctions as related to BSA compliance obligations; supervisory examination for BSA compliance is logically connected to the examination of a financial institution’s compliance with OFAC sanctions.

**Nuclear Iran causes extinction**

**Rubin**, ‘**9** (Barry, director of the Global Research in International Affairs (GLORIA) Center in Israel and editor of the Middle East Review of International Affairs (MERIA) Journal, 3/9/09, pg online @ [http://articles.nydailynews.com/2009-03-09/news/17917609\_1\_nuclear-weapons-iran-middle-east]greenhill-au, alp)

If and when Iran gets nuclear weapons it would set off a global nightmare. Most obviously, Iran could use nuclear arms to attack Israel. It's easy to say that Iran's leaders would be cautious, but what if ideology, error, or an extremist faction decides to wipe the Jewish state off the map? Even a 10-percent chance of nuclear holocaust is terrifying. And if Israel decides its existence is at risk, it would launch a preemptive attack that would also produce a big crisis. That's just for starters. Once Iran has nuclear weapons, every Arab state, with the exception of Iran's ally Syria, would also be imperiled. Those countries would beg for U.S. protection. But could they depend on America, under the Barack Obama administration, to go to war - especially a nuclear one - to shield them? Uncertain of U.S. reliability, these governments would rush to appease Iran. To survive, the Arab states will do whatever Iran wants - which would come at high cost for America: alliances would weaken and military bases would close down. No Arab state would dare support peace with Israel, either. But Arab states wouldn't feel safe with just appeasement. An arms' race would escalate in which several other countries would try to buy or build nukes of their own. Tension and chance for nuclear war, whether through accident or miscalculation, would soar. The United States would eventually have to get dragged in. European allies would also be scared. As reluctant as they are to help America in the Middle East, that paralysis would get worse. As willing as they are to appease Tehran, they'd go far beyond that. Meanwhile, an emboldened Iran would push to limit oil and gas production and increase prices. Other oil producers would feel compelled to move away from their former, more responsible practices. Consumers' fears would push up the prices further. Yet there's worse. Flush with a feel of victory, Iran and its allies - Syria, Hamas, Hezbollah and Iraqi insurgents - would recruit more members to its cause. These terrorist groups would interpret the retreat of more moderate Arab countries and the West as signs of weakness and use it to fuel more aggression. Indeed, all Islamists, even those hostile to Iran, would view its achievement as a great Islamic victory. Hundreds of thousands would join or become active supporters of radical Islamist groups throughout the Middle East, in Europe and elsewhere. Fervent with a sense of divine favor and imminent victory, they'd escalate their operations. The result would be increased violence and possible civil war in every Arab state and far more terrorism in the West. Such a terrible scenario is likely **even if Iran never actually uses a nuclear weapon** on another country. This new era in the Middle East would bring risks and the probability of war for America that would dwarf all the region's current troubles and the crises faced by the United States in the whole world. And that's why it's so important to avoid Iran getting nuclear weapons in the first place.

**Sanctions solve Korean prolif**

**Bishop**, United States Army War College, **2004** (Colonel David J., “DISMANTLING NORTH KOREA’S NUCLEAR WEAPONS PROGRAMS”, USAWC Strategy Research Project, March 19**th**)

CONTAINMENT

A second course of action is to pursue a policy of containment. One dictionary defines containment as “a policy of creating strategic alliances in order to check the expansion of a hostile power or ideology or to force it to negotiate peacefully.”54 Containment seeks to force North Korea to abandon its nuclear ambitions through a series of punitive actions. In other words, the DRPK would have to comply with internationally imposed conditions to avoid negative consequences of coercive diplomacy and economic sanctions. The goal of a containment policy would be to isolate North Korea in order to pressure the Kim government to comply with nuclear control regimes. A containment policy would emphasize the military 7 element of power (short of preemption), along with coercive diplomacy and further economic sanctions. Because a credible threat is the engine of containment, this option precludes the offer of a security guarantee by the United States. Finally, a successful containment strategy requires multilateral solidarity (especially among key regional actors) in isolating North Korea. Some example of containment concepts follow. Military actions could include aggressive interdiction of vessels inbound to and outbound from North Korean ports, with an option to upgrade to quarantine if WMD proliferation efforts are discovered.55 Long-term deployment of an additional aircraft carrier battle group, surface combatants and additional bomber aircraft to the Western Pacific should precede such actions to prepare for potential escalation of tensions.56 Also, as part of a containment policy, the U.S. should take prudent defensive actions to protect its interests in Korea. To enhance deterrence, the U.S. could revert to its former policy of neither confirming nor denying the presence of nuclear weapons on the Korean Peninsula, to deter the Kim regime from taking escalatory action.57 Relocation of all U.S. forces south of the Han River (and out of range of most of North Korea’s threatening arsenal), and upgrade of air defense, and nuclear, biological and chemical protective measures would significantly reduce risks to U.S. forces in Korea.58 Additionally, a United Nations Security Council Resolution against North Korea condemning its nuclear weapons program and a reprioritization of humanitarian food shipments to more deserving countries would help the long term success of containment. 59 Reintroduction of IAEA inspections should be included in a containment strategy as well. Finally, another tool in a containment strategy is to interdict the illicit activities of the Pyongyang regime. From 1995 to 2001, the North Korean GNP fell from $22.3 billion to $15.7 billion. In 2001, legitimate businesses exports totaled only $650 million, compared to illegal income from drugs which was estimated somewhere between $500 million and $1 billion. Also, North Korea made over $560 million in profit from missile sales and sold over $100 million in counterfeit U.S. currency worldwide. By shutting down Kim Jong Il’s illegal revenues from missiles, drugs and counterfeiting, the U.S. could **greatly hinder North Korea’s ability to finance its nuclear weapons programs**.60 The U.S. led Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI) is a promising program currently under development. The PSI program involves multilateral interdiction of the transport or transfer of WMD and missile technology. Eleven nations currently participate including the following Asian states: Australia, Japan and Singapore (China is not a participant). Although the PSI has not successfully seized WMD, it has been successful in seizing illegal narcotics.61 8 Advantages and Disadvantages of Containment The main advantage of containment is it directly addresses the risk presented by North Korea’s nuclear weapons today as well as the risk of proliferation in the future **through a direct path to resolving the issue**.62 However this approach presents significant operational and political risks.

**Korean prolif causes nuclear war**

**Hayes and Hamel-Green 9**—Professor of International Relations, RMIT University, Executive Director of the Nautilus Institute for Security and Sustainable Development, degree in History, PhD from Berkeley—AND—Michael Hamel-Green, Professor, Executive Dean, Faculty of Arts, Education and Human Development @ Victoria University, BA MA Melb, DipEd Hawthorn, PhD La Trobe (Peter, 14 December 2009, The Path Not Taken, The Way Still Open: Denuclearizing The Korean Peninsula And Northeast Asia," The Asia-Pacific Journal, <http://www.japanfocus.org/-Michael-Hamel_Green/3267>, RBatra)

The consequences of failing to address the proliferation threat posed by the North Korea developments, and related political and economic issues, are serious, not only for the Northeast Asian region but for the whole international community. At worst, there is the **possibility of nuclear attack**1, whether by **intention, miscalculation, or merely accident**, leading to the resumption of Korean War hostilities. On the Korean Peninsula itself, key population centres are well within short or medium range missiles. The whole of Japan is likely to come within North Korean missile range. Pyongyang has a population of over 2 million, Seoul (close to the North Korean border) 11 million, and Tokyo over 20 million. **Even a limited nuclear exchange would result in a holocaust of unprecedented proportions.** But the catastrophe within the region would not be the only outcome. New research indicates that even a limited nuclear war in the region would rearrange our global climate far more quickly than global warming. Westberg draws attention to new studies modelling the effects of even a limited nuclear exchange involving approximately 100 Hiroshima-sized 15 kt bombs2 (by comparison it should be noted that the United States currently deploys warheads in the range 100 to 477 kt, that is, individual warheads equivalent in yield to a range of 6 to 32 Hiroshimas).The studies indicate that the soot from the fires produced would lead to a decrease in global temperature by 1.25 degrees Celsius for a period of 6-8 years.3 In Westberg’s view: That is not global winter, but the nuclear darkness will cause a deeper drop in temperature than at any time during the last 1000 years. The temperature over the continents would decrease substantially more than the global average. A decrease in rainfall over the continents would also follow…The period of nuclear darkness will cause much greater decrease in grain production than 5% and it will continue for many years...hundreds of millions of people will die from hunger…To make matters even worse, such amounts of smoke injected into the stratosphere would cause a huge reduction in the Earth’s protective ozone.4 These, of course, are not the only consequences. Reactors might also be targeted, causing further mayhem and downwind radiation effects, superimposed on a smoking, radiating ruin left by nuclear next-use. Millions of refugees would flee the affected regions. The direct impacts, and the follow-on impacts on the global economy via ecological and food insecurity, could **make the present global financial crisis pale by comparison**. How the great powers, especially the nuclear weapons states respond to such a crisis, and in particular, whether nuclear weapons are used in response to nuclear first-use, could make or break the global non proliferation and disarmament regimes. There could be many unanticipated impacts on regional and global security relationships5, with **subsequent nuclear breakout** and geopolitical turbulence, including possible loss-of-control over fissile material or warheads in the chaos of nuclear war, and **aftermath chain-reaction affects involving other potential proliferant states.** The Korean nuclear proliferation issue is not just a regional threat but a global one that warrants priority consideration from the international community. North Korea is currently believed to have sufficient plutonium stocks to produce up to 12 nuclear weapons.6 If and when it is successful in implementing a uranium enrichment program - having announced publicly that it is experimenting with enrichment technology on September 4, 20097 in a communication with the UN Security Council - it would likely acquire the capacity to produce over 100 such weapons. Although some may dismiss Korean Peninsula proliferation risks on the assumption that the North Korean regime will implode as a result of its own economic problems, food problems, and treatment of its own populace, there is little to suggest that this is imminent. If this were to happen, there would be the risk of nuclear weapons falling into hands of non-state actors in the disorder and chaos that would ensue. Even without the outbreak of nuclear hostilities on the Korean Peninsula in either the near or longer term, North Korea has every financial incentive under current economic sanctions and the needs of its military command economy to export its nuclear and missile technologies to other states. Indeed, it has already been doing this for some time. The Proliferation Security Initiative may conceivably prove effective in intercepting ship-borne nuclear exports, but it is by no means clear how air-transported materials could similarly be intercepted. Given the high stakes involved, North Korean proliferation, if unaddressed and unreversed, has the potential to destabilize the whole East Asian region and beyond. Even if a nuclear exchange does not occur in the short term, the acute sense of nuclear threat that has been experienced for over five decades by North Koreans as a result of US strategic deterrence is now likely to be keenly felt by fellow Koreans south of the 38th Parallel and Japanese across the waters of the Sea of Japan. China, too, must surely feel itself to be at risk from North Korean nuclear weapons, or from escalation that might ensue from next-use in the Korean Peninsula resulting not only in the environmental consequences noted above, but in regime collapse and massive refugee flows. South Korea and Japan appear willing to rely on their respective bilateral security pacts with the United States to deter North Korean nuclear attack for the time being. However, should South Korea and/or Japan acquire nuclear weapons, the outcome would be destabilizing, especially if this resulted from rupture of their alliance relationships with the United States. **Both have the technical capability to do so very rapidly**. South Korea has previously engaged in nuclear weapons research but desisted after US pressure. Japan still proclaims its adherence to the three Non-Nuclear Principles although recent confirmation that the United States routinely transited nuclear weapons through Japan and retains the right of emergency reintroduction of nuclear weapons has tarnished Japan’s non-nuclear image. Moreover, it has large stockpiles of plutonium that could rapidly be used to produce nuclear warheads. Such responses, already advocated by conservative and nationalist groups within South Korea and Japan, could trigger a regional nuclear arms race involving the Koreas, Japan, Taiwan, and China, with incalculable wider consequences for Southeast Asia, South Asia and the whole Pacific and beyond. These developments would spell **the demise of the current global non-proliferation regime** as underpinned by the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Failure to reverse the DPRK’s nuclear breakout is also an important factor driving a general malaise in the exercise of American power which one of the authors has characterized elsewhere as “**the end of American nuclear hegemony**.”8

#### Korean conflict is likely—the impact is catastrophic

**Wit and Town 4/16**

(Joel, fellow with the US-Korea institute at Johns Hopkins school of International Studies, and Jenny, researcher at the same institute; “7 Reasons to Worry about North Korea’s Weapons”, http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2013/04/7-reasons-to-worry-about-north-koreas-weapons/275020//HH)

It is getting so you need a scorecard to keep track of the North Korea crisis. Every day there are reports of new moves on both sides-- U.S. bombers flying to the Korean peninsula, interceptors shifting into position to shoot down missiles, North Korea restarting a nuclear reactor to produce bomb-making material and preparing for missile tests, and of course louder threats. Even harder to figure out are the real dangers; one day the White House says that there are no signs of disturbing military moves by the North, the next day Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel trumpets that Pyongyang represents a "clear and present danger to the United States," and the next North Korea is warning foreigners to leave the peninsula. The situation is confusing, but one thing is sure. These weapons are not going away and neither are the North Koreans. Pyongyang's arsenal could grow from a few bombs to, according to some estimates, as many as 50 by 2016, quite a lot for a small country, or any country for that matter. Also, odds are North Korea will adopt a dangerous strategy for using these weapons, similar to what NATO did during the Cold War. Faced with superior conventional military forces, just as NATO was with the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact, Pyongyang might threaten to "go nuclear" very early in a conflict to forestall defeat. A North Korean nuclear bomb dropped on Seoul or Tokyo would inflict enormous devastation, killing or injuring an estimated two million people in each city. Of course, all may not go well for the North; Pyongyang's close friend China may head it off at the nuclear pass; the North might experience problems building more nuclear weapons; or the U.S. could strike a deal with the North that stops its growing arsenal. In short, we can hope for the best but should be prepared for the worst. Why then should we be concerned about North Korea's WMD arsenal now and in the future? It boils down to seven reasons. 1) The threat of a nuclear attack : Right now, a North Korean attack on the continental United States is not likely because its missiles cannot fly far enough carrying a heavy nuclear warhead. However, they may make progress in the future, and Secretary Hagel's announcement that the U.S. plans to position interceptors in Alaska and possibly on the east coast to shoot down North Korean missiles is important. The more immediate danger, however, is that the North could use nuclear weapons against its neighbors, South Korea and Japan. If there is a war on the peninsula, experts believe Pyongyang could probably put nuclear warheads on shorter-range missiles and attack major population centers. A North Korean nuclear bomb dropped on Seoul or Tokyo would inflict enormous devastation, killing or injuring an estimated two million people in each city, not to mention radioactivity that would last for decades. Pyongyang's ability to inflict horrendous damage is only going to grow if it builds new and more powerful bombs. 2) The potential for increased WMD exports. The North has already tried to help Syria build a nuclear reactor that could produce materials for nuclear weapons. Luckily, that reactor was destroyed by Israeli warplanes in 2006. But if Pyongyang's inventory of nuclear bombs grows, its technological base expands, and its need for hard currency to help cope with international sanctions increases, the North will have a larger inventory of merchandise, plus the incentive to look for overseas buyers. It's worth noting that some exports can be done just with the push of a button -- that's all it takes to transfer a bomb design in today's connected world. Even if we detect transfers, because Pyongyang's own nuclear security blanket may grow, the international community will be less able to stop exports. While some Americans argue that the U.S. should simply attack North Korea if it is caught sending nuclear bombs or technology to our enemies, launching military strikes against a North Korea that has a bristling arsenal of weapons and is not afraid to threaten or even use them would be extremely risky. 3) Growing strains on the U.S. nuclear umbrella provided to our allies. America's alliances with South Korea and Japan are designed to protect them from attack. That includes not just stationing U.S. troops in those countries, but also a willingness to threaten and even use nuclear weapons in their defense against other nuclear-armed countries. While some experts question how effective our "nuclear umbrella" has been, South Korea and Japan see it as vital. It stands to reason that if the threat from North Korea's nuclear arsenal grows, the stress on the U.S. umbrella will also grow, requiring constant reassurance for our allies. The U.S. sent B-2 and B-52 bombers able to carry nuclear weapons to South Korea during the current crisis to calm our ally's growing security concerns while telegraphing a warning to the North. Whether such an approach will remain effective in the future is unclear. Washington's moment of truth may come if North Korea develops nuclear-armed missiles able to reach the United States and South Koreans ask themselves whether the U.S. will risk sacrificing Los Angeles to protect Seoul. Many South Koreans doubt American reliability even today, despite 50 years of alliance. And some cite the distressing example of Washington pulling out of Vietnam during the 1970s. With confidence in U.S. security guarantees already in question, an emboldened Pyongyang could erode that confidence even further. 4) Increased risk of war by miscalculation . Pyongyang may believe that its nuclear arsenal gives it more freedom to conduct limited military provocations--such as the 2010 sinking of a South Korean ship and artillery attack on the South's Yeonpyeong Island -- without reprisal. That was true then, although Washington seems to have restrained the South from launching a serious military response to those actions for fear of triggering a second Korean war. However, now Seoul is working with the U.S. on a new proactive strategy. This means launching "preventive attacks" if intelligence indicates that the North is preparing for a limited strike. It also means responding militarily to provocations like those in 2010. In either case, the dynamic set in motion could trigger an all-out war. What if a mistake is made in identifying North Korean preparations for a strike? And why does anyone think the North is going to roll over and play dead? While some argue that Pyongyang would not respond because war with a stronger U.S. and South Korea would mean suicide, the North may be willing to take the risk. Not responding after all would show a fatal weakness. It's a tough spot for the United States and South Korea to be in, but the cure may be worse than the disease. 5) The aggravation of fault lines in U.S.-Chinese relations. Every time North Korea does something wrong, there is an inevitable outcry that China should solve this problem for us. The logic is, as the North's closest political and economic ally, Beijing has more influence with Pyongyang than anyone else. China, however, is right in claiming that its influence is limited, not only because the North Koreans are adept at resisting pressure from all comers, but also because Beijing has its own national interests. China's top priority has been to avoid instability on its borders--not the U.S. prime objective of denuclearization of the North--and that means making sure North Korea stays solvent in order to avoid collapse and the emergence of a unified Korea aligned with the U.S. on its doorstep. A nuclear-armed South Korea would not only suffer from the economic blowback from its trading partners but its building of nuclear weapons might convince Japan, which has not always been on the best of terms with the South, to follow suit. If Pyongyang's arsenal continues to grow and China does not join in efforts to stop it, chances are this problem will aggravate fault lines already appearing between Beijing and Washington on a whole raft of issues in Asia and elsewhere. The split between the two will deepen, as will the divide between China and South Korea and Japan, who remain the target of threats by Pyongyang. That will create more tensions in a vital region already beset by a host of other problems. 6) A breakdown of the international regime intended to stop the spread of nuclear weapons. North Korea's nuclear program, while a setback for efforts to stop the spread of these weapons, may trigger far worse developments. In South Korea, where discussion of building nuclear weapons was almost unheard, public opinion polls show two-thirds of Korean citizens now support the idea. As one Seoul dweller told the New York Times, "Having a nuclear North Korea is like facing a person holding a gun with your bare hands." Of course, the downsides would be serious. A nuclear-armed South Korea would not only suffer from the economic blowback from its trading partners but its building of nuclear weapons might convince Japan, which has not always been on the best of terms with the South, to follow suit. That in turn, would create further tensions with Japan's rival, China. At the end of the day, faced with a bullying, nuclear-armed Pyongyang, whose ultimate objective is reunification of the Korean peninsula on its terms, Seoul may have no choice but to rely on its own nuclear umbrella. Where the nuclear dominos fall will depend on Washington's ability to cope with the dangers posed by a nuclear North and to shield its ally. 7) Instability leading to a nuclear coup, nuclear civil war or bombs leaking beyond the North's borders. Pundits have been predicting for decades that North Korea would collapse just like the Soviet Union. They have been proven wrong, although instability remains possible. North Korea could experience convulsions, perhaps because the military is fed up with the young leader pursuing policies contrary to its interests; new food shortages could lead to unrest and the unraveling of the government; or factional fighting between those supporting reform and others who want to maintain the status quo could break out. The more weapons Pyongyang has, the more dangerous instability becomes. Nuclear bombs could be pawns in a power struggle, even used by different factions against rivals, or they might simply disappear, smuggled abroad and sold to the highest bidder. Moreover, there is nothing that could be done to stop it from happening; restoring order in a collapsing North would require hundreds of thousands of outside troops, and finding the bombs before they are used or exported would require almost 100,000 more. And what would the Chinese do if these troops approach the Yalu River like American soldiers did during the Korean War? Talk about mission impossible. The bottom line is that, even if this current crisis recedes, North Korea's WMD programs pose serious security risks in the region and to the U.S. that will continue to grow if not addressed in a direct and compelling way. Warning Pyongyang against aggression and reacting to nuclear and missile tests with sanctions, while tactically necessary, is strategically inadequate. The challenge for statesmen is to find a strategy that does not just wait for the North's next bellicose outburst, but seeks to moderate its behavior and goes beyond military countermeasures and economic sanctions. It may be distasteful given the nature of the North Korean regime, but there is no substitute for diplomacy and direct contact with Pyongyang. Only through such contacts can the United States and the international community figure out whether there is a peaceful way forward.

### 1AC Latin America

Advantage one is latin America relations--s**olves nuclear material transfer and warming**

Shifter 12

(Michael is an Adjunct Professor of Latin American Studies at Georgetown University's School of Foreign Service. He is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations and writes for the Council's journal Foreign Affairs. He serves as the President of Inter-American Dialogue. “Remaking the Relationship: The United States and Latin America,” April, IAD Policy Report, http://www.thedialogue.org/PublicationFiles/IAD2012PolicyReportFINAL.pdf)

Cuba, too, poses a significant challenge for relations between the United States and Latin America. The 50-year-old US embargo against Cuba is rightly criticized throughout the hemisphere as a failed and punitive instrument. It has long been a strain on US-Latin American relations. Although the United States has recently moved in the right direction and taken steps to relax restrictions on travel to Cuba, Washington needs to do far more to dismantle its severe, outdated constraints on normalized relations with Cuba. Cuba is one of the residual issues that most obstructs more effective US-Latin American engagement. At the same time, Cuba’s authoritarian regime should be of utmost concern to all countries in the Americas. At present, it is the only country without free, multi-party elections, and its government fully controls the press. Latin American and Caribbean nations could be instrumental in supporting Cuba’s eventual transition to democratic rule. An end to the US policy of isolating Cuba, without setting aside US concern about human rights violations, would be an important first step. Many of the issues on the hemispheric agenda carry critical global dimensions. Because of this, the United States should seek greater cooperation and consultation with Brazil, Mexico, and other countries of the region in world forums addressing shared interests. Brazil has the broadest international presence and influence of any Latin American nation. In recent years it has become far more active on global issues of concern to the United States. The United States and Brazil have clashed over such issues as Iran’s nuclear program, non-proliferation, and the Middle East uprisings, but they have cooperated when their interests converged, such as in the World Trade Organization and the G-20 (Mexico, Argentina, and Canada also participate in the G-20), and in efforts to rebuild and provide security for Haiti. Washington has worked with Brazil and other Latin American countries to raise the profile of emerging economies in various international financial agencies, including the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. In addition to economic and financial matters, Brazil and other Latin American nations are assuming enhanced roles on an array of global political, environmental, and security issues. Several for which US and Latin American cooperation could become increasingly important include: As the world’s lone nuclear-weapons-free region, Latin America has the opportunity to participate more actively in non-proliferation efforts. Although US and Latin American interests do not always converge on non-proliferation questions, they align on some related goals. For example, the main proliferation challenges today are found in developing and unstable parts of the world, as well as in the leakage—or transfer of nuclear materials—to terrorists. In that context, south-south connections are crucial. Brazil could play a pivotal role. Many countries in the region give priority to climate change challenges. This may position them as a voice in international debates on this topic. The importance of the Amazon basin to worldwide climate concerns gives Brazil and five other South American nations a special role to play Mexico already has assumed a prominent position on climate change and is active in global policy debates. Brazil organized the first-ever global environmental meeting in 1992 and, this year, will host Rio+20. Mexico hosted the second international meeting on climate change in Cancún in 2010. The United States is handicapped by its inability to devise a climate change policy. Still, it should support coordination on the presumptionof shared interests on a critical policy challenge. Latin Americans are taking more active leadership on drug policy in the hemisphere and could become increasingly influential in global discussions of drug strategies. Although the United States and Latin America are often at odds on drug policy, they have mutual interests and goals that should allow consultation and collaboration on a new, more effective approach to the problem.

#### Now is the key time for improved US-Latin American ties. Permanent collapse is coming.

Shifter ‘12

(Michael is an Adjunct Professor of Latin American Studies at Georgetown University's School of Foreign Service. He is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations and writes for the Council's journal Foreign Affairs. He serves as the President of Inter-American Dialogue. “Remaking the Relationship: The United States and Latin America,” April, IAD Policy Report, http://www.thedialogue.org/PublicationFiles/IAD2012PolicyReportFINAL.pdf)

If the United States and Latin America do not make the effort now, the chance may slip away. The most likely scenario then would be marked by a continued drift in their relationship, further deterioration of hemisphere-wide institutions, a reduced ability and willingness to deal with a range of common problems, and a spate of missed opportunities for more robust growth and greater social equity. The United States and Latin America would go their separate ways, manage their affairs independently of one another, and forego the opportunities that could be harvested by a more productive relationship. There are risks of simply maintaining the status quo. Urgent problems will inevitably arise that require trust and effective collaboration to resolve. And there is a chance that tensions between the United States and Latin America could become much worse, adversely affecting everyone’s interests and wellbeing. It is time to seize the moment and overhaul hemispheric relations.

**The risk of nuclear terrorism is high**

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

Terrorists exploit gaps in security. The current global regime for protecting the nuclear materials that terrorists desire for their ultimate weapon is far from seamless. It is based largely on unaccountable, voluntary arrangements that are inconsistent across borders. Its weak links make it dangerous and inadequate to prevent nuclear terrorism.¶ Later this month in Seoul, the more than 50 world leaders who will gather for the second Nuclear Security Summit need to seize the opportunity to start developing an accountable regime to prevent nuclear terrorism.¶ There is a consensus among international leaders that the threat of nuclear terrorism is real, not a Hollywood confection. President Obama, the leaders of 46 other nations, the heads of the International Atomic Energy Agency and the United Nations, and numerous experts have called nuclear terrorism one of the most serious threats to global security and stability. It is alsopreventable with more aggressive action.¶ At least four terrorist groups, including Al Qaeda, have demonstrated interest in using a nuclear device. These groups operate in or near states with histories of questionable nuclear security practices. Terrorists do not need to steal a nuclear weapon. It is quite possible to make an improvised nuclear device from highly enriched uranium or plutonium being used for civilian purposes. And there is a black market in such material. There have been 18 confirmed thefts or loss of weapons-usable nuclear material. In 2011, the Moldovan police broke up part of a smuggling ring attempting to sell highly enriched uranium; one member is thought to remain at large with a kilogram of this material.

**Terrorism causes extinction—**

**1) loose nukes and US retaliation**

**Wright 7** – New America Foundation senior fellow (Robert, 4/28, Planet Of The Apes, http://select.nytimes.com/2007/04/28/opinion/28wright.html, AG)

(3) Terrorism. Alas, the negative-feedback loop -- bad outcomes lead to smart policies -- may not apply here. We reacted to 9/11 by freaking out and invading one too many countries, creating more terrorists. With the ranks of terrorists growing -- amid **evolving biotechnology and loose nukes** -- we could within a decade see terrorism on a scale that would **make us forget any restraint** we had learned from the Iraq war's outcome. If 3,000 deaths led to two wars, how many wars would 300,000 deaths yield? And how many new terrorists? Terrorism alone won't wipe out humanity. But with our unwitting help, it could strengthen other lethal forces. It could give weight to the initially fanciful ''clash of civilizations'' thesis. Muslim states could fall under the control of radicals and opt out of what might otherwise have become a global civilization. **Armed with nukes** (Pakistan already is), they would **revive the nuclear Armageddon** scenario. A fissure between civilizations would also sabotage the solution of **environmental problems**, and the ensuing eco-calamity could make people on both sides of the fissure receptive to radical messages. The worse things got, the worse they'd get. So while no one of the Big Three doomsday dynamics is likely to bring the apocalypse, they could well combine to form a positive-feedback loop, a k a the planetary death spiral. And the catalyst would be terrorism, along with our mishandling of it.

#### 2) Puts on the dead-hand which ensures preemption

Ayson 10

Robert – Professor of Strategic Studies and Director of the Centre for Strategic Studies: New Zealand at the Victoria University of Wellington – “After a Terrorist Nuclear Attack: Envisaging Catalytic Effects,” Studies in Conflict & Terrorism, Volume 33, Issue 7, July, obtained via InformaWorld

But these two nuclear worlds—a non-state actor nuclear attack and a catastrophic interstate nuclear exchange—are not necessarily separable. It is just possible that some sort of terrorist attack, and especially an act of nuclear terrorism, could precipitate a chain of events leading to a massive exchange of nuclear weapons between two or more of the states that possess them. In this context, today’s and tomorrow’s terrorist groups might assume the place allotted during the early Cold War years to new state possessors of small nuclear arsenals who were seen as raising the risks of a catalytic nuclear war between the superpowers started by third parties. These risks were considered in the late 1950s and early 1960s as concerns grew about nuclear proliferation, the so-called n+1 problem. It may require a considerable amount of imagination to depict an especially plausible situation where an act of nuclear terrorism could lead to such a massive inter-state nuclear war. For example, in the event of a terrorist nuclear attack on the United States, it might well be wondered just how Russia and/or China could plausibly be brought into the picture, not least because they seem unlikely to be fingered as the most obvious state sponsors or encouragers of terrorist groups. They would seem far too responsible to be involved in supporting that sort of terrorist behavior that could just as easily threaten them as well. Some possibilities, however remote, do suggest themselves. For example, how might the United States react if it was thought or discovered that the fissile material used in the act of nuclear terrorism had come from Russian stocks, FN 40 and if for some reason Moscow denied any responsibility for nuclear laxity? The correct attribution of that nuclear material to a particular country might not be a case of science fiction given the observation by Michael May et al. that while the debris resulting from a nuclear explosion would be “spread over a wide area in tiny fragments, its radioactivity makes it detectable, identifiable and collectable, and a wealth of information can be obtained from its analysis: the efficiency of the explosion, the materials used and, most important … some indication of where the nuclear material came from.”41 Alternatively, if the act of nuclear terrorism came as a complete surprise, and American officials refused to believe that a terrorist group was fully responsible (or responsible at all) suspicion would shift immediately to state possessors. Ruling out Western ally countries like the United Kingdom and France, and probably Israel and India as well, authorities in Washington would be left with a very short list consisting of North Korea, perhaps Iran if its program continues, and possibly Pakistan. But at what stage would Russia and China be definitely ruled out in this high stakes game of nuclear Cluedo? In particular, if the act of nuclear terrorism occurred against a backdrop of existing tension in Washington’s relations with Russia and/or China, and at a time when threats had already been traded between these major powers, would officials and political leaders not be tempted to assume the worst? Of course, the chances of this occurring would only seem to increase if the United States was already involved in some sort of limited armed conflict with Russia and/or China, or if they were confronting each other from a distance in a proxy war, as unlikely as these developments may seem at the present time. The reverse might well apply too: should a nuclear terrorist attack occur in Russia or China during a period of heightened tension or even limited conflict with the United States, could Moscow and Beijing resist the pressures that might rise domestically to consider the United States as a possible perpetrator or encourager of the attack? Washington’s early response to a terrorist nuclear attack on its own soil might also raise the possibility of an unwanted (and nuclear aided) confrontation with Russia and/or China. For example, in the noise and confusion during the immediate aftermath of the terrorist nuclear attack, the U.S. president might be expected to place the country’s armed forces, including its nuclear arsenal, on a higher stage of alert. In such a tense environment, when careful planning runs up against the friction of reality, it is just possible that Moscow and/or China might mistakenly read this as a sign of U.S. intentions to use force (and possibly nuclear force) against them. In that situation, the temptations to preempt such actions might grow, although it must be admitted that any preemption would probably still meet with a devastating response. As part of its initial response to the act of nuclear terrorism (as discussed earlier) Washington might decide to order a significant conventional (or nuclear) retaliatory or disarming attack against the leadership of the terrorist group and/or states seen to support that group. Depending on the identity and especially the location of these targets, Russia and/or China might interpret such action as being far too close for their comfort, and potentially as an infringement on their spheres of influence and even on their sovereignty. One far-fetched but perhaps not impossible scenario might stem from a judgment in Washington that some of the main aiders and abetters of the terrorist action resided somewhere such as Chechnya, perhaps in connection with what Allison claims is the “Chechen insurgents’ … long-standing interest in all things nuclear.”42 American pressure on that part of the world would almost certainly raise alarms in Moscow that might require a degree of advanced consultation from Washington that the latter found itself unable or unwilling to provide.There is also the question of how other nuclear-armed states respond to the act of nuclear terrorism on another member of that special club. It could reasonably be expected that following a nuclear terrorist attack on the United States, both Russia and China would extend immediate sympathy and support to Washington and would work alongside the United States in the Security Council. But there is just a chance, albeit a slim one, where the support of Russia and/or China is less automatic in some cases than in others. For example, what would happen if the United States wished to discuss its right to retaliate against groups based in their territory? If, for some reason, Washington found the responses of Russia and China deeply underwhelming, (neither “for us or against us”) might it also suspect that they secretly were in cahoots with the group, increasing (again perhaps ever so slightly) the chances of a major exchange. If the terrorist group had some connections to groups in Russia and China, or existed in areas of the world over which Russia and China held sway, and if Washington felt that Moscow or Beijing were placing a curiously modest level of pressure on them, what conclusions might it then draw about their culpability? If Washington decided to use, or decided to threaten the use of, nuclear weapons, the responses of Russia and China would be crucial to the chances of avoiding a more serious nuclear exchange. They might surmise, for example, that while the act of nuclear terrorism was especially heinous and demanded a strong response, the response simply had to remain below the nuclear threshold. It would be one thing for a non-state actor to have broken the nuclear use taboo, but an entirely different thing for a state actor, and indeed the leading state in the international system, to do so. If Russia and China felt sufficiently strongly about that prospect, there is then the question of what options would lie open to them to dissuade the United States from such action: and as has been seen over the last several decades, the central dissuader of the use of nuclear weapons by states has been the threat of nuclear retaliation. If some readers find this simply too fanciful, and perhaps even offensive to contemplate, it may be informative to reverse the tables. Russia, which possesses an arsenal of thousands of nuclear warheads and that has been one of the two most important trustees of the non-use taboo, is subjected to an attack of nuclear terrorism. In response, Moscow places its nuclear forces very visibly on a higher state of alert and declares that it is considering the use of nuclear retaliation against the group and any of its state supporters. How would Washington view such a possibility? Would it really be keen to support Russia’s use of nuclear weapons, including outside Russia’s traditional sphere of influence? And if not, which seems quite plausible, what options would Washington have to communicate that displeasure? If China had been the victim of the nuclear terrorism and seemed likely to retaliate in kind, would the United States and Russia be happy to sit back and let this occur? In the charged atmosphere immediately after a nuclear terrorist attack, how would the attacked country respond to pressure from other major nuclear powers not to respond in kind? The phrase “how dare they tell us what to do” immediately springs to mind. Some might even go so far as to interpret this concern as a tacit form of sympathy or support for the terrorists. This might not help the chances of nuclear restraint. FN 40. One way of reducing, but probably not eliminating, such a prospect, is further international cooperation on the control of existing fissile material holdings.

Warming is real and anthropogenic --- causes extinction

Flournoy 12 – PhD and MA from the University of Texas, Former Dean of the University College @ Ohio University, Former Associate Dean @ State University of New York and Case Institute of Technology, Project Manager for University/Industry Experiments for the NASA ACTS Satellite, Currently Professor of Telecommunications @ Scripps College of Communications @ Ohio University (Don, "Solar Power Satellites," January, Springer Briefs in Space Development, Book)

In the Online Journal of Space Communication , Dr. Feng Hsu, a NASA scientist at Goddard Space Flight Center, a research center in the forefront of science of space and Earth, writes, “The evidence of global warming is alarming,” noting the potential for a catastrophic planetary climate change is real and troubling (Hsu 2010 ) . Hsu and his **NASA colleagues** were engaged in monitoring and analyzing climate changes on a global scale, through which they received first-hand scientific information and data relating to global warming issues, including the dynamics of polar ice cap melting. After discussing this research with colleagues who were world experts on the subject, he wrote: I now have **no doubt** global temperatures are rising, and that global warming is a serious problem confronting all of humanity. No matter whether these trends are due to human interference or to the cosmic cycling of our solar system, there are two basic facts that are crystal clear: (a) there is overwhelming scientific evidence showing positive correlations between the level of CO2 concentrations in Earth’s atmosphere with respect to the historical fluctuations of global temperature changes; and (b) the overwhelming majority of the world’s scientific community is in agreement about the risks of a potential catastrophic global climate change. That is, if we humans continue to ignore this problem and do nothing, if we continue dumping huge quantities of greenhouse gases into Earth’s biosphere, humanity will be at dire risk (Hsu 2010 ) . As a technology risk assessment expert, Hsu says he can show with some confidence that the planet will face more risk doing nothing to curb its fossil-based energy addictions than it will in making a fundamental shift in its energy supply. “This,” he writes, “is because the risks of a catastrophic anthropogenic climate change can be potentially the extinction **of human species**, a risk that is simply too high for us to take any chances” (Hsu 2010 ) . It was this NASA scientist’s conclusion that humankind must now embark on the next era of “sustainable energy consumption and re-supply, the most obvious source of which is the mighty energy resource of our Sun” (Hsu 2010 ) (Fig . 2.1 ).

**Global warming is real and anthropogenic—positive feedbacks cause nuclear war**

Kaku 11 – Michio Kaku, co-creator of string field theory, a branch of string theory. He received a B.S. (summa cum laude) from Harvard University in 1968 where he came first in his physics class. He went on to the Berkeley Radiation Laboratory at the University of California, Berkeley and received a Ph.D. in 1972. In 1973, he held a lectureship at Princeton University. Michio continues Einstein’s search for a “Theory of Everything,” seeking to unify the four fundamental forces of the universe—the strong force, the weak force, gravity and electromagnetism. He is the author of several scholarly, Ph.D. level textbooks and has had more than 70 articles published in physics journals, covering topics such as superstring theory, supergravity, supersymmetry, and hadronic physics. Professor of Physics — He holds the Henry Semat Chair and Professorship in theoretical physics at the City College of New York, where he has taught for over 25 years. He has also been a visiting professor at the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, as well as New York University (NYU). “Physics of the Future” http://213.55.83.52/ebooks/physics/Physics%20of%20the%20Future.pdf Accessed 6/26/12 BJM

By midcentury, the full impact of a fossil fuel economy should be in full swing: global warming.It is now indisputable that the earth is heating up**.** Within the last century,the earth’s temperature rose 1.3° F, and the pace is accelerating.The signs are unmistakable everywhere we look: The thickness of Arctic ice has decreased byan astonishing50 percent in just the past fifty years. Much of this Arctic ice is just below the freezing point, floating on water. Hence, it is acutely sensitive to small temperature variations of the oceans, acting as a canary in a mineshaft, an early warning system. Today, parts of the northern polar ice caps disappear during the summer months, and may disappear entirely during summer as early as 2015. The polar ice cap may vanish permanently by the end of the century**,** disrupting the world’s weather by altering the flow of ocean and air currents around the planet**.** Greenland’s ice shelves shrank by twenty-four square miles in 2007. This figure jumped to seventy-one square miles in 2008. (If all the Greenland ice were somehow to melt, sea levels would rise about twenty feet around the world.)Large chunks of Antarctica’s ice, which have been stable for tens of thousands of years, are gradually breaking off**.** In 2000, a piece the size of Connecticut broke off, containing 4,200 square miles of ice. In 2002, a piece of ice the size of Rhode Island broke off the Thwaites Glacier. (If all Antarctica’s ice were to melt, sea levels would rise about 180 feet around the world.)For every vertical foot that the ocean rises, the horizontal spread of the ocean is about 100 feet. **Already,** sea levels have risen 8 inches in the past century, mainly caused by the expansion of seawater as it heats up**.** According to the United Nations, sea levels could rise by 7 to 23 inches by 2100. Some scientists have said that the UN report was too cautious in interpreting the data. According to scientists at the University of Colorado’s Institute of Arctic and Alpine Research, by2100 sea levels could rise by 3 to 6 feet**.** So gradually the map of the earth’s coastlines will change. Temperatures started to be reliably recorded in the late 1700s; 1995, 2005, and 2010 ranked among the hottest years ever recorded; 2000 to 2009 was the hottest decade.Likewise, levels of carbon dioxide are rising dramatically. They are at the highest levels in 100,000 years.As the earth heats up,tropical diseases are gradually migrating northward**.** Therecentspread of the West Nile virus carried by mosquitoes may be a harbinger of things to come**.** UN officials are especially concerned about the spread of malaria northward. Usually, the eggs of many harmful insects die every winter when the soil freezes. But with the shortening of the winter season, it means the inexorable spread of dangerous insects northward. CARBONDIOXIDE—GREENHOUSEGAS According to the UN’s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change,scientists have concluded with 90 percent confidence that global warming is driven by human activity, especially the production of carbon dioxidevia the burning of oil and coal**.** Sunlight easily passes through carbon dioxide. But as sunlight heats up the earth, it creates infrared radiation, which does not pass back through carbon dioxide so easily. The energy from sunlight cannot escape back into space and is trapped. We also see a somewhat similar effect in greenhouses or cars. The sunlight warms the air, which is prevented from escaping by the glass. Ominously,the amount of carbon dioxide generated has grown explosively, especially in the last century**.** Before the Industrial Revolution, the carbon dioxide content of the air was 270 parts per million (ppm). Today, it has soared to 387 ppm. (In 1900, the world consumed 150 million barrels of oil. In 2000, it jumped to 28 billion barrels, a 185-fold jump. In 2008, 9.4 billion tons of carbon dioxide were sent into the air from fossil fuel burning and also deforestation, but only 5 billion tons were recycled into the oceans, soil, and vegetation. The remainder will stay in the air for decades to come, heating up the earth.) VISIT TO ICELAND The rise in temperature is not a fluke, as we can see by analyzing ice cores.By drilling deep into the ancient ice of the Arctic, scientists have been able to extract air bubbles that are thousands of years old. By chemically analyzing the air in these bubbles, scientists can reconstruct the temperature and carbon dioxide content of the atmosphere going back more than 600,000 years.Soon, they will be able to determine the weather conditions going back a million years. I had a chance to see this firsthand. I once gave a lecture in Reykjavik, the capital of Iceland, and had the privilege of visiting the University of Iceland, where ice cores are being analyzed. When your airplane lands in Reykjavik, at first all you see is snow and jagged rock, resembling the bleak landscape of the moon. Although barren and forbidding, the terrain makes the Arctic an ideal place to analyze the climate of the earth hundreds of thousands of years ago. When I visited their laboratory, which is kept at freezing temperatures, I had to pass through thick refrigerator doors. Once inside, I could see racks and racks containing long metal tubes, each about an inch and a half in diameter and about ten feet long. Each hollow tube had been drilled deep into the ice of a glacier. As the tube penetrated the ice, it captured samples from snows that had fallen thousands of years ago. When the tubes were removed, I could carefully examine the icy contents of each. At first, all I could see was a long column of white ice. But upon closer examination, I could see that the ice had stripes made of tiny bands of different colors. Scientists have to use a variety of techniques to date them. Some of the ice layers contain markers indicating important events, such as the soot emitted from a volcanic eruption. Since the dates of these eruptions are known to great accuracy, one can use them to determine how old that layer is. These ice cores were then cut in various slices so they could be examined. When I peered into one slice under a microscope, I saw tiny, microscopic bubbles. I shuddered to realize that I was seeing air bubbles that were deposited tens of thousands of years ago, even before the rise of human civilization. The carbon dioxide content within each air bubble is easily measured. But calculating the temperature of the air when the ice was first deposited is more difficult. (To do this, scientists analyze the water in the bubble. Water molecules can contain different isotopes. As the temperature falls, heavier water isotopes condense faster than ordinary water molecules. Hence, by measuring the amount of the heavier isotopes, one can calculate the temperature at which the water molecule condensed.) Finally, after painfully analyzing the contents of thousands of ice cores, these scientists have come to some important conclusions. They found thattemperature and carbon dioxide levels have oscillated in parallel**,** like two roller coasters moving together, in synchronizationover many thousands of years**.** When one curve rises or falls, so does the other. Most important,they found a sudden spike in temperature and carbon dioxide content happening just within the last century**.** This is highly unusual, since most fluctuations occur slowly over millennia.This unusual spike is not part of this natural heating process, scientists claim, but is a direct indicator of human activity.There are other ways to show that this sudden spike is caused by human activity, and not natural cycles. Computer simulations are now so advanced that we can simulate the temperature of the earth with and without the presence of human activity**.** Without civilization producing carbon dioxide, we find a relatively flat temperature curve. But with the addition of human activity,we can show that there should be a sudden spike in both temperature and carbon dioxide.The predicted spike fits the actual spike perfectly. Lastly, one can measure the amount of sunlight that lands on every square foot of the earth’s surface. Scientists can also calculate the amount of heat that is reflected into outer space from the earth. Normally, we expect these two amounts to be equal, with input equaling output. But in reality, we find the net amount of energy that is currently heating the earth. Then if we calculate the amount of energy being produced by human activity, we find a perfect match. Hence, human activity is causing the current heating of the earth. Unfortunately, even if we were to suddenly stop producing any carbon dioxide, the gas that has already been released into the atmosphere is enough to continue global warming for decades to come. As a result,by midcentury, the situation could be dire**.** Scientists have created pictures of what our coastal cities will look like at midcentury and beyond if sea levels continue to rise.Coastal cities may disappear**.** Large parts of Manhattan may have to be evacuated, with Wall Street underwater**.** Governments will have to decide which of their great cities and capitals are worth saving and which are beyond hope**.** Some cities may be saved via a combination of sophisticated dikes and water gates. Other cities may be deemed hopeless and allowed to vanish under the ocean, creating mass migrations of people**.** Since most of the commercial and population centers of the world are next to the ocean, this could have a disastrous effect on the world economy**.** Even if some cities can be salvaged, there is still the danger that large storms can send surges of water into a city, paralyzing its infrastructure**.** For example, in 1992 a huge storm surge flooded Manhattan, paralyzing the subway system and trains to New Jersey. With transportation flooded, the economy grinds to a halt.FLOODING BANGLADESH AND VIETNAM A report by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change isolated three hot spots for potential disaster: Bangladesh, the Mekong Delta of Vietnam, and the Nile Delta in Egypt. The worst situation is that of Bangladesh, a country regularly flooded by storms even without global warming. Most of the country is flat and at sea level. Although it has made significant gains in the last few decades, it is still one of the poorest nations on earth, with one of the highest population densities. (It has a population of 161 million, comparable to that of Russia, but with 1/120 of the land area.) About 50 percent of the land area will be permanently flooded if sea levels rise by three feet. Natural calamities occur there almost every year, but in September 1998, the world witnessed in horror a preview of what may become commonplace. Massive flooding submerged two-thirds of the nation, leaving 30 million people homeless almost overnight; 1,000 were killed, and 6,000 miles of roads were destroyed. This was one of the worst natural disasters in modern history. Another country that would be devastated by a rise in sea level is Vietnam, where the Mekong Delta is particularly vulnerable. By midcentury, this country of 87 million people could face a collapse of its main food-growing area. Half the rice in Vietnam is grown in the Mekong Delta, home to 17 million people, and much of it will be flooded permanently by rising sea levels. According to the World Bank, 11 percent of the entire population would be displaced if sea levels rise by three feet by midcentury. The Mekong Delta will also be flooded with salt water, permanently destroying the fertile soil of the area. If millions are flooded out of their homes in Vietnam, many will flock to Ho Chi Minh City seeking refuge. But one-fourth of the city will also be underwater. In 2003 the Pentagon commissioned a study, done by the Global Business Network, that showed that, in a worst-case scenario, **chaos could spread around the world** due to global warming**.** As millions of refugees cross national borders, governments could lose all authority and collapse, so countries could descend into the nightmare of looting, rioting, and chaos**.** In this desperate situation, nations, when faced with the prospect of the influx of millions of desperate people, may resort to nuclear weapons**.** “Envision Pakistan, India, and China—all armed with nuclear weapons—skirmishing at their borders over refugees, access to shared rivers, and arable land**,”** the report said. Peter Schwartz, founder of the Global Business Network and a principal author of the Pentagon study, confided to me the details of this scenario. He told me that the biggest hot spot would be the border between India and Bangladesh**.** In a major crisis in Bangladesh**,** up to 160 million people could be driven out of their homes, sparking one of the greatest migrations in human history**.** Tensions could rapidly rise as borders collapse, local governments are paralyzed, and mass rioting breaks out**. Schwartz sees that** nations may use nuclear weapons as a last resort**.** In a worst-case scenario,we could have a greenhouse effect that feeds on itself**.** For example,the melting of the tundra in the Arctic regions may release millions of tons of methane gasfrom rotting vegetation. Tundra covers nearly 9 million square miles of land in the Northern Hemisphere, containing vegetation frozen since the last Ice Age tens of thousands of years ago.This tundra contains more carbon dioxide and methane than the atmosphere, and this poses an enormous threat to the world’s weather.Methane gas, moreover, is a much deadlier greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide. It does not stay in the atmosphere as long, but it causes much more damage than carbon dioxide. The release of so much methane gas from the melting tundra could cause temperatures to rapidly rise, which will cause even more methane gas to be released, causing a runaway cycle of global warming.
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#### A) Signal of anti-Americanism

White 13
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Throughout his career, the autocratic Mr. Chávez used our embargo as a wedge with which to antagonize the United States and alienate its supporters. His fuel helped prop up the rule of Mr. Castro and his brother Raúl, Cuba’s current president. The embargo no longer serves any useful purpose (if it ever did at all); President Obama should end it, though it would mean overcoming powerful opposition from Cuban-American lawmakers in Congress.¶ An end to the Cuba embargo would send a powerful signal to all of Latin America that the United States wants a new, warmer relationship with democratic forces seeking social change throughout the Americas.

#### B) litmus test

Sheridan ‘9 (Mary Beth Sheridan; Washington Post Staff Writer, May 29, 2009, “U.S. Urged to Relax Cuba Policy to Boost Regional Relations,” LexisNexis Accessed 7/17/13) S.E.

The U.S. government is fighting an effort to allow Cuba to return to the Organization of American States after a 47-year suspension. But the resistance is putting it at odds with much of Latin America as the Obama administration is trying to improve relations in the hemisphere.¶ Eliminating the Cold War-era ban would be largely symbolic, because Cuba has shown no sign of wanting to return to the OAS, the main forum for political cooperation in the hemisphere. But the debate shows how central the topic has become in U.S. relations with an increasingly assertive Latin America. The wrangling over Cuba threatens to dominate a meeting of hemispheric foreign ministers, including Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton, scheduled for Tuesday in Honduras.¶ "Fifty years after the U.S. . . . made Cuba its litmus test for its commercial and diplomatic ties in Latin America, Latin America is turning the tables," said Julia E. Sweig, a Cuba scholar at the Council on Foreign Relations. Now, she said, Latin countries are "making Cuba the litmus test for the quality of the Obama administration's approach to Latin America."¶ President Obama has taken steps toward improving ties with Cuba, lifting restrictions on visits and money transfers by Cuban Americans and offering to restart immigration talks suspended in 2004. But he has said he will not scrap the longtime economic embargo until Havana makes democratic reforms and cleans up its human rights record. Ending the embargo would also entail congressional action.¶ Obama is facing pressure to move faster, both from Latin American allies and from key U.S. lawmakers. Bipartisan bills are pending in Congress that would eliminate all travel restrictions and ease the embargo.¶ Cuba has sent mixed signals about its willingness to respond to the U.S. gestures.¶ Latin American leaders say that isolating Cuba is anachronistic when most countries in the region have established relations with communist nations such as China. The OAS secretary general, JosÃ© Miguel Insulza, has called the organization's 1962 suspension of Cuba "outdated" -- noting it is based on the island's alignment with a "communist bloc" that no longer exists. However, he has suggested that OAS members could postpone Cuba's full participation until it showed democratic reforms.¶ Cuban exile organizations and some U.S. lawmakers are strongly opposed to readmitting the island.¶ "If we invite Cuba back in, in spite of their violations, what message are we sending to the rest of the hemisphere -- that it's okay to move backwards away from democracy and human rights, that there will be no repercussions for such actions?" Sen. Robert Menendez (D-N.J.), a Cuban American, demanded in a speech. He threatened to cut off U.S. funding for the OAS -- about 60 percent of its budget -- if the measure passed.¶ Clinton said last week that Cuba should be readmitted only if it abided by the OAS's Democratic Charter, a set of principles adopted in 2001 that commits countries to hold elections and to respect human rights and press freedoms.¶ Most Latin American countries broke relations with Cuba after its 1959 revolution. Nearly all have restored diplomatic ties, and the United States will soon be the only holdout in the hemisphere.¶ The Cuba ban could be lifted by a two-thirds vote of the OAS foreign ministers on Tuesday. However, the organization generally works by consensus, and several countries have indicated they do not want a showdown with the United States.¶ Diplomats have been trying in recent days to hammer out a compromise. U.S. diplomats introduced a resolution that would instruct the OAS to open a dialogue with Cuba about its "eventual reintegration," consistent with the principles of "democracy and full respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms."¶ A diplomat said last night that the United States appears to be softening its opposition to lifting the ban as long as Cuba's full reinstatement is contingent on moving toward democracy. He spoke on the condition of anonymity because of the sensitivity of the talks.¶ Venezuela, an ally of Cuba, has indicated it will not support any resolution that includes such conditions. "This is 'Jurassic Park,' " fumed Venezuelan Ambassador Roy Chaderton. "We're still in the Cold War."¶ Some Latin American diplomats worry that the Cuba imbroglio could further marginalize the OAS. The organization is respected for monitoring elections, and it has tried to broker disputes in the hemisphere. But critics lambaste it as largely a debating society.¶ Venezuela has threatened to quit the organization and form an alternative regional group. It has set up a leftist trade alliance known as ALBA with several poor countries in Latin America. Cuba has derided the OAS as a U.S.-dominated tool of the United States.¶ Peter Hakim, president of the Inter-American Dialogue, a think tank in Washington, said the Cuba resolution has trapped the Obama administration between two of its priorities: democracy promotion and better relations with its neighbors. In 2001, the U.S. government supported the Democratic Charter, a milestone in a region once known for dictatorships. But Obama told hemispheric leaders in Trinidad and Tobago last month that he wanted to form closer partnerships and not have the United States dictate policy.¶ "There's really two different values at play here: multilateralism versus democracy. You can't have multilateralism and then let one country, i.e. the U.S., make the decision for a multilateral organization," Hakim said.

#### C) brings us into line with the region

McKenna and Kirk ’09 (Peter McKenna and John M. Kirk are the co-authors of the recently released book, Fighting Words: Competing Voices from Revolutionary Cuba, April 17, 2009, “U.S.-Cuba relations ripe for change; If Washington wants to revitalize its role in the Americas, it must repeal Cuban embargo” from the Toronto Star, Accessed 7/17/2013 on Lexis Nexis)

At the Summit of the Americas that begins today in Trinidad and Tobago, the elephant in the room will clearly be revolutionary Cuba. It is worth noting here that all of the countries of the Americas, with the exception of the United States, have now established full diplomatic relations with Havana.¶ While it was not officially invited to the summit proceedings, a number of Latin American and Caribbean countries have promised to make Raul Castro's Cuba a major priority. Venezuela's Hugo Chavez was unequivocal: "Cuba is Latin America. It's no longer the Cuba that was kicked out of the OAS (Organization of American States) by those governments subordinate to the Pentagon."¶ Many others, including regional heavyweights Mexico and Brazil, have called for the reintegration of Cuba into the hemispheric fold. They are adamantly opposed to the decades-long U.S. embargo and want the Obama administration to push for its repeal.¶ There is serious talk in Washington these days that Barack Obama's administration is going to announce a significant shift in the near comatose U.S.-Cuba relationship. The White House announced Monday that Cuban-Americans will now be able to visit the island as often as they like and send as much money as they want to relatives. But speculation is rampant that Obama is going to end permanently the U.S. travel ban - first imposed in 1963 - to Cuba for all Americans.¶ Although this is a step in the right direction, the Obama team would be well-advised to go much further. It might begin by acknowledging that Cuba is a major player in the Americas and punches above its weight, hemispherically speaking.¶ If the Obama administration wants to reverse the damaging neglect of the region during the Bush years, it needs to secure some form of accommodation with Havana. There is simply no way for Washington to revitalize its role in the Americas without first radically changing its sterile Cuba policy.¶ Significantly, the Obama White House should look to embrace dialogue with the Cuban government, increase commercial exchange, undertake friendly persuasion, and strive for more person-to-person contacts. And since Raul Castro has offered on several occasions to partake in a diplomatic dialogue with the United States, there is no reason why the U.S. should not extend a hand to the Cubans.¶ In emulating Canada's modus operandi toward Cuba, the United States should carefully choose its words when it does eventually sit down at the table with the Cubans. It certainly behooves official Washington to set the correct tone for diplomatic discussions by acknowledging the Cuban revolution's notable social achievements. And as Canada has learned all too well, it is exceedingly counterproductive to hector and preach to the Cubans only on human rights questions, to ignore their nationalistic pride and deep desire for independence and autonomy, or to attach significant social, political and economic reforms as a precondition to any bilateral dialogue.¶ In borrowing a page from Canada's Cuba policy of constructive engagement, officialdom in Washington could move to swiftly implement a series of confidence-building measures. Along with Obama's decisions to remove restrictions on travel and remittances for Cuban-Americans, revoke the ban on U.S. telecommunications companies and close down the Guantanamo detention centre, the president should focus on eliminating the harsh rhetoric directed at the Cuban government, issuing visas to Cuban academic and cultural representatives, and ending the restrictions on U.S. academic and educational travel.¶ On a more controversial note, but in the face of a less monolithic Cuban-American community, it should also give serious consideration to pressing for the removal of the U.S. economic embargo, terminating Radio and TV Marti, and pardoning the so-called "Cuban Five" agents now being held in a U.S. prison. Additionally, the Obama White House could move to take Cuba's name off the U.S. state department list of terrorism-supporting countries, permanently end the complicated payment system for agricultural purchases by the Cuban government, and launch low-level discussions between U.S. and Cuban officials.¶ The fact of the matter is that there will be little opportunity for any improvement in U.S.-Cuba relations as long as the blockade remains in place. Obama can strongly urge the Congress to rescind what Canadian officials have long chastised - the anti-Cuba Helms-Burton law.¶ Of course, removing the U.S. embargo will not be an easy undertaking or one that will happen in short order, but Obama can use the presidential "bully pulpit" to galvanize the American public against those members of Congress who insist on living in a Cold War time warp. Indeed, political pressure could go some way toward weakening any congressional opposition to a lifting of the outmoded blockade.¶ By undertaking these policy initiatives, Washington will put itself in a far better position than it is today to cultivate a positive relationship with those Cubans who will be shaping Cuba's future path.¶ The only thing that stands in the U.S. president's way is a nonsensical and reflexive impulse to cling to a badly outdated and discredited policy of hostility and pettiness toward Cuba. The fifth Summit of the Americas offers Obama a perfect opportunity to fundamentally alter that policy approach, and to set U.S.-Cuba relations on a course for eventual normalization.

#### the embargo fails but won’t be lifted

Chapman ‘13

Steve Chapman is a columnist and editorial writer for the Chicago Tribune. Reason Magazine – April 15th – “It's Time to End the U.S. Embargo of Cuba” – ¶ http://reason.com/archives/2013/04/15/its-time-to-end-the-us-embargo-of-cuba

The communist regime in Cuba was just about to come tumbling down, ending decades of dictatorship and opening the way for freedom and democracy. But before that could happen, Jay-Z and Beyonce took a trip to the island. So Cuba's despotism can expect to survive another 50 years.¶ Well, maybe I exaggerate. It's just possible that the musical couple's presence or absence was utterly irrelevant to Cuba's future. Americans have somewhat less control over the island than we like to imagine.¶ The U.S. embargo of Cuba has been in effect since 1962, with no end in sight. Fidel Castro's government has somehow managed to outlast the Soviet Union, Montgomery Ward, rotary-dial telephones and 10 American presidents.¶ The boycott adheres to the stubborn logic of governmental action. It was created to solve a problem: the existence of a communist government 90 miles off our shores. It failed to solve that problem. But its failure is taken as proof of its everlasting necessity.¶ If there is any lesson to be drawn from this dismal experience, though, it's that the economic quarantine has been either 1) grossly ineffectual or 2) positively helpful to the regime.¶ The first would not be surprising, if only because economic sanctions almost never work. Iraq under Saddam Hussein? Nope. Iran? Still waiting. North Korea? Don't make me laugh.¶ What makes this embargo even less promising is that we have so little help in trying to apply the squeeze. Nearly 200 countries allow trade with Cuba. Tourists from Canada and Europe flock there in search of beaches, nightlife and Havana cigars, bringing hard currency with them. So even if starving the country into submission could work, Cuba hasn't starved and won't anytime soon.¶ Nor is it implausible to suspect that the boycott has been the best thing that ever happened to the Castro brothers, providing them a scapegoat for the nation's many economic ills. The implacable hostility of the Yankee imperialists also serves to align Cuban nationalism with Cuban communism. Even Cubans who don't like Castro may not relish being told what to do by the superpower next door.

#### -----------

#### The Plan is necessary and sufficient

Rowen 13

(Dolores Rowen, graduate student at Seton Hall University focusing on International Economics/Development and Latin America and the Caribbean, “What about Cuba?”, The Alternative Press.com: Maplewood’s News Online, 4/19/13, <http://thealternativepress.com/articles/what-about-cuba>, accessed 7/17/13.) ZP

**The international community does not look favorably upon the perpetuation of this embargo. Our Latin American neighbors are adamantly opposed to it. Normalizing relations with Cuba would** probably **improve our overall relations with Latin American** and Caribbean **states, resulting in better relations within the Western Hemisphere, and prove to** bolster the US’ “soft power” in the region.In March 2013, I attended a lecture given by Cuban Ambassador to the United Nations Rodolfo Reyes Rodríguez. Ambassador Rodríguez specifically spoke on US-Cuba relations and the embargo. He affirmed that **Cuba has** much to improve on in the fields of education, health, patterns of consumption, and sustainability as it is still a developing country. He admitted that there are **significant problems of inadequate social justice and liberty that need to be addressed.** Cuba is willing to discuss the embargo and have productive dialogue **as long as the US respects the country’s sovereignty.**

#### Gradualism doesn’t solve – Cuban leadership won’t end and embargo won’t fall

Sanchez ‘12

Alex is a Research Fellow at the Council on Hemispheric Affairs where he focuses on geopolitics and security issues. His analyses have appeared in numerous refereed journals like Cuban Affairs. “Cuba ends 2012 looking for oil and with Castro brothers still in power” – VOXXI – December 26th – ¶ http://www.voxxi.com/cuba-2012-oil-castro-brothers-power/#ixzz2V59ocrSu

The structure of the Cuban government is unlikely to change in 2013 as the Castro brothers appear to remain firmly in power and continue to search for oil.¶ Fidel Castro, the former president of Cuba who ruled the island for five decades, has been nominated to run for a position in the Cuban Parliament in the upcoming February 2013 elections. The move is largely a symbolic one, since Castro, despite no longer being head of state, still enjoys a great deal of influence within the Cuban government and is regularly consulted on state affairs. In other words, Castro hardly needs an official government position to be influential in Cuba’s decision-making process.¶ Regardless of this, given Castro’s frail state, it is unclear if the man will be able to actually take his seat in the National Assembly when elected (it is hard to imagine that he would not be). If he is not well enough to assume his parliamentary seat, there may be an agreement allowing him to choose someone to replace him.¶ Meanwhile, Fidel’s brother, Raul Castro, continues as president of the island nation, although that apparently has not prevented him from also being nominated as a municipal representative in the upcoming elections. The structure of the Cuban government is unlikely to change in 2013 as the Castro brothers, in spite of their advanced age (both are in their 80s), appear to remain firmly in power. It will be interesting to see what developments the New Year brings to the island. Of particular interest are economic and international affairs, particularly those regarding the U.S.¶ The nomination of the Castro brothers to the Cuban Parliament, considering that they have jointly ruled the island since the 1950s, is slightly bizarre to say the least. Nevertheless, it is clear that the island, under Raul Castro’s rule, has evolved from Fidel’s Cuba. This is particularly true when it comes to the economy. Under Raul, the island’s Communist government has taken some steps to modernize its socialist economy, particularly by allowing the appearance of privately owned businesses. The head of state has declared that “today, nearly 40 thousand Cubans have licenses to have autonomous work or small businesses.”¶ An interesting development that may further affect the Cuban economy is the plan announced by the Russian oil company Zarubezhneft to utilize a Norwegian oil platform as means of continuing to search for deep-water oil deposits in the Cuban sea. For years there have been diverse reports about exactly how much oil Cuba possesses, but so far the numerous explorations have yet to find wells that yield commercially viable quantities of the liquid gold. If Cuba were ever able to actually find and produce massive quantities of oil (it claims to have up to 20 billion barrels while other analyses give a more modest number) this would be a huge turning point for the Cuban economy. But until this happens, the island will remain at the mercy of Venezuela, which, under Hugo Chavez’s rule, has essentially given thousands of barrels of oil to the island as a gift.¶ This brings up another issue as President Chavez’ deteriorating health, exemplified by his recent trip to Cuba for a new operation to deal with his cancer, should have put the Cuban government on alert as a non-Chavez government may not be so willing to essentially give away oil. Fortunately for Havana, Chavez’s health seems to be improving, which means that Cuba will continue to enjoy more essentially-free Venezuelan oil during the immediate future, at least until it discovers some of its own.¶ Relations with the US have yet to improve¶ Even though U.S. President Barack Obama has not fully lifted the embargo on the island during his first term in office, many Cubans and Americans hope that he will do so during his second term. Such a development would go a long way in improving U.S. diplomacy, and not only with Cuba but also with the rest of Latin America. During the Summit of the Americas held in Cartagena, Colombia, several heads of states protested the fact that Cuba had not been invited to take part in the high-level meeting because Washington opposed their participation. Despite the positive benefits that the United States would garner from such a move, it is still unlikely that President Obama will fully lift the embargo due to congressional political barriers.