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#### Economic engagement is a subset of conditional engagement and implies a tit-for-tat exchange

Shinn 96 [James Shinn, C.V. Starr Senior Fellow for Asia at the CFR in New York City and director of the council’s multi-year Asia Project, worked on economic affairs in the East Asia Bureau of the US Dept of State, “Weaving the Net: Conditional Engagement with China,” pp. 9 and 11, google books]

In sum, conditional engagement consists of a set of objectives, a strategy for attaining those objectives, and tactics (specific policies) for implementing that strategy.¶ The objectives of conditional engagement are the ten principles, which were selected to preserve American vital interests in Asia while accommodating China’s emergence as a major power.¶ The overall strategy of conditional engagement follows two parallel lines: economic engagement, to promote the integration of China into the global trading and financial systems; and security engagement, to encourage compliance with the ten principles by diplomatic and military means when economic incentives do not suffice, in order to hedge against the risk of the emergence of a belligerent China.¶ The tactics of economic engagement should promote China’s economic integration through negotiations on trade liberalization, institution building, and educational exchanges. While a carrots-and-sticks approach may be appropriate within the economic arena, the use of trade sanction to achieve short-term political goals is discouraged.¶ The tactics of security engagement should reduce the risks posed by China’s rapid military expansion, its lack of transparency, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and transnational problems such as crime and illegal migration, by engaging in arms control negotiations, multilateral efforts, and a loosely-structured defensive military arrangement in Asia.8¶ [To footnotes]¶ 8. Conditional engagement’s recommended tactics of tit-for-tat responses are equivalent to using carrots and sticks in response to foreign policy actions by China. Economic engagement calls for what is described as symmetric tit-for-tat and security engagement for asymmetric tit-for-tat. A symmetric response is one that counters a move by China in the same place, time, and manner; an asymmetric response might occur in another place at another time, and perhaps in another manner. A symmetric tit-for-tat would be for Washington to counter a Chinese tariff of 10 percent on imports for the United States with a tariff of 10 percent on imports from China. An asymmetric tit-for-tat would be for the United States to counter a Chines shipment of missiles to Iran with an American shipment of F-16s to Vietnam (John Lewis Gaddis, Strategies of Containment: A critical Appraisal of Postwar American National Security Policy. New York: Oxford University Press, (1982). This is also cited in Fareed Zakaria, “The Reagan Strategy of Containment,” Political Science Quarterly 105, no. 3 (1990), pp. 383-88).

#### Violation --- The aff unilaterally phases out the embargo – that is a form of unconditional engagement.

#### Reasons to Vote Negative –

#### Limits – the embargo means there’s a near-infinite range of “one exception” affs – conditionality forces the aff to find deals that Cuba would accept

#### Ground – unconditional engagement denies us “say no” and backlash arguments, and country specific DAs such as the local PTX das which are a crucial part of the engagement debate

### 2

#### Cuba is a strategic asset to cuba- provides a point of common intreast to the rest of Latin America.

Hearn 09 – Senior Research Fellow at the University of Sydney. Kiriyama Research Fellow at the University of San Francisco Center for the Pacific Rim (Adrian, "China's relations with Mexico and Cuba: A Study of Contrasts" Pacific Rim Report No 52, January, usf.usfca.edu/pac\_rim/new/research/pacrimreport/pacrimreport52.html)

In terms of economic openness and political ideology Mexico and Cuba are at opposite ends of the spectrum. Nevertheless, for China both hold high strategic value. Examining China’s relations with Mexico and Cuba opens an analytic window into the way that bilateral commercial, cultural, and diplomatic cooperation programs have adapted to distinct local conditions. Based on interviews and observations gathered during three years in Cuba, ten months in China, and eight months in Mexico, this *Pacific Rim Report* outlines some of the positive and negative local responses that intensifying engagement with China has produced. It also suggests that China has effectively tailored bilateral programs to local environments to advance common economic, political, and cultural objectives. China’s economic impact across Latin America has been uneven. Its demand for energy resources has driven up commodity prices, benefiting exporters such as Argentina and Brazil (soy), Chile (copper), Peru (iron, fishmeal), and Venezuela (crude oil) (Jiang 2005, Zweig and Jianhai 2005). Nevertheless, as the case studies of José Luis León Manríquez (2006) show, the exports of Mexico and the countries of Central America consist primarily of manufactured products and textiles, resulting in seemingly insurmountable competition from a tidal wave of legal and illicit Chinese imports. Romer Cornejo (2005) suggests that this regional variation results in part from the structural adjustments of the public and private sectors pursued by Latin American countries to facilitate cooperation with China. To examine this issue in depth, in 2006 the *Red de Estudios de América Latina y el Caribe sobre Asia del Pacífico* (Latin American and Caribbean Study Network on Asia and the Pacific, or REDEALAP) of the Inter-American Development Bank (IADB) brought together scholars from IADB member countries to debate the effectiveness and future trajectory of structural adjustments in order to deepen cooperation with China in areas ranging from fiscal integration into regional trade blocks to natural disaster relief (REDEALAP 2006). A recent book from the OECD (Santiso 2007) argues that although China’s emergence represents a valuable opportunity for Latin America to develop alternative economic partnerships that reduce dependence on the United States and Europe, resource exports to China could gradually push the region into a ‘raw materials corner’. Similarly, a book from the Inter-American Development Bank entitled, *The Emergence of China: Opportunities and Challenges for Latin America and the Caribbean*, argues that to avoid future dependence on primary resource exports, Latin American governments should adopt long-term strategies that position their countries as service providers for the expanding Chinese middle class, particularly in the tourism and education sectors (Devlin et al. 2006). The authors signal that to climb the industrial value chain in this way will require a greater coordinating role for Latin American governments, since development strategies guided by the market alone, adopted in part as a backlash to previous import substitution strategies, will naturally favor short-term growth through commodity export. One summary of China’s relations with six Latin American countries (Jorge I. Domínguez et al., 2006) juxtaposes political cooperation with trade patterns. The study argues that although economic considerations are paramount, Cuba, Venezuela, Argentina, and Brazil have to varying degrees used China to balance U.S. influence in the region. Varying degrees of alarm about this prospect are expressed in the publications of research institutions and think tanks associated with the U.S. military and government (CLATF 2006:2, Eisenman 2006, Lam 2004, Mrozinski 2002). Indeed, the ‘triangular’ relationship between China, Latin America, and the United States is emerging as a prominent topic of debate (e.g. Arnson et al. 2007). China’s multiple objectives in Latin America are evident in the diversity of its activities in Cuba and Mexico. Although Cuba harbors some economic value for China through oil exploration, nickel extraction, biomedical collaboration, and electronics sales and manufacturing, its appeal is mainly political. Diplomatic links with Cuba promote China’s image as a ‘non-aligned’ protagonist of ‘South-South’ cooperation, providing ideological common ground with the eight mineral-rich countries that make up Latin America’s ‘New Left’. Mexico, by contrast, offers China more conventional economic incentives such as a market for Chinese consumer products, a manufacturing base with geographic and legal access to North American markets, and the prospect of potentially massive investment in the oil sector. The following sections discuss the challenges and opportunities that China has brought to Mexico and Cuba, and the steps taken by both governments to respond effectively.

#### Increased US engagement will trade-off with Chinese involvement

Watson 09 Professor of Strategy at National War College [Cynthia A. Watson, U.S. Responses to China’s Growing Interests in Latin America: Dawning Recognition of a Changing Hemisphere, “Enter the Dragon? China’s Presence in Latin America”, http://www.wilsoncenter.org/sites/default/files/EnterDragonFinal.pdf]

CONCLUSIONS

Beijing probably might not have increased its role in Latin America had the Middle East not been a major distraction for Washington over the past fi ve and a half years. Washington has wanted Beijing to modernize its economy. This was bound to create more economic, diplomatic, and trade prowess for China as it has reached beyond the isolationism of the Cultural Revolution, particularly in the newly globalized world. In many ways, Beijing’s increased involvement in Latin America reflects the unanticipated consequence of getting what the West hoped for from China.

But, the inability of Washington to consider anything beyond the concerns about terrorism spreading around the world, and trying to salvage a peace of some sort without nuclear weapons in the Middle East, is having consequences for U.S. interests in other parts of the world. For cultural and geographic reasons, the ties between the United States and Latin America ought to be stronger than those between China and the Latins. Expectations of the strength of Latin America–U.S. ties have probably always been unrealistic and frankly ahistorical; the two parts of the world actually have a number of fundamental differences. But the distance between Latin America’s experiences and those of China are even vaster, ranging from religion to ethnic homogeneity to historical roles in the world. Washington must make a more concerted effort to act as a genuine partner with the region, rather than relegating it to the position of secondary or tertiary thought that assumes absolute U.S. leadership.

The United States and China claim that each is serious about adopting the economic philosophy that undergirds capitalism: economic growth is a net benefit for all, not a zero sum game. If true, China, Latin America, and the United States benefit from the greater Chinese engagement in this region because it creates competition. Pure economic theory, however, always runs up against political philosophies, leading to trade conflicts, protectionism, and all-too-often a zero sum view based on the international relations theory of realpolitik: what’s good for my adversary must be bad for me.

The risks of arousing realpolitik in the United States, particularly as the nation faces increased frustration with the reality of the Middle East, is significant, probably more than the PRC bargained for when it began engaging more with Latin America over the past decade. It appears unlikely that Beijing will seriously accelerate its involvement in the region because of the number of Congressional hearings, public conferences and assessments, and other warnings alerting the United States to China having discovered Latin America. To accelerate its involvement would risk the relatively strong relations with Washington at a time when other trade problems and overall concerns about China’s growing power are already rising in the United States.

At the same time, Washington’s ability to focus equally on all areas of the world is not possible. With U.S. interests directed elsewhere, it seems highly likely that Beijing will be able to maintain the level of involvement in the region it already has, without Washington raising too great a ruckus. Indeed, Beijing’s best outcome from its current balance of involvement in the area is probably going to be the long-term development of trust and ties over several decades with the leaders of this region, rather than immediately creating crucial, highly public ties between itself and Latin American leaders. As so often appears true in the international system, probably the old tale of the tortoise and hare applies here, where China’s biggest gain will be accomplished over a long time of getting to know the region, rather than showing up repeatedly in the ‘rock star’ role which is too soon and too rash for a long-term, stable set of ties. Washington seems likely to worry about the rock star phenomenon, rather than attempting to manage the emergence of another state becoming a long-term partner with its Latin American neighbors.

#### Chinese influence in the region key to the global economy and regime stability – preventing US influence key

Ellis 11

[R. Evan, Assistant Professor of National Security Studies in the Center for Hemispheric Defense Studies at the National Defense University.Chinese Soft Power in Latin America, 1st quarter 2011, <http://www.ndu.edu/press/lib/images/jfq-60/JFQ60_85-91_Ellis.pdf>]

Access to Latin American Markets. Latin American markets are becoming increasingly valuable for Chinese companies because they allow the PRC to expand and diversify its export base at a time when economic growth is slowing in traditional markets such as the United States and Europe. The region has also proven an effective market for Chinese efforts to sell more sophisticated, higher value added products in sectors seen as strategic, such as automobiles, appliances, computers and telecommunication equipment, and aircraft. In expanding access for its products through free trade accords with countries such as Chile, Peru, and Costa Rica, and penetrating markets in Latin American countries with existing manufacturing sectors such as Mexico, Brazil, and Argentina, the PRC has often had to overcome resistance by organized and often politically well-connected established interests in those nations. In doing so, the hopes of access to Chinese markets and investments among key groups of businesspeople and government officials in those nations have played a key role in the political will to overcome the resistance. In Venezuela, it was said that the prior Chinese ambassador to Venezuela, Zheng Tuo, was one of the few people in the country who could call President Chávez on the telephone and get an instant response if an issue arose regarding a Chinese company. Protection of Chinese Investments in and Trade Flows from the Region. At times, China has applied more explicit pressures to induce Latin America to keep its markets open to Chinese goods. It has specifically protested measures by the Argentine and Mexican governments that it has seen as protectionist: and, in the case of Argentina, as informal retaliation, China began enforcing a longstanding phytosanitary regulation, causing almost $2 billion in lost soy exports and other damages for Argentina.14 China has also used its economic weight to help secure major projects on preferential terms. In the course of negotiating a $1.7 billion loan deal for the Coco Coda Sinclair Hydroelectric plant in Ecuador, the ability of the Chinese bidder SinoHidro to self-finance 85 percent of the projects through Chinese banks helped it to work around the traditional Ecuadorian requirement that the project have a local partner. Later, the Ecuadorian government publicly and bitterly broke off negotiations with the Chinese, only to return to the bargaining table 2 months later after failing to find satisfactory alternatives. In Venezuela, the Chávez government agreed, for example, to accept half of the $20 billion loaned to it by the PRC in Chinese currency, and to use part of that currency to buy 229,000 consumer appliances from the Chinese manufacturer Haier for resale to the Venezuelan people. In another deal, the PRC loaned Venezuela $300 million to start a regional airline, but as part of the deal, required Venezuela to purchase the planes from a Chinese company.15 Protection of Chinese Nationals. As with the United States and other Western countries, as China becomes more involved in business and other operations in Latin America, an increasing number of its nationals will be vulnerable to hazards common to the region, such as kidnapping, crime, protests, and related problems. The heightened presence of Chinese petroleum companies in the northern jungle region of Ecuador, for example, has been associated with a series of problems, including the takeover of an oilfield operated by the Andes petroleum consortium in Tarapoa in November 2006, and protests in Orellana related to a labor dispute with the Chinese company Petroriental in 2007 that resulted in the death of more than 35 police officers and forced the declaration of a national state of emergency. In 2004, ethnic Chinese shopkeepers in Valencia and Maracay, Venezuela, became the focus of violent protests associated with the Venezuelan recall referendum. As such incidents increase, the PRC will need to rely increasingly on a combination of goodwill and fear to deter action against its personnel, as well as its influence with governments of the region, to resolve such problems when they occur.The rise of China is intimately tied to the global economy through trade, financial, and information flows, each of which is highly dependent on global institutions and cooperation. Because of this, some within the PRC leadership see the country’s sustained growth and development, and thus the stability of the regime, threatened if an actor such as the United States is able to limit that cooperation or block global institutions from supporting Chinese interests. In Latin America, China’s attainment of observer status in the OAS in 2004 and its acceptance into the IADB in 2009 were efforts to obtain a seat at the table in key regional institutions, and to keep them from being used “against” Chinese interests. In addition, the PRC has leveraged hopes of access to Chinese markets by Chile, Peru, and Costa Rica to secure bilateral free trade agreements, whose practical effect is to move Latin America away from a U.S.-dominated trading block (the Free Trade Area of the Americas) in which the PRC would have been disadvantaged.

#### Chinese economic collapse causes WWIII.

Plate 3 (June 30, 2003, Tom Plate - professor of Policy and Communication Studies, “WHY NOT INVADE CHINA?,” http://asiamedia.ucla.edu/TomPlate2003/06302003.htm)

But imagine a China disintegrating- on its own, without neo-conservative or Central Intelligence Agency prompting, much less outright military invasion because the economy (against all predictions) suddenly collapses. That would knock Asia into chaos. A massive flood of refugees would head for Indonesia and other places with poor border controls, which don’t’ want them and cant handle them; some in Japan might lick their lips at the prospect of World War II revisited and look to annex a slice of China. That would send Singapore and Malaysia- once occupied by Japan- into nervous breakdowns. Meanwhile, India might make a grab for Tibet, and Pakistan for Kashmir. Then you can say hello to World War III, Asia style.

### 3

#### There will be bipartisan compromise on a long term budget

Matthews 11-13 (Laura Matthews, U.S. politics reporter for the International Business Times, “Budget Conference Committee Hopes To 'Keep Ball Rolling'” <http://www.ibtimes.com/budget-conference-committee-hopes-keep-ball-rolling-1468804> 11-13-13)AH

Further, House and Senate budget committee leaders have said they won’t waste time debating the areas where they already know there’s no agreement, but will focus on where deals can be cut.¶ “We hope that today’s meeting will keep the ball rolling,” said U.S. Rep. Paul Ryan, R-Wis., and chair of the House Budget Committee.¶ “The hard part is figuring out where we agree,” he later added.¶ Related¶ ¶ Ryan's call for compromise was echoed by Senate Budget Committee Chair Patty Murray, D-Wash., who told the conference that the highest priority is ensuring short- and medium-term needs for improving the economy are met.¶ Even so, the two are very much aware there is a chasm between them in terms of their respective budgets. Just how they will bridge that gap and reach common ground on a compromise budget before the Dec. 13 deadline is the massive task. But each side remains optimistic.¶ “Our budgets are dramatically different,” Murray said, but added that it is extremely important the two sides step out of their partisan corner and cut a deal.¶ Cutting a deal has never been easy for Democrats and Republicans, who differ greatly on taxes and spending. At the heart of past budget deal failures: programs and policies that are dear to each party's constituents: Democrats favor increasing taxes while Republicans do not; Republicans want significant cuts to entitlement programs like Medicare and Social Security, but Democrats are opposed to it. Still, Murray suggested their is a deal-point - an act by the GOP that could put things in motion:¶ “I am willing to meet Republicans halfway and make some compromises when it comes to additional spending reductions,” Murray wrote in a recent Washington Post op-ed. “Democrats won’t agree to irresponsible cuts that hurt seniors and families, but we can find responsible savings across the federal budget to get to a fair deal.”¶ “Compromise, however, runs both ways,” Murray continued. “While we scour programs to identify savings, Republicans have to work with us to scour the bloated tax code and close loopholes used by the wealthiest Americans and corporations to replace the other half of sequestration.”

#### Obama needs PC for negotiations

Madhani 10/17/13 (Aamer Madhani- writer for USA Today, writes about a variety of topics, including politics, current events, Congress, the government, etc, thank you for writing this article omg, “In fiscal fight, Obama steps back, looks to next battle,” <http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2013/10/17/obama-shutdown-strategy-gop/2997437/>, 10/17/13, 12:05 pm, Sundar)

¶ WASHINGTON — As the battle over the government shutdown and debt ceiling barreled toward a culminating point this week, President Obama stepped back from a debate that seemed to grow more chaotic by the day.¶ After two weeks of vowing that he would not negotiate with Republicans or pay them "a ransom" to "do their job," Obama appeared to decide that keeping an arms-length from the fight was the best strategy with an even bigger budget battle on the horizon.¶ On Thursday, he called on his allies and adversaries to look past the punditry that has declared him the winner in this battle and the Republicans losers.¶ "Let's be clear, there are no winners here," Obama said. "The last few weeks have inflicted completely unnecessary damage to our economy. We don't know the full scope of it yet, but every analyst out there believes it slowed our growth."¶ Even before Congress voted to reopen a shuttered federal government and raise the debt ceiling Wednesday night, Obama began discarding some of the sharper rhetorical darts and tried to melt into the background as the Republican leadership grappled with the reality that they would have to blink first.¶ When the president addressed reporters Wednesday night shortly after the Senate voted, he thanked Republican and Democratic leaders for ending the impasse and spoke in conciliatory terms.¶ "I am eager to work with anybody — Democrat or Republican, House or Senate members — on any idea that will grow our economy, create new jobs, strengthen the middle class, and get our fiscal house in order for the long term," Obama said. "I've never believed that Democrats have a monopoly on good ideas. And despite the differences over the issue of shutting down our government, I'm convinced that Democrats and Republicans can work together to make progress for America."¶ The president began shifting toward a longer view early in the week.¶ STORY: Congress passes deal to end shutdown, raise debt limit¶ On Monday, he commiserated with furloughed federal workers at a Washington food pantry. Later that day, he scrapped a scheduled meeting with the four top congressional leaders when it appeared talks between Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid and Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell were making headway — keeping the onus on Congress.¶ The following day he made only a glancing reference to the crisis at his only public appearance for the day — a ceremony to award former U.S. Army Capt. William Swenson the Medal of Honor — when he suggested that Washington could learn something from the young officer's selfless action.¶ Throughout the debate, White House officials insisted that Obama would not negotiate, even as he hosted Republican leadership for talks at the White House during the shutdown.¶ And unlike the past two standoffs over fiscal issues earlier in his administration, Obama did not dispatch Vice President Biden — who some Democrats groused gave up too much to McConnell in the earlier talks — to Capitol Hill.¶ Instead, Obama had White House chief of staff Denis McDonough and his senior adviser Rob Nabors serve as point men to deal with Congress during the crisis.¶ "It was a smart move to take a hands-off approach — particularly since the American people weren't going to be particularly thrilled with the outcome anyway," said Allan Lichtman, an expert on the American presidency at American University.¶ In the end, Obama more or less stuck to his guns and gave little to the Republicans — whose starting negotiating point included defunding implementation of the president's signature health care law — for agreeing to reopen the government or extending the borrowing authority through Feb. 7.¶ The agreement extends spending levels that were set in the 2011 fiscal battle through Jan. 15. The deal also sets a mid-December deadline for congressional budget negotiators to report on their efforts to find solutions to longer-term fiscal issues. Those talks will be led by Sen. Patty Murray D-Wash., and Rep. Paul Ryan, R-Wis.¶ The only change to the health care law Republicans were able to extract was minor: The administration will have to verify the incomes of individuals who receive federal subsidies to help pay for health insurance. McConnell offered that the deal was "far less than many of us hoped for, quite frankly, but far better than what some had sought."¶ Still, the White House wasn't exactly spiking the football in the end zone.¶ "There is a lot of work ahead of us, including our need to earn back the trust of the American people that has been lost over the last few weeks," Obama said.¶ Obama's hands-off approach may have worked for this round in part because his end goal was straight forward: sending the message that Republicans would not win concessions from him by shuttering government or threatening default.¶ It required him "to draw a line in the sand and then stand back and tell Congress that's where the line in the sand was," explained Jonathan Cowan, a former Clinton administration official and president of the centrist Democratic group the Third Way.¶ But in his next fiscal battle, Obama will have to push not only Republicans, but also the left-wing of his own party on difficult issues like entitlement and tax reform if there is any chance for a big legacy-setting budget deal that he desires.¶ "It may be that the president played it right in this round by having an intentionally more hands-off strategy," Cowan said. "But in the next round, it's imperative that President Obama call for and push aggressively for a big economic bargain."

#### The plan is a massive congressional fight that infects the legislative future of unrelated initiatives

LeoGrande ’12 [William M. LeoGrande School of Public Affairs American University, Professor of Government and a specialist in Latin American politics and U.S. foreign policy toward Latin America, Professor LeoGrande has been a frequent adviser to government and private sector agencies, 12/18/12, http://www.american.edu/clals/upload/LeoGrande-Fresh-Start.pdf]

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

#### Certainty is key to long term economic growth

Novack 10/16 (Janet Novack writes from D.C. about tax and retirement policy and planning, 10/16/13, “Political Uncertainty Will Continue To Stunt Economic Growth”, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/janetnovack/2013/10/16/its-the-washington-uncertainty-stupid/>, TL)

Even if, as now appears likely, Congress passes a deal to raise the debt ceiling until Feb. 7th and fund the federal government through Jan. 15th, the uncertainty emanating from Washington will continue to hold down economic growth, Moody’s Analytics Chief Economist Mark Zandi said Wednesday. “I’m increasingly of the view that the reason why our economy can’t get into a higher gear is because of the uncertainty created by Washington, that this brinkmanship which happens every 3, to 6, to 12 months is corrosive on our collective psyche and it’s weighing on our willingness and ability to take risk,’’ Zandi said during a meeting with journalists at Washington think tank Third Way. Such uncertainty doesn’t cause businesses to lay off workers, but it does cause them to delay hiring and reduces their willingness to invest in riskier areas such as research and development, he said. While acknowledging that the Affordable Care Act (a.k.a. ObamaCare) has created some “wrenching changes,” Zandi said the “uncertainty related to ObamaCare is fading fast.” He added: “The predominant contribution to uncertainty is the mess we’re in right now related to the brinkmanship. So if lawmakers decide what they’re going to do is raise the debt limit for a few months, the stock market is going to be okay, but it means we’re doomed to be in this lackluster growth. We really need for Washington to get out of the way, literally get out of the way. If they could just get off the front pages of The New York Times and Wall Street Journal…that would mean the private economy would really be taking off. I think that’s the key impediment to the ability of the private sector to really engage. “ Zandi estimates that the combination of the January 1 fiscal cliff tax hikes and the budget cuts that were agreed to in 2011 have reduced the GDP gowth rate from 3% to 1.5% a year. While that fiscal contraction was faster than he favored, Zandi said, it would be manageable if Washington would just end the uncertainty—and leave well enough alone for a few years. “I think we’ve made a lot of progress on the deficit. Deficits are coming down very rapidly, faster than people would have expected,’’ he said. The key to solving the longer term deficit issues, he added, “is establishing a stronger rate of growth and the key to doing that is getting Washington off the front page. They have to do nothing, literally nothing. No change at all for the next 3 or 4 years. Let the private economy do its thing. Let’s reconvene 3 or 4 years from now and see what it looks like.” By that time, he noted, Congress will have a better idea of whether ObamaCare has done anything to bend the health care cost curve down—crucial to controlling the long term deficit as the baby boomers move onto Medicare. Zandi isn’t the only economist to argue that Washington’s partisan wars are holding the economy back. Vanguard Group Chief Economist Joseph Davis, for example, estimates that even before the current federal shutdown/debt ceiling crisis, a Washington “Uncertainty Tax” was knocking about a percentage point off U.S. economic growth. Washington’s recurring budget wars are also changing attitudes oversees, Zandi believes. During the first crisis over raising the debt ceiling in 2011, he said, foreign investors assumed the U.S. would work it out. “This is now changing to the point where people overseas are really concerned about the dysfunctionality of the process,’’ he said. “You’re hearing increasing calls and increasing preferences to diversify away from the United States.”

#### Economic decline leads to miscalculation and crisis escalation—escalates

Harris and Burrows, ‘09 [Mathew, PhD European History at Cambridge, counselor in the National Intelligence Council (NIC) and Jennifer, member of the NIC’s Long Range Analysis Unit “Revisiting the Future: Geopolitical Effects of the Financial Crisis” <http://www.ciaonet.org/journals/twq/v32i2/f_0016178_13952.pdf>]

Increased Potential for Global Conflict Of course, the report encompasses more than economics and indeed believes the future is likely to be the result of a number of intersecting and interlocking forces. With so many possible permutations of outcomes, each with ample Revisiting the Future opportunity for unintended consequences, there is a growing sense of insecurity. Even so, history may be more instructive than ever. While we continue to believe that the Great Depression is not likely to be repeated, the lessons to be drawn from that period include the harmful effects on fledgling democracies and multiethnic societies (think Central Europe in 1920s and 1930s) and on the sustainability of multilateral institutions (think League of Nations in the same period). There is no reason to think that this would not be true in the twenty-first as much as in the twentieth century. For that reason, the ways in which the potential for greater conflict could grow would seem to be even more apt in a constantly volatile economic environment as they would be if change would be steadier. In surveying those risks, the report stressed the likelihood that terrorism and nonproliferation will remain priorities even as resource issues move up on the international agenda. Terrorism’s appeal will decline if economic growth continues in the Middle East and youth unemployment is reduced. For those terrorist groups that remain active in 2025, however, the diffusion of technologies and scientific knowledge will place some of the world’s most dangerous capabilities within their reach. Terrorist groups in 2025 will likely be a combination of descendants of long established groups\_inheriting organizational structures, command and control processes, and training procedures necessary to conduct sophisticated attacks\_and newly emergent collections of the angry and disenfranchised that become self-radicalized, particularly in the absence of economic outlets that would become narrower in an economic downturn. The most dangerous casualty of any economically-induced drawdown of U.S. military presence would almost certainly be the Middle East. Although Iran’s acquisition of nuclear weapons is not inevitable, worries about a nuclear-armed Iran could lead states in the region to develop new security arrangements with external powers, acquire additional weapons, and consider pursuing their own nuclear ambitions. It is not clear that the type of stable deterrent relationship that existed between the great powers for most of the Cold War would emerge naturally in the Middle East with a nuclear Iran. Episodes of low intensity conflict and terrorism taking place under a nuclear umbrella could lead to an unintended escalation and broader conflict if clear red lines between those states involved are not well established. The close proximity of potential nuclear rivals combined with underdeveloped surveillance capabilities and mobile dual-capable Iranian missile systems also will produce inherent difficulties in achieving reliable indications and warning of an impending nuclear attack. The lack of strategic depth in neighboring states like Israel, short warning and missile flight times, and uncertainty of Iranian intentions may place more focus on preemption rather than defense, potentially leading to escalating crises. 36 Types of conflict that the world continues to experience, such as over resources, could reemerge, particularly if protectionism grows and there is a resort to neo-mercantilist practices. Perceptions of renewed energy scarcity will drive countries to take actions to assure their future access to energy supplies. In the worst case, this could result in interstate conflicts if government leaders deem assured access to energy resources, for example, to be essential for maintaining domestic stability and the survival of their regime. Even actions short of war, however, will have important geopolitical implications. Maritime security concerns are providing a rationale for naval buildups and modernization efforts, such as China’s and India’s development of blue water naval capabilities. If the fiscal stimulus focus for these countries indeed turns inward, one of the most obvious funding targets may be military. Buildup of regional naval capabilities could lead to increased tensions, rivalries, and counterbalancing moves, but it also will create opportunities for multinational cooperation in protecting critical sea lanes. With water also becoming scarcer in Asia and the Middle East, cooperation to manage changing water resources is likely to be increasingly difficult both within and between states in a more dog-eat-dog world.

### 1NC Cred

#### 1. No spillover or brink – its been in place for 50 years

#### 3. Plan doesn’t get rid of things like democracy promotion in the Middle East – it’s an alt cause

#### 6. 8 point font concedes alt causes---Guantanamo, Kyoto, Bali conference, the ICC, and human rights treaties

Burgsdorff--- ---9**–** Ph. D in Political Science from Freiburg University, EU Fellow at the University of Miami (Sven Kühn von, “Problems and Opportunities for the Incoming Obama Administration”, <http://www6.miami.edu/eucenter/publications/vonBurgsdorfUSvsCubalong09edi.pdf>)

6.3 How would the international community react? At international level all major actors would clearly welcome an end to the embargo. While the sanctions policy allowed European, Canadian and, more recently, Venezuelan, Chinese, Brazilian and Russian to become more involved with Cuba in the absence of competitors from the US (with the exception of agriculture produce), most of the foreign powers, and in particular the EU and Latin American countries, would clearly support a definite lifting of the coercive measures. Ending the embargo would be perceived as a decision carrying a momentum of powerful symbolism since it would signal a newly found willingness in Washington to reconsider the usefulness of acting unilaterally and outside the international legal framework. As a matter of fact, together with other measures such as closing Guantanamo, signing up to the Kyoto Protocol and putting into practice the succeeding agreement under the Bali conference, and possibly, joining the International Criminal Court as well as ratifying further international human rights treaties such as the 1990 Convention on the Rights of the Child, it would be interpreted by the international community as steps towards effective multilateralism.

#### 5. No reason the plan is key – engaging other countries solves –it’s *not* in the context of Cuba

#### 7. This evidence assumes we engage all regimes – this only changes our actions toward Cuba

#### 8. No spillover — lack of credibility in one commitment doesn’t affect others at all

Paul K. MacDonald 11, Assistant Professor of Political Science at Williams College, and Joseph M. Parent, Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Miami, Spring 2011, “Graceful Decline?: The Surprising Success of Great Power Retrenchment,” International Security, Vol. 35, No. 4, p. 7-44

Second, pessimists overstate the extent to which a policy of retrenchment can damage a great power's capabilities or prestige. Gilpin, in particular, assumes that a great power's commitments are on equal footing and interdependent. In practice, however, great powers make commitments of varying degrees that are functionally independent of one another. Concession in one area need not be seen as influencing a commitment in another area.25 Far from being perceived as interdependent, great power commitments are often seen as being rivalrous, so that abandoning commitments in one area may actually bolster the strength of a commitment in another area. During the Korean War, for instance, President Harry Truman's administration explicitly backed away from total victory on the peninsula to strengthen deterrence in Europe.26 Retreat in an area of lesser importance freed up resources and signaled a strong commitment to an area of greater significance.

### 1NC – Ethanol

#### 1. Your internal link evidence is about Soya – *NOT* ethanol

#### 3. No reason US is key – countries like China can resolve your impacts

#### 8. Destruction slowing and Soya is the major cause of destruction – that’s what your ev is about

**Vitali, 1AC Author, 2011** (Isabella, Soya and the Cerrado: Brazil’s forgotten jewel , http://assets.wwf.org.uk/downloads/soya\_and\_the\_cerrado.pdf , Senior Policy Officer)//moxley

The most recent figures suggest that the pace of Cerrado destruction may be slowing. The Brazilian government estimates that in 2008-09, around 7,600 sq km were lost, just over half the average for 2002-08. However, the latest survey also shows continuing high rates of loss in the frontier areas associated with current expansion of soya, such as the northern state of Maranhão where 1.1% of the total Cerrado vegetation was lost in a single year.40 19

#### 5. Market incentives overwhelms any reason why it would shift from Brazilian ethanol to Cuba

#### 6. No brink – Brazilian ethanol has been used for a while should’ve triggered your impacts already

#### 9. Squo solves shift from corn ethanol

**Roach 8-1-13** (John, NBC News, “Move over corn, a new source of ethanol is in town”, August 1st, 2013, <http://www.nbcnews.com/science/move-over-corn-new-source-ethanol-town-6C10822210>)//moxley

Commercial quantities of the alternative fuel ethanol are being produced from wood waste and other vegetative matter, a chemical company announced Wednesday. The milestone holds potential to curb the controversial practice of using corn kernels to brew the fuel that is commonly mixed with gasoline. Several companies have been racing in recent years to develop the technology required to produce ethanol from cellulose — the woody parts of plants — and many are close to firing up commercial facilities. INEOS Bio is at the finish line. "The breakthrough would be that they are going to have the first commercial sale," Jim McMillan, a research engineer at the Department of Energy's National Renewable Energy Laboratory in Golden, Colo., told NBC News. "And we all want to see commercial sales of cellulosic biofuels … we'd like to expand the options and move to a more sustainable feedstock basis that doesn't potentially compete with food and feed," he added. "So there are lots of reasons to be excited." A different brew Corn and other grain-based ethanols are produced using essentially the same process that a brewery uses to brew beer: sugars are extracted from the grains and inoculated with yeast that ferment the sugars into ethanol. INEOS Bio begins with wood waste and other vegetative matter and gasifies it — a cooking process that turns it into an energy-rich mix of carbon monoxide and hydrogen. Bacteria then feast on the gas mix, fermenting it to ethanol for distillation. Heat and other gases produced in the process are captured to generate power needed to run the facility; the excess is sold to the surrounding community. For a more detailed explanation, check out the video below from INEOS Bio. The process was scaled up at the company's Vero Beach, Fla., plant and on Wednesday chief executive Peter Williams announced in a statement that "we are producing commercial quantities of bioethanol from vegetative and wood waste, and at the same time exporting power to the local communities." By the end of the year, the company aims to be on track to annually produce 8 million gallons of cellulosic ethanol and 6 megawatts of renewable power with municipal food and yard waste.

#### 10. Your evidence says billions are “at risk” ---- billions don’t die every time corn goes up otherwise they would have died every few years since 1945

#### 11. Historical data proves food price spikes don’t increase hunger

Paarlberg in ‘8

(Robert, Prof. Pol. Sci. @ Wellesley, and Visiting Prof. Gov. @ Harvard, The Chronicle Review, “The Real Food Crisis: The True Threats are Local, not Global”, 6-27, 54:42, http://english.sxu.edu/musgrove/realfoodcrisis.pdf)

We might gain some insight into today's food economy from a comparable interlude that occurred roughly three decades ago. Between 1971 and 1974, the export price of wheat suddenly doubled, and the export price of corn increased by 60 percent. World reserve stocks of grain shrank by more than half. The price of soybeans rose so steeply in the United States that the federal government placed a momentary ban on exports. The United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization convened a food-crisis summit in Rome. In that earlier case, international markets had indeed tightened, and the higher prices did lead to significant consumption cutbacks, but mostly by the well-to-do, who were then (and still are) the primary users of international markets. Because of higher corn prices, the United States reduced the feeding of grain to livestock by 25 percent, which led to higher meat prices and less meat consumption, but primarily among the well fed. In most poor countries, because supplies from the world market were a relatively unimportant part of consumption, higher world prices had little adverse impact. Data from the U.N. organization later revealed that, between 1971 and 1974 in most poor countries, the consumption of cereals actually increased on a per-capita basis. Over the 1970s as a whole, despite rapid population growth, the prevalence of malnutrition did not worsen in South Asia or sub-Saharan Africa, and in Latin America and developing East Asia hunger actually declined sharply. Ironically, it was only when the so-called food crisis of the 1970s came to an end, during the slow-growth decade of the 1980s, that food circumstances in poor countries significantly worsened. In Latin America, even though world food prices were falling sharply, the number of hungry people increased from 46 million to more than 60 million. The reason was a regional "debt crisis" triggered by higher U.S. interest rates after 1979. The number of hungry people also increased sharply in Africa during the 1980s. The reason was faltering farm production, exacerbated in some regions by severe drought and civil conflict. The price for imported food was down, but hunger was up. Most real food crises are local rather than global.

#### No impact---mitigation and adaptation will solve---no tipping point or “1% risk” args

Robert O. Mendelsohn 9, the Edwin Weyerhaeuser Davis Professor, Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, Yale University, June 2009, “Climate Change and Economic Growth,” online: http://www.growthcommission.org/storage/cgdev/documents/gcwp060web.pdf

The heart of the debate about climate change comes from a number of warnings from scientists and others that give the impression that human-induced climate change is an immediate threat to society (IPCC 2007a,b; Stern 2006). Millions of people might be vulnerable to health effects (IPCC 2007b), crop production might fall in the low latitudes (IPCC 2007b), water supplies might dwindle (IPCC 2007b), precipitation might fall in arid regions (IPCC 2007b), extreme events will grow exponentially (Stern 2006), and between 20–30 percent of species will risk extinction (IPCC 2007b). Even worse, there may be catastrophic events such as the melting of Greenland or Antarctic ice sheets causing severe sea level rise, which would inundate hundreds of millions of people (Dasgupta et al. 2009). Proponents argue there is no time to waste. Unless greenhouse gases are cut dramatically today, economic growth and well‐being may be at risk (Stern 2006). These statements are largely alarmist and misleading. Although climate change is a serious problem that deserves attention, society’s immediate behavior has an extremely low probability of leading to catastrophic consequences. The science and economics of climate change is quite clear that emissions over the next few decades will lead to only mild consequences. The severe impacts predicted by alarmists require a century (or two in the case of Stern 2006) of no mitigation. Many of the predicted impacts assume there will be no or little adaptation. The net economic impacts from climate change over the next 50 years will be small regardless. Most of the more severe impacts will take more than a century or even a millennium to unfold and many of these “potential” impacts will never occur because people will adapt. It is not at all apparent that immediate and dramatic policies need to be developed to thwart long‐range climate risks. What is needed are long‐run balanced responses.

#### Turn: Agricultural crises are creating global food shortages – that kills a billion people – increased CO2 is key to solve

Idso’s, 11 [Sherwood PhD and former research physicist for the Department of Agriculture, Keith PhD Botany, Craig PhD Geography, 6/6/2011, “Meeting the Food Needs of a Growing World Population”, http://www.co2science.org/articles/V14/N27/EDIT.php] DHirsch

Parry and Hawkesford (2010) introduce their study of the global problem by noting that "food production needs to increase 50% by 2030 and double by 2050 to meet projected demands," and they note that at the same time the demand for food is increasing, production is progressively being limited by "non-food uses of crops and cropland," such as the production of biofuels, stating that in their homeland of the UK, "by 2015 more than a quarter of wheat grain may be destined for bioenergy production," which surely must strike one as both sad and strange, when they also note that "currently, at least one billion people are chronically malnourished and the situation is deteriorating," with more people "hungrier now than at the start of the millennium." So what to do about it: that is the question the two researchers broach in their review of the sad situation. They begin by describing the all-important process of photosynthesis, by which the earth's plants "convert light energy into chemical energy, which is used in the assimilation of atmospheric CO2 and the formation of sugars that fuel growth and yield," which phenomena make this natural and life-sustaining process, in their words, "a major target for improving crop productivity both via conventional breeding and biotechnology." Next to a plant's need for carbon dioxide comes its need for water, the availability of which, in the words of Parry and Hawkesford, "is the major constraint on world crop productivity." And they state that "since more than 80% of the [world's] available water is used for agricultural production, there is little opportunity to use additional water for crop production, especially because as populations increase, the demand to use water for other activities also increases." Hence, they rightly conclude that "a real and immediate challenge for agriculture is to increase crop production with less available water." Enlarging upon this challenge, they give an example of a *success story*: the Australian wheat variety 'Drysdale', which gained its fame "because it uses water more efficiently." This valued characteristic is achieved "by slightly restricting stomatal aperture and thereby the loss of water from the leaves." They note, however, that this ability "reduces photosynthetic performance slightly under ideal conditions," but they say it enables plants to "have access to water later in the growing season thereby increasing total photosynthesis over the life of the crop." Of course, Drysdale is but one variety of one crop; and the ideal goal would be to get nearly all varieties of all crops to use water more efficiently. And that goal can actually be reached by doing nothing, by merely halting the efforts of radical environmentalists to deny earth's carbon-based life forms -- that's all of us and the rest of the earth's plants and animals -- the extra carbon we and they need to live our lives to the fullest. This is because allowing the air's CO2content to rise in response to the burning of fossil fuels naturally causes the vast majority of earth's plants to progressively reduce the apertures of their stomata and thereby lower the rate at which water escapes through them to the air. And the result is even better than that produced by the breeding of Drysdale, because the extra CO2 in the airmore than overcomes the photosynthetic reduction that results from the partial closure of plant stomatal apertures, allowing even more yield to be produced per unit of water transpired in the process. Yet man can make the situation better still, by breeding and selecting crop varieties that perform better under higher atmospheric CO2 concentrations than the varieties we currently rely upon, or he can employ various technological means of altering them to do so. Truly, we can succeed, even where "the United Nations Millennium Development Goal of substantially reducing the world's hungry by 2015 will not be met," as Parry and Hawkesford accurately inform us. And this truly seems to us the moral thing to do, when "at least one billion people are chronically malnourished and the situation is deteriorating," with more people "hungrier now than at the start of the millennium."

#### No biod impact – their linear risk and systemic frames are wrong AND resilience is true

Kareiva et al, Chief Scientist and Vice President, The Nature Conservancy, 12

(Peter, Michelle Marvier, professor and department chair of Environment Studies and Sciences at Santa Clara University, Robert Lalasz, director of science communications for The Nature Conservancy, Winter, “Conservation in the Anthropocene,” http://thebreakthrough.org/index.php/journal/past-issues/issue-2/conservation-in-the-anthropocene/, accessed 12-18-12)

2. As conservation became a global enterprise in the 1970s and 1980s, the movement's justification for saving nature shifted from spiritual and aesthetic values to focus on biodiversity. Nature was described as primeval, fragile, and at risk of collapse from too much human use and abuse. And indeed, there are consequences when humans convert landscapes for mining, logging, intensive agriculture, and urban development and when key species or ecosystems are lost.¶ But ecologists and conservationists have grossly overstated the fragility of nature, frequently arguing that once an ecosystem is altered, it is gone forever. Some ecologists suggest that if a single species is lost, a whole ecosystem will be in danger of collapse, and that if too much biodiversity is lost, spaceship Earth will start to come apart. Everything, from the expansion of agriculture to rainforest destruction to changing waterways, has been painted as a threat to the delicate inner-workings of our planetary ecosystem.¶ The fragility trope dates back, at least, to Rachel Carson, who wrote plaintively in Silent Spring of the delicate web of life and warned that perturbing the intricate balance of nature could have disastrous consequences.22 Al Gore made a similar argument in his 1992 book, Earth in the Balance.23 And the 2005 Millennium Ecosystem Assessment warned darkly that, while the expansion of agriculture and other forms of development have been overwhelmingly positive for the world's poor, ecosystem degradation was simultaneously putting systems in jeopardy of collapse.24¶ The trouble for conservation is that the data simply do not support the idea of a fragile nature at risk of collapse. Ecologists now know that the disappearance of one species does not necessarily lead to the extinction of any others, much less all others in the same ecosystem. In many circumstances, the demise of formerly abundant species can be inconsequential to ecosystem function. The American chestnut, once a dominant tree in eastern North America, has been extinguished by a foreign disease, yet the forest ecosystem is surprisingly unaffected. The passenger pigeon, once so abundant that its flocks darkened the sky, went extinct, along with countless other species from the Steller's sea cow to the dodo, with no catastrophic or even measurable effects.¶ These stories of resilience are not isolated examples -- a thorough review of the scientific literature identified 240 studies of ecosystems following major disturbances such as deforestation, mining, oil spills, and other types of pollution. The abundance of plant and animal species as well as other measures of ecosystem function recovered, at least partially, in 173 (72 percent) of these studies.25¶ While global forest cover is continuing to decline, it is rising in the Northern Hemisphere, where "nature" is returning to former agricultural lands.26 Something similar is likely to occur in the Southern Hemisphere, after poor countries achieve a similar level of economic development. A 2010 report concluded that rainforests that have grown back over abandoned agricultural land had 40 to 70 percent of the species of the original forests.27 Even Indonesian orangutans, which were widely thought to be able to survive only in pristine forests, have been found in surprising numbers in oil palm plantations and degraded lands.28¶ Nature is so resilient that it can recover rapidly from even the most powerful human disturbances. Around the Chernobyl nuclear facility, which melted down in 1986, wildlife is thriving, despite the high levels of radiation.29 In the Bikini Atoll, the site of multiple nuclear bomb tests, including the 1954 hydrogen bomb test that boiled the water in the area, the number of coral species has actually increased relative to before the explosions.30 More recently, the massive 2010 oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico was degraded and consumed by bacteria at a remarkably fast rate.31¶ Today, coyotes roam downtown Chicago, and peregrine falcons astonish San Franciscans as they sweep down skyscraper canyons to pick off pigeons for their next meal. As we destroy habitats, we create new ones: in the southwestern United States a rare and federally listed salamander species seems specialized to live in cattle tanks -- to date, it has been found in no other habitat.32 Books have been written about the collapse of cod in the Georges Bank, yet recent trawl data show the biomass of cod has recovered to precollapse levels.33 It's doubtful that books will be written about this cod recovery since it does not play well to an audience somehow addicted to stories of collapse and environmental apocalypse.¶ Even that classic symbol of fragility -- the polar bear, seemingly stranded on a melting ice block -- may have a good chance of surviving global warming if the changing environment continues to increase the populations and northern ranges of harbor seals and harp seals. Polar bears evolved from brown bears 200,000 years ago during a cooling period in Earth's history, developing a highly specialized carnivorous diet focused on seals. Thus, the fate of polar bears depends on two opposing trends -- the decline of sea ice and the potential increase of energy-rich prey. The history of life on Earth is of species evolving to take advantage of new environments only to be at risk when the environment changes again.¶ The wilderness ideal presupposes that there are parts of the world untouched by humankind, but today it is impossible to find a place on Earth that is unmarked by human activity. The truth is humans have been impacting their natural environment for centuries. The wilderness so beloved by conservationists -- places "untrammeled by man"34 -- never existed, at least not in the last thousand years, and arguably even longer.

### 1NC – Nat Security

#### 1. Other sanctions trigger your impacts – Cuba isn’t key

#### 2. Your author concludes that there’s no resource problems

**GAO, 1AC Author, 2007** (Government Accountability Office report Economic Sanctions: Agencies Face Competing Priorities in Enforcing the U.S. Economic Embargo on Cuba. “Enforcing Economic Sanctions Government Accountability Office Analysis,” November)//moxley

Treasury. Treasury expressed neither agreement nor disagreement with our draft recommendation that OFAC assess the consistency of its resource allocations related to Cuba embargo violations with the risk of these violations to U.S. security. Treasury stated that OFAC's resources for investigating and penalizing violations of the Cuba embargo and other sanctions programs are allocated according to the agency's priorities, legal obligations to enforce all sanctions laws fairly, and volume of work. Treasury reiterated that Cuba-related cases represent a smaller portion of OFAC's enforcement work and require fewer resources than the number of such cases suggests. However, Treasury's comments do not address our finding that, since 2000, OFAC has conducted more investigations and imposed more penalties for violations of the Cuba embargo than for all of the other 20-plus sanctions programs the agency implements, including sanctions related to terrorism, weapons proliferation, and narcotics trafficking. In contrast, we report that other agencies reduced the resources devoted to Cuba embargo violations after 2001 **to focus on cases presenting a greater threat to homeland and national security and that embargo- related cases comprise a small percentage of their workloads**. In addition, Treasury did not provide data showing OFAC's allocation of resources for the Cuba embargo versus the more than 20 other sanctions programs it administers.

#### 3. Multiple alt causes – you’re author

**GAO, 1AC Author, 2007** (Government Accountability Office report Economic Sanctions: Agencies Face Competing Priorities in Enforcing the U.S. Economic Embargo on Cuba. “Enforcing Economic Sanctions Government Accountability Office Analysis,” November)//moxley

Recommendations for Executive Action:

In light of the recognized weaknesses in CBP's inspections capacity at major ports of entry, we recommend that the Secretary of Homeland Security direct CBP to re-evaluate whether the current level of resources focused on secondary inspections of passengers arriving from Cuba at the Miami airport effectively balances its responsibility for enforcing the Cuba embargo with its responsibilities for keeping terrorists, criminals, and inadmissible aliens out of the country. In addition, in light of OFAC's responsibilities for administering more than 20 sanctions programs, including sanctions against countries engaged in terrorism, weapons proliferations, and narcotics trafficking, we recommend that the Secretary of the Treasury direct OFAC to assess its allocation of resources for investigating and penalizing violations of the Cuba embargo with respect to the numerous other sanctions programs it administers.

#### 4. Plan wouldn’t affect counterterrorism or prolif – OFAC just manages things like travel visas

#### 5. Can’t enforce the embargo

**GAO, 1AC Author, 2007** (Government Accountability Office report Economic Sanctions: Agencies Face Competing Priorities in Enforcing the U.S. Economic Embargo on Cuba. “Enforcing Economic Sanctions Government Accountability Office Analysis,” November)//moxley

U.S. Agencies Face Several Challenges in Enforcing the Embargo on Cuba: U.S. officials and others cited the following key factors as hindering agencies' enforcement of the U.S. embargo on Cuba: (1) lack of foreign support for, and cooperation with, the embargo; (2) divided U.S. public opinion about the embargo, particularly the recent tightening of restrictions; (3) the difficulty of detecting some embargo violations; and (4) the embargo's complexity and changing rules. In some cases, these factors act in concert.

#### 6. Your ev concedes that we need international effort to address it

#### 7. Terrorist attacks in other countries trigger your impacts

#### 8. No widespread proliferation

Hymans 12

Jacques Hymans, USC Associate Professor of IR, 4/16/12, North Korea's Lessons for (Not) Building an Atomic Bomb, www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/137408/jacques-e-c-hymans/north-koreas-lessons-for-not-building-an-atomic-bomb?page=show

Washington's miscalculation is not just a product of the difficulties of seeing inside the Hermit Kingdom. It is also a result of the broader tendency to overestimate the pace of global proliferation. For decades, Very Serious People have predicted that strategic weapons are about to spread to every corner of the earth. **Such warnings have routinely proved wrong** - for instance, the intelligence assessments that led to the 2003 invasion of Iraq - but they continue to be issued. In reality, despite the diffusion of the relevant technology and the knowledge for building nuclear weapons, the world has been experiencing a great proliferation slowdown. Nuclear weapons programs around the world are taking much longer to get off the ground - and their failure rate is much higher - than they did during the first 25 years of the nuclear age. As I explain in my article "Botching the Bomb" in the upcoming issue of Foreign Affairs, the key reason for the great proliferation slowdown is the absence of strong cultures of scientific professionalism in most of the recent crop of would-be nuclear states, which in turn is a consequence of their poorly built political institutions. In such dysfunctional states, the quality of technical workmanship is low, there is little coordination across different technical teams, and technical mistakes lead not to productive learning but instead to finger-pointing and recrimination. **These problems are debilitating**, and **they cannot be fixed** simply by bringing in more imported parts through illicit supply networks. In short, as a struggling proliferator, North Korea has a lot of company.

#### 9. No terrorism impact

Zenko & Cohen 12 – Micah Zenko, Fellow in the Center for Preventive Action at the Council on Foreign Relations; and Michael A. Cohen, Fellow at the Century Foundation, March/April 2012, “Clear and Present Safety,” Foreign Affairs, Vol. 91, No. 2, p. 79-93

Take terrorism. Since 9/11, no security threat has been hyped more. Considering the horrors of that day, that is not surprising. But the result has been a level of fear that is completely out of proportion to both the capabilities of terrorist organizations and the United States' vulnerability. On 9/11, al Qaeda got tragically lucky. Since then, the United States has been preparing for the one percent chance (and likely even less) that it might get lucky again. But al Qaeda lost its safe haven after the U.S.-led invasion of Afghanistan in 2001, and further military, diplomatic, intelligence, and law enforcement efforts have decimated the organization, which has essentially lost whatever ability it once had to seriously threaten the United States.¶ According to U.S. officials, al Qaeda's leadership has been reduced to two top lieutenants: Ayman al-Zawahiri and his second-in-command, Abu Yahya al-Libi. Panetta has even said that the defeat of al Qaeda is "within reach." The near collapse of the original al Qaeda organization is one reason why, in the decade since 9/11, the U.S. homeland has not suffered any large-scale terrorist assaults. All subsequent attempts have failed or been thwarted, owing in part to the incompetence of their perpetrators. Although there are undoubtedly still some terrorists who wish to kill Americans, their dreams will likely continue to be frustrated by their own limitations and by the intelligence and law enforcement agencies of the United States and its allies.