# 1AC

### 1ac plan

#### The executive branch of the United States federal government should offer to ease restrictions on general licenses for non-tourist travel between the United States and Cuba.

### 1ac engagement

#### Contention 1 is ENGAGEMENT:

#### Migration talks with Cuba are *ongoing* – but *de-linking* is key to progress

López-Levy 13 (Arturo López-Levy, lecturer and Ph.D. candidate, Josef Korbel School of International Studies, University of Denver, former political analyst for the Cuban government, M.A. International Affairs, Columbia University, M.A. Economics, Carleton University, “The Cuban Cargo Caper,” The National Interest, 7-26-2013, http://nationalinterest.org/commentary/the-cuban-cargo-caper-8782)

Earlier this month, Panamanian security forces seized an undeclared stash of weapons aboard the North Korean ship Chong Chon Gang. The revelation that the shipment was from Havana has sparked interesting speculation, with some commentators making references to the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962.¶ Just a day after the ship was stopped, Cuban authorities claimed ownership of the sugar and weapons found. Cuba's Ministry of Foreign Affairs released a statement saying that the weapons were obsolete, from the mid-twentieth century, and were headed to North Korea for repair as part of an agreement between the two countries.¶ Cuba's explanation sought to calm the hype surrounding the incident and seems to be accurate in describing the weapons as outdated. If what they say is correct, then this incident in Panama was a political mistake, which, to paraphrase Talleyrand, is "worse than a crime." The arms may be obsolete, but nevertheless, shipment and transfer to North Korea is a violation of UN sanctions. (Given North Korea's aggressive behavior, the Security Council, acting under chapter VII of the UN Charter, explicitly prohibits any military-related transaction with the Pyongyang regime.)¶ This incident reveals a serious lack of institutional coordination between Cuba’s branches of government. It could not come at a worse time, just after the announcement of a new wave of economic reforms by Vice President Murillo and on the eve of migration talks with United States. The nature of diplomacy means that although they are officially about migration, these negotiations will include other topics. If President Raul Castro is serious about order and efficiency, as he has stated, then this situation qualifies as a major fiasco and should result in several dismissals.¶ This will also have serious repercussions for foreign policy. Those confiscated weapons are not in themselves a threat to the United States or world peace, but Cuba will now have to answer to the Security Council committee that administers UN sanctions. Worse, Cuba’s image in the world is already harmed by a link to a regime with one of the worst human-rights records and erratic international behavior. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea is not of the people, nor is it democratic or a republic. It is a dynastic regime, with each new descendant of the house of Kim worse than the last. Cubans should know better. Just last April 5, former president Fidel Castro urged the North Korean leadership to behave reasonably and "prevent a war in Korea."¶ The Cuban leadership should prepare for serious damage control. Cuba remains on the U.S. State Department's list of state sponsors of terrorism, even though the Bush administration removed North Korea from it. Cuba should keep its distance from North Korea’s dog-and-pony show and fully cooperate with the UN. It's not enough to cobble together a paragraph about Cuba's commitment to world peace and disarmament. Havana, as a member of the international community, must declare its unequivocal rejection of attempts by North Koreans to sneak into the club of nuclear powers. It is time to set priorities: Cuba should focus on creating a friendly international environment for its ongoing reforms. Everything else is secondary.¶ Something Always Happens¶ Taking place on the eve of the resumption of bilateral talks based on the 1994-95 U.S.-Cuban migration accords, the detention of the Chong Chon Gang evokes an old pattern in bilateral relations between Havana and Washington. Not only have relations been held hostage by Cold War logic, they have also suffered from unexpected pitfalls. "Something always happens," say the pessimists. The instant the news broke about the ship being confiscated by Panamanian president Ricardo Martinelli, Congresswoman Ileana Ros-Lehtinen and Senator Marco Rubio demanded the talks be called off and reiterated that Cuba must remain on the list of terrorist-sponsoring countries. That is exactly the opposite of what the reaction should be.¶ It is time for policymakers in Havana and Washington to learn some crisis management, linking or separating issues as convenient to national interests, rather than leaving them up to the circus of the radicals on both sides. The United States should focus its superpower efforts where the threat warrants: Pyongyang. The discovery of this Cuban-North Korean violation offers an opportunity to further isolate the North Korean regime, adding measures of monitoring and control of any transaction with the country. North Korea is a threat to peace in East Asia, a violator of the nuclearnonproliferation system and a known smuggler of weapons to conflict zones such as the Congo or Yemen. Cuba is none of these things.¶ Any action against Cuba should take place within the multilateral framework of the sanctions against North Korea. It is up to the Security Council to get full cooperation from Cuba on this incident, in such a way that intensifies North Korea's isolation. As White House press secretary Jay Carney declared: “if it’s determined that materials found on board that vessel violate sanctions, then the body that levied the sanctions…would handle enforcement matters.” Abandoning negotiations on the implementation of migration agreements or continuing to unfairly keep Cuba on the list of terrorism-sponsoring countries distracts from efforts to place greater pressure on North Korea.¶ Cuba must answer for its alleged violation of UN Security Council resolutions 1718, 1874 and 2094. But Senator Rubio would like the United States to approach the situation like a butcher, when what is needed is a surgeon. U.S. diplomacy is sophisticated enough to correct its flawed policy towards Cuba while at the same time supporting multilateral pressure exerted by the UN’s seamless application of sanctions against the DPRK. It is not in the national interest to obfuscate clear multilateral standards of nonproliferation applied to any military transaction with the DPRK with arbitrary and unilateral double standards on terrorism applied to Cuba. There is plenty of evidence that North Korea has violated the nuclear nonproliferation regime, while none exists that Cuba participated or sponsored any terrorist act in the last twenty years.¶ Avoiding Another Mistake¶ The resumption of migration talks between Cuba and the United States is an opportunity to launch a new positive cycle in the bilateral relationship. High-level negotiations on topics amenable to give and take creates incentives for goodwill gestures, even in areas that are not officially included on the agenda—such as the imprisonment of U.S. aid worker Alan Gross and the inclusion of Cuba on the state sponsors of terrorism list. An act of goodwill by one party may be reciprocated by the other. Official face-to-face communication safeguards against one party pocketing unilateral concession without reciprocating.¶ Assuming there is no faction in Havana interested in "egging on" hostility between the two countries for their own benefit—a notion that is too conspiratorial but that cannot be dismissed outright—Cuba’s decision to ship obsolete Soviet military equipment in a North Korean ship was irresponsible. By following through with the bilateral talks while demanding application of the UN resolutions, President Obama's administration has made the wise decision not to respond to irresponsible behavior with more of the same. Hopefully it will remain on that course.

#### Offering to ease *travel restrictions* *spurs cooperation* on mutual interests – like the *environment* and *disaster prevention*

García Iturbe 13 (Dr. Néstor García Iturbe, leading academic and foreign affairs expert of the Cuban Communist Party, “What should Obama do? The view from Cuba,” International Institute for the Study of Cuba, 2-18-2013, http://cubastudies.org/what-should-obama-do-the-view-from-cuba/)

Cuba’s official position¶ The revolutionary government of Cuba has always shown interest in the study of this issue and its willingness to analyze the proposals created for better climate between the two countries. The story picks up a number of facts that confirm what was said.¶ Our position was recently expounded in the speech of the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Cuba, Bruno Rodriguez Parrilla, before the General Assembly of the United Nations, on November 13, 2012, when he said:¶ “I reiterate, on behalf of President Raúl Castro Ruz, the commitment of the Government of Cuba to move toward normalization of relations with the United States, through respectful dialogue, without preconditions, on a reciprocal basis of sovereign equality and without detracting from our independence and sovereignty.¶ “Again today I present again to the Government of the United States the proposed agenda for bilateral talks aimed at moving towards normalization of relations, which includes as core issues, the lifting of the economic, commercial and financial blockade, exclusion from the arbitrary and illegitimate terrorist country list, the repeal of the Cuban Adjustment Act and the policy of “wet foot, dry foot,” compensation for economic and human damages, the return of the territory occupied by the Guantanamo Naval Base, the end of radio and television aggression, and the cessation of financing internal subversion.¶ “An essential element of this agenda is the release of the five Cuban antiterrorist fighters unjustly and cruelly imprisoned and held in this country. An act of justice or, at least, a humanitarian solution would win the gratitude of my people and our government’s response.¶ “I also offer to the government of the United States to negotiate agreements for cooperation in areas of mutual interest, such as fighting drug trafficking, terrorism, human trafficking and for the full normalization of migratory relations and the mitigation and prevention of natural disasters, environmental protection and preservation of our common seawaters. We also propose resuming talks, unilaterally suspended by the counterparty, on migration issues and the restoration of the postal service. “¶ The possible behaviour of the Obama administration in the period 2013-2017 and the position that Cuba could take¶ To make a prediction about the likely behaviour of the Obama administration in the period 2013-2017 it is necessary to take as a base one of the scenarios that might arise regarding foreign policy toward Cuba.¶ We will take as a hypothesis the most favorable of these, which once again confirms our willingness to analyze and discuss the problems between the two countries. That is, let us assume that all contact is made through respectful dialogue, without preconditions, on a reciprocal basis of sovereign equality and, in defense of the interests of each country, without any loss to the independence and sovereignty of either.¶ An analysis along these lines, with mutual interest and practical solutions appropriate in the interests of both countries, would solve more than half of the problems that exist between the two nations. The selected areas are those in which the U.S. president holds powers that allow him to change the existing situation.¶ In my proposal, the ball is thrown to the U.S. camp, but in a way that they can catch and return it to Cuba, to facilitate that exchange is initiated and to achieve the best possible result.¶ How to order the items on the Agenda? What would be the first items to discuss?¶ The most logical would be to start with those situations where there is already some kind of progress or agreement, whether signed or implied, between the parties. The agreements and results obtained in the first points, that may not be the most important, would allow each party to a study how to complete the discussion, what is the disposition of the other party and also show progress in the process that has begun.¶ I will point out what I consider the most important and urgent because there are many that could be dealt with.¶ Migration talks¶ Travel to Cuba and remittances from Cubans living in the United States was one of the initial concerns of the Obama administration in its first term. The action taken, which many people refer to as “lifting travel restrictions to Cuba,” did not even go as far as introducing the restrictions as they were applied in the Clinton era.¶ Cubans living in other countries are not subject to these regulations, so they have complete freedom to travel and send money to relatives in Cuba. It is only those who reside in the United States who do not enjoy such freedoms.¶ President Obama could order the Departments of State, Commerce and Treasury to issue regulations on the specificities related to these trips, which would allow him to take steps in terms of increasing them.¶ The resumption of these talks could give a great boost to the whole process. It is a point of great interest in both the United States and Cuba for the number of people who are involved.¶ Cuba has just issued new immigration regulations, to which the United States will surely have to respond.

#### That’s because the plan doesn’t try to *change interests* – just *insulates* disagreements

Rueckert 13 (Phineas Rueckert, Research Associate at the Council on Hemispheric Affairs, “U.S.-Cuba Mail and Migration Talks: Opportunities and Limitations of Mutual Interest Cooperation,” Council on Hemispheric Affairs, 7-3-2013, http://www.coha.org/u-s-cuba-mail-and-migration-talks-opportunities-and-limitations-of-mutual-interest-cooperation/)

On June 18-19, Cuban and U.S. diplomats met with their postal service counterparts in Washington to discuss the possibility of ending the 50-year ban on direct mail service between the two nations, which has been in effect since 1963. On June 18, “knowledgeable sources” reported to El Nuevo Herald that the State Department and Cuban Foreign Ministry officials will hold talks to discuss migration policy starting July 17. 1¶ While these bilateral talks are an important step forward for both countries, on their own they do not signify a transformation of U.S.-Cuban relations or portend the emergence of a relationship of “mutual respect” between Washington and Havana. In the best-case scenario, these talks will lead to further discussions of specific issues of mutual interest, such as environmental and counterterrorism cooperation. However, until Washington can show that it has the political will to achieve durable results in its dealings with Cuba—as opposed to mere self-interest in resolving short-term issues—such negotiations will likely not amount to anything more than a transient, and ultimately meaningless, convergence of low-value interests.¶ Officials have stressed that these negotiations are of a technical nature, and “that they did not indicate a change in U.S. policy toward Cuba.” 2 While the fact that the two countries are talking despite the continued detentions of Alan Gross and the Cuban Five (now four) is significant, the talks seem to imply a logistical confluence of interests as opposed to a more comprehensive rapprochement.¶ Mutual-Interest Cooperation¶ In the past, the United States and Cuba have been able to cooperate on certain issues by using a category-by-category approach to bilateral relations based on mutual interest, rather than seeking to repair ties through sweeping reforms. Such categories include cooperation in counternarcotics, “fence line” negotiations at Guantánamo Bay, and coast guard security. 3 As early as the 1970s, the United States (under the Carter Administration) worked with the Castro regime on areas of mutual concern, for example, signing the Cuba–United States Maritime Boundary Agreement in 1977, which helped to determine the international borders between the two nations. In the same vein as these past reforms, the direct mail and migration talks present an opening for the countries to further discuss issues of mutual interest. When asked about the mail service negotiations, Mavis Anderson, Senior Research Fellow at the Latin America Working Group responded:¶ “….beyond reestablishing this important link between Cubans and U.S. citizens…[the mail service negotiation] builds confidence between our two nations, perhaps provides a platform for small forays into issues beyond postal service, and demonstrates (hopefully) that Cuba and the United States can come to an agreement on issues of mutual interest.”¶ Mutual-interest cooperation may be the most practical way for the United States and Cuba to move towards a rapprochement. Issues like the suspension of postal service between the two countries are minor impediments that are more of a hassle than anything else, and serve little practical or political purpose. As it stands, postcards and letters sent between the two countries must go through a middleman country (usually Mexico). Restoring direct mail between the United States and Cuba would merely cut this step out of the process—at once benefiting the struggling U.S. Postal Service and citizens on both sides of the U.S.-Cuba divide.¶ Cuba-U.S. Migration: A Series of Unconventional Policies¶ The negotiations on migration could initiate a more significant and impassioned conversation than the reestablishment of direct mail has, although this possibility by no means presupposes an immediate or straightforward path leading to a rapprochement.¶ Migration between the two countries is a highly contentious issue rooted in a prolonged series of sporadic agreements and negotiations. The first formalized agreement on migration came in the form of the Cuban Adjustment Act of 1966, which accords Cuban migrants preferential treatment from the Attorney General of the United States on account of their perceived persecution within their country, and does not force them to “apply for political asylum or prove that they are refugees.” 4 While this accord was initially intended as a response to political conditions within Cuba during the 1960s, it remains active today as the act was given no formal end date. It is still used to justify regularization of Cuban refugees once they reach the United States, even if they did so illegally.¶ In 1980, the United States and Cuba attempted to coordinate a more open migration policy—leading to the Mariel Boatlift, an emigration of more than 125,000 Cubans to Miami. 5 This policy ended up backfiring for President Carter, as about 10 percent of these refugees were later discovered to be either criminals or mentally institutionalized individuals, termed lumpens or “undesirables.” Furthermore, the affair cost the United States $700 million USD. 6 While the boatlift had negative political implications for Carter, it did eventually force the United States’ hand on migration policy. The same accords that returned the 2,746 lumpens to Cuba created a legal means for 20,000 Cubans per year to receive permanent visas to live in the United States. 7¶ When Cuba entered the “Special Period in a Time of Peace,” the economic near-collapse that followed the dissolution of the Soviet Union, a rising number of Cubans sought to migrate illegally to the United States by boat—and almost 40,000 illegal migrants were intercepted by the U.S. Coast Guard in 1994. 8 As a response to increased illegal migration, the 1994 Cuban Migration Agreement aimed to normalize migration between the two countries. This agreement reinforced the policy of granting 20,000 immigration visas per year and opened up other means for legal immigration, such as family-based immigration initiatives. 9 It also indicated that: “The United States [would discontinue] its practice of granting parole to all Cuban migrants who reach U.S. territory in irregular ways.” 10 Regrettably, the United States has largely disregarded this commitment, on account of its “wet-foot, dry-foot” policy, which admits illegal Cuban migrants to the United States if they reach land, but returns them to the island if the U.S. Coast Guard intercepts them at sea.¶ The Cuban Migration Agreement instituted biannual migration talks between representatives of the two nations, which proved to be an important means for mutual-interest cooperation despite perpetually strained relations between the United States and Cuba on other issues. In 2003, however, President George W. Bush suspended these biannual talks on account of their “lack of progress.” 11 President Obama briefly restarted migration talks in 2009, but they were frozen in 2011 with the sentencing of Alan Gross, a USAID contractor who was detained for illegally disseminating communications equipment to the Jewish community in Cuba. Importantly, since Obama’s election, both countries have loosened their respective travel restrictions—Obama in April 2009 and Cuban President Raúl Castro in January 2013—thereby allowing more fluid movement between the longstanding rivals. The demonstrated intention to resume migration talks further suggests that Washington and Havana are at least recognizing that the demand for bilateral contact is increasing among citizens of both countries.¶ Conclusion¶ The direct mail and migration talks are undoubtedly an important logistical step forward for U.S.-Cuban relations. They may even be symbolic of a positive, albeit incremental, change in the overall nature of negotiations. However, it is important to keep in mind that they are just talks. President Obama and Secretary of State John Kerry need to demonstrate that they have the political resolve to improve U.S.-Cuban relations, which will eventually involve tackling grittier, more substantive issues such as Alan Gross, the Cuban Five, and the decades-old economic embargo that still remains in place. In other words, a category-by-category approach to bilateral relations based on mutual interest can only ameliorate relations to a certain extent. According to Larry Birns, Director of the Council on Hemispheric Affairs, “U.S. policy [towards Cuba] is to prevent the functioning of diplomacy.” As long as this policy is in place, movements toward a rapprochement will continue to be slow, uneven, and ultimately insufficient.

#### Improving *environmental cooperation* is key to *global sustainable development* AND *environmental leadership*

Conell 9 (Christina Conell, Research Associate, Council on Hemispheric Affairs, M.P.P. Public Policy, University of Virginia, B.A. Latin American Studies, Spanish Language, University of Virginia, “The U.S. and Cuba: Destined to be an Environmental Duo?” 6-12-2009, [http://www.coha.org/the-us-and-cuba-an-environmental-duo/)](http://www.coha.org/the-us-and-cuba-an-environmental-duo/)//TL)

•Cuba’s abundant natural resources need to be protected with heightened vigilance ¶ •Lifting the trade embargo would open up the possibility for a constructive partnership between Cuba and the U.S. by developing compatible and sustainable environmental policies¶ •With the support of the U.S., Cuba could become a model for sustainable preservation and environmental protection on a global scale ¶ Through accidents of geography and history, Cuba is a priceless ecological resource. The United States should capitalize on its proximity to this resource-rich island nation by moving to normalize relations and establishing a framework for environmental cooperation and joint initiatives throughout the Americas. Cuba is the most biologically diverse of all the Caribbean Islands. Since it lies just 90 miles south of the Florida Keys, where the Atlantic, the Caribbean and the Gulf of Mexico intersect, the U.S. could play a key role in environmental conservation as well as the region in general. However, when it comes to environmental preservation, the Obama administration is obstructing progress and hindering any meaningful cooperation with its current U.S.- Cuba policy. ¶ Climate change and environmental degradation are two of the most pressing contemporary issues. If President Obama is sincerely committed to environmental sustainability, he must forge international partnerships to implement this objective. Where better to begin than in the U.S.’s own backyard, where Cuba has a huge presence. Only then can Cuba and the United States move forward to find joint solutions to environmental challenges. ¶ Environmental Riches and Implications ¶ Cuba’s glittering white sand beaches, extensive coral reefs, endemic fauna and diverse populations of fish compose the Caribbean’s most biologically diverse island. Based on a per hectare sampling when compared to the U.S. plus Canada, Cuba has 12 times more mammal species, 29 times as many amphibian and reptile species, 39 times more bird species, and 27 times as many vascular plant species. Equally important, adjacent ocean currents and the island nation’s close proximity, carry fish larvae into U.S. waters, making protection of Cuba’s coastal ecosystems vital to replenishing the U.S.’s ailing fisheries. Therefore, preserving the marine resources of Cuba is critical to the economic health of North America’s Atlantic coastal communities. ¶ The U.S. and Cuba also share an ancient deepwater coral system that stretches up to North Carolina. The island’s 4,200 islets and keys support important commercial reef fish species such as snapper and grouper as well as other marine life including sea turtles, dolphins and manatees in both countries. Fifty percent of its flora and 41 percent of its fauna are endemic, signifying the importance of protecting the island’s resources in order to safeguard the paradisiacal vision that Christopher Columbus observed when landing on the island in 1492. ¶ Oro Negro and Dinero ¶ The recent discovery of oil and natural gas reserves in the Florida straits in Cuban waters has attracted foreign oil exploration from China and India, both eager to begin extraction. Offshore oil and gas development could threaten Cuba’s and Florida’s environmental riches. Together, Cuba and the U.S. can develop policies to combat the negative results coming from the exploitation of these resources. The increased extraction and refining of oil in Cuba could have detrimental effects on the environment. Offshore drilling is likely to increase with the discovery of petroleum deposits in the Bay of Cárdenas and related areas. Excavation increases the possibility of oil spills, which would in turn destroy the surrounding ecosystem, including fisheries and coral reef formations. The amount of pollutants released into the air from refining crude oil and the amount of wayward oil residuals would also increase with drilling and extraction. Those conversant with the very sensitive habitat issues are calling for immediate consultations aimed at anticipating what should be done. ¶ However the U.S.’s enormous oil usage and its development requirements will cultivate economic growth on the island. Washington must work with Cuba to create an ecological protection plan not only to establish an environmentally friendly public image, but to make it a reality as well. Degradation of the environment will deprive Cuba, in the long run, of one of its most important sources of present and future revenue: tourism. Consequently, it is in the mutual interests of the U.S. and Cuba to develop a cooperative relationship that will foster tourism and growth in a sustainable manner. ¶ Sustainability through Collaboration ¶ In many parts of the country communism has inadequately acted as a seal to preserve elements of Cuba’s past as the centralized government prohibited private development by not giving special permission. A number of tourist resorts already dot the island, but Cuba has been largely exempt from mass tourist exploitation due to frozen relations with the U.S. Although the island remains underdeveloped, Fidel Castro has used his unchecked power to back policies, which have been heedless to environmental considerations, thus damaging some of the island’s pristine ecosystem that once defined the island. Roughly the size of Pennsylvania, Cuba is the largest Caribbean island, and if preservation and conservation measures are planned and carried out in a cognizant manner, it could become a paradigm for sustainable development at the global level. ¶ The Obama administration’s recent easing of travel restrictions on Cuban Americans visiting relatives on the island could be of immense importance not only to Cuban families, but also to the preservation of Cuba’s unique and increasingly threatened coastal and marine environments. Such a concession on Washington’s part would mark a small, but still significant stride in U.S.-Cuba relations, yet the travel restrictions still remain inherently discriminatory. The preposterous regulations that allow only a certain category of Americans into Cuba signify only a meager shift in U.S. policy towards Cuba. ¶ The 50-year-old U.S. embargo against the island has resoundingly failed to achieve its purpose. Obama’s modifications fall short of what it will take to reestablish a constructive U.S.-Cuba relationship. Cuba’s tropical forests, soils, and maritime areas have suffered degradation as a result of harmful policies stemming from a Soviet-style economic system. Cuba’s economy could be reinvigorated through expanded tourism, development initiatives and an expansion of commodity exports, including sugarcane for ethanol. U.S. policy toward Cuba should encourage environmental factors, thereby strengthening U.S. credibility throughout the hemisphere. ¶ An environmental partnership between the U.S. and Cuba is not only possible, but could result in development models that could serve as an example for environmental strategies throughout the Americas. The U.S. has the economic resources necessary to aid Cuba in developing effective policy, while the island provides the space where sustainable systems can be implemented initially instead of being applied after the fact. Cuba’s extreme lack of development provides an unspoiled arena for the execution of exemplary sustainable environmental protection practices. ¶ Waste Not, Want Not¶ Although the government of Cuba has established state-based agencies to develop sustainable environmental practices, the island’s resources are left to be used at the government’s discretion. It is estimated that throughout Cuba, about 113.5 billion gallons of water contaminated with agricultural, industrial and urban wastes are dumped into the sea annually and more than 3.27 billion gallons find their way into its rivers. As direct dumping of untreated industrial waste into rivers, aquifers, and the sea is the norm, Cuban scientists estimate that this volume of industrial liquid waste pollutes roughly 486 gallons of clean water per year. The majority of this contamination stems from four industries, all state owned and operated, nickel excavation, sugar refineries, oil refineries, and rice farms.¶ A 1994 Cuban press release disclosed that the Soto Alba nickel plant on the Moa Bay dumped more than 3.17 billion gallons of untreated liquid waste into the sea every day. The waste contained 72 tons of aluminum, 48 tons of chromium, 15 tons of magnesium, and 30 tons of sulfuric acid. By way of comparison, the treatment standards for wastewater in the U.S. limit the concentration of chromium to a maximum of 0.32 milligrams per liter, 12 times less than the daily dumping into the Moa Bay by only one of the three nickel plants operating in the area. In the sugar industry, more than 15.85 billion gallons of liquid waste are dumped into caves by the 151 operating sugar mills on the island creating the most enduring environmental problem. These alarming figures highlight the precipitous position of Cuba’s environment. While Cuban citizens increasingly are aware of the importance of environmental conservation, the government continues to exploit the island’s resources for state use without hindrance of being environmentally sound. Environmentalists maintain that the Cuban government must take responsibility for enforcing the environmental laws it has enacted and agreements it has signed.¶ For Cubans and foreigners alike, the beaches of Cuba constitute the principle tourist attraction in the country, but even these have not escaped wasteful government exploitation. The famous beaches east of Havana have been the victims of sand removal for use by the Cuban government in the construction industry. In addition to coastal destruction, like many of its Caribbean neighbors, Cuba faces deforestation, over-cultivation of land and compaction of soils due to the use of heavy farm machinery and strip mining. These practices have resulted in high salinity in soils and heavy land erosion. Furthermore, poor water quality in freshwater streams has affected the wildlife habitat, which is in turn influenced by runoff from agricultural practices, erosion due to deforestation, and sedimentation of freshwater streams. Cuba must act in a responsible manner to stop environmental degradation and preserve its tourist industry as an early step to salvage its inert economy.¶ Beginning Concerns¶ The environmental degradation that began during the colonial era has transcended time as a result of Castro’s political and economic paradigm. Only in the last 40 years, with the development of the Commission for the Protection of the Environment and the Conservation of Natural Resources (COMARNA), has Cuba begun to address growing environmental concerns. COMARNA consolidated all of the agencies with environmental responsibilities, as a step towards giving them the power to influence all environmental issues. Although COMARNA was all-inclusive, it lacked independent authority, so its activities achieved few tangible results. The sad fact was that the centralized agency only succeeded in aiding the state in squandering resources.¶ In reality, establishing the agency was a modest concession to ease environmental concerns, but the truth lingered that Cuba’s wealth of natural resources remained under the auspices of the government. COMARNA acknowledged the appeals for conservation by the international community, yet it allowed for the misuse of natural resources by the State. By way of example, the centralized Cuban agency built thousands of miles of roads for the development of non-existent state agricultural enterprises and dams where there was hardly any water to contain.¶ In 1981, Cuba enacted Law 33 in an attempt to legitimize their environmental laws and regulations, yet Law 33 played only a miniscule role in guiding the extraction of natural resources and the conservation of ecological life on the island. Lauded as a law ahead of its time, Law 33 purportedly covers all the regulations concerning the environment and the protection and use of Cuban national resources, even though it produced few results.¶ The statute includes a section comparing the “wise use of natural resources by communist countries versus the indiscriminate use of natural resources by the capitalistic world.” In this regard, the document is more a piece of political propaganda than a law meant to be rigorously enforced. Moreover it palls in comparison to international environmental protection guidelines and has relatively limited significance within the country since the Cuban government is responsible for the operation of the bulk of the industries and is therefore the principal polluter and consumer of natural resources. Thus Law 33 exonerates the Cuban government from enforcing stricter conservation standards by making a system that looks efficient, but in reality may not be so. A closer analysis on Law 33 exposes its inherent lack of efficacy and applicability.¶ Attempts to Move Forward¶ In 1994, Cuba developed the Ministry of Science, Technology and the Environment (CITMA) in order to absorb the tasks of the unproductive COMARNA. CITMA attempts to steer the implementation of environmental policy, the rational use of natural resources, and the adoption of sustainable development programs. Law 81 developed out of the necessity to give the Ministry a more sharply defined role in the government by replacing the outdated Law 33. Law 81, the Law of the Environment, was enacted in 1997 and presents a comprehensive framework law that covers all aspects of the environment ranging from air, water and waste, to historic preservation and coastal zone management. Although it details inspections and an enforcement plan, the law is ultimately ineffective due to its overarching nature, which makes it difficult to enforce. Law 81 may replace a necessary revision of Law 33; however, it remains vague in its enforcement procedures. For example, Law 81, Article 81 states that national resources will be used in accordance with the provisions that “their rational use will be assured, for which their quantitative and qualitative continuity will be preserved, recycling and recovery systems will be developed, and the ecosystems to which they belong safeguarded.” This portion of the provision elucidates the ambiguous nature of the law, as it continues to delineate objectives without coming up with specific implementation strategies.¶ In 1997, the Earth Summit, a conference sponsored by the United Nations aimed at aiding governments in rethinking economic development and finding ways to halt the destruction of irreplaceable natural resources and pollution of the planet was held in New York. At the Summit, Cuban officials were refreshingly blunt in acknowledging the environmental degradation present on their island. In a pamphlet distributed at the conference, the Havana government stated that “there have been mistakes and shortcomings, due mainly to insufficient environmental awareness, knowledge and education, the lack of a higher management demand, limited introduction and generalization of scientific and technological achievements, as well as the still insufficient incorporation of environmental dimensions in its policies. The authorities also pointed to the insufficient development plans and programs and the absence of a sufficiently integrative and coherent judicial system,” to enforce environmental regulations. After the Earth Summit, Cuba designed and implemented a variety of programs, administrative structures, and public awareness initiatives to promote sound environmental management and sustainable development. Although the conference spurred motivation in environmental matters, Cuba still lacked the economic resources needed to support its share of environmental protection responsibilities due to the loss of its financial ties with the former Soviet Union.¶ The Earth Summit came after the fall of the Soviet Union and the tightening of the U.S. blockade against Cuba in 1992, which resulted in a 35% retrenchment of the Cuban GDP. The Special Period, referring to the cut off of economic subsidies that had regularly come from the former Soviet Union, witnessed a decrease in many environmentally damaging activities both by choice and by necessity. The end of aid from the Russia also resulted in many decisions aimed at resuscitating the Cuban economy. The economic crisis increased pressure to sacrifice environmental protection for economic output. Although development slowed due to economic concerns, the island’s forests were particularly overworked for firewood and finished wood exports. However, the crisis also provided the impetus for pursuing sustainable development strategies. The principle motivating such change has been a realization that if Cuba does not preserve its environment, it will, at the very least, lose its attraction to tourists.¶ Diverging Views¶ Unlike the U.S., which still has never ratified the Kyoto Protocol, Cuba signed the document in 1997, which calls for the stabilization of greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous interference with the global climate system. This legally binding international agreement attempts to tackle the issue of global warming and the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. The U.S., although a signatory of the Kyoto Protocol, has neither ratified nor withdrawn from the Protocol. The signature alone is merely symbolic, as the Kyoto Protocol is non-binding on the United States unless ratified. Although in 2005 the United States was the largest per capita emitter of carbon dioxide from the burning of fossil fuels, it experienced only a modest decline of 2.8 percent from 2007 to 2008. This decline demonstrates that the U.S. has the framework to reverse Cuba’s substandard environmental track record. By aiding Havana, Washington would be able to brand itself as an active conservationist. Such a label would enable the U.S. to create a valuable ecological public image in the international arena.¶ The developmental assistance and economic growth potential that might stem from a U.S.-Cuba partnership might aid in developing enforceable implementation strategies. Even though Cuba’s written regulations characteristically lack feasible, implementable standards. Cuban laws, currently in effect, do provide a foundation for greater conservation activity in the future. The Cuban government does show an interest in encouraging sustainable development initiatives in the future, yet its laws are all based on maintaining a centralized government featuring a command economy. For example, CITMA appears to be trying to affect change, but many aspects of Cuba’s bureaucracy are rooted in the past and it remains difficult to update the ways of an outdated administrative substructure. If the embargo is lifted without a robust partnership and plans for environmental sustainability, the invasion of U.S. consumerism may seriously damage the island.¶ Fear of “Cancunization”¶ Many Cuba well-wishers fear if President Obama lifts the trade embargo, the invasion of raw capitalism could destroy Cuba’s relatively pristine environment. Although the Cuban government points to its environmental laws and the government agency which was established to develop a sustainable environmental policy, these measures have done little up to now to affect substantial change. In several distinct sectors, Cuba seems to remain unprepared for the lifting of the embargo and the island inevitably could face a flood of investors from the United States and elsewhere, eager to exploit the beautiful landscapes of the island, at great cost and risk.¶ After years of relying on government subsidies and protectionism, this rapid growth could generate irreparable shock waves through the economy. Oliver Houck, a professor at Tulane University who aided the Cuban government in writing its environmental protection provisions, said “an invasion of U.S. consumerism, a U.S.-dominated future, could roll over it (Cuba) like a bulldozer,” when the embargo ends. The wider Caribbean region has experienced water contamination, mangrove destruction and sewage problems due to large quantities of tourists and inadequate plumbing. Therefore, U.S. tourism regulations need to be in place in order to protect the precious ecosystem of the island and prohibit over development. Collaboration between the U.S. and Cuba would be mutually beneficial, as the U.S. could use Cuba as a laboratory of sustainable development and U.S. tourism would stimulate Cuba’s stagnant economy, if its negative impact could be controlled. Both countries must agree upon a mutual plan for development.¶ The Environmental Defense Fund (EDF) has conducted research in Cuba since 2000, working with Cuban partners on scientific investigations and strategies for protecting coastal and marine resources. Operating under a special license from the United States government, EDF experts are collaborating with Cuban scientists on research projects aimed at ensuring that if Cuba taps offshore oil and gas reserves, it will be done in an environmentally concious way. The US should establish more partnerships like these as President Obama has the legal authority to institute far-reaching cooperation with Cuba on joint marine environmental projects. These partnerships should be implemented as the first step in creating an elaborate alliance for environmental protection between the two countries.¶ If the embargo is lifted, symbols of meretricious American capitalism are likely to invade the once relatively isolated island. Opinion columnist Cynthia Tucker has commented on such matters: “Mickey Mouse is sure to arrive, bringing with him the aptly predicted full frontal assault of American culture and consumer goods,” suggesting that if Obama lifts the embargo, a functioning system of environmental protection supported by both the U.S. and the Cuban public must be present for the island to be protected.¶ It is Cuba’s lack of development that makes the island attractive to tourists and although tourism boosts the economy, it also could have detrimental effects on the environment. If the embargo is lifted, strict development restrictions need to be in place in order to prevent further environmental exploitation. Currently, without a severe shift in enforcement of environmental laws and the formation of a hard-working U.S.-Cuba partnership, the Caribbean’s most biodiverse island will continue to be damaged. The key to a new dynamic in the U.S.-Cuba relationship might be to embark on a series of strategic actions that aim to establish a bilateral relationship for sustainable development and associated activities based on mutual respect and the autonomy of each country’s sovereignty and traditions.

#### Ecological *resiliency* is *at the tipping point* – sustainable development is key to survival

UNDP 12 (United Nations Development Programme, Biodiversity and Ecosystems Team, guided by senior management in UNDP, “The Future We Want: Biodiversity and Ecosystems—Driving Sustainable Development; United Nations Development Programme Biodiversity and Ecosystems Global Framework 2012-2020,” 2012, p.13, http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/Environment%20and%20Energy/biodiversity/UNDP-Biodiversity-and-Ecosystems-Global-Framework-2012-2020.pdf)

Human survival and wellbeing depend upon biodiversity and healthy ecosystems, and the goods and¶ services they provide. Yet, in recent decades, the world has experienced unprecedented biodiversity loss and¶ ecosystem degradation, undermining the very foundations of life on Earth.¶ Rapid demographic changes, overconsumption, and the use of technologies that damage the environment,¶ now combined with climate change, are pushing our planet to its limits. Severe shortages of food, water and¶ energy are predicted as human pressure on the planet’s climatic, geophysical, atmospheric and ecological¶ processes approach a level at which abrupt global environmental change is likely to occur. Scientists believe¶ we are beginning to transgress the planetary boundaries within which societies have been sustained for the¶ past 10,000 years.ii¶ The loss of biodiversity and ecosystems is a challenge for us all, but it¶ is a particular challenge for the world’s poor. Many of the 1.2 billion¶ people living in severe poverty, on less than US$ 1 a day, depend¶ directly on nature for food, clean water, fuel, medicine, shelter,¶ and reduced vulnerability to climate change and natural disasters.¶ Dependent on ecosystem goods and services for their livelihoods¶ and subsistence, the poor stand to suffer disproportionately from¶ potentially catastrophic changes to fragile ecosystems in coming¶ decades. Ultimately, however, all societies stand to lose.iii¶ The international community faces some stark choices—the current¶ global development model is unsustainable.iv The links between¶ biodiversity and ecosystems and the goods and services they¶ provide, and the roles these play in our economies, are not fully¶ understood or valued. As a result, biodiversity and ecosystems are¶ not managed to protect their present and future values, and the¶ costs of their loss and degradation are escalating.v UNDP’s 2012¶ Human Development Report for Africa ‘Towards a Food Secure¶ Future’ confirms that the loss of biodiversity and ecosystems has negative effects on many aspects of human¶ wellbeing, such as food and energy security, access to clean water and raw materials, and vulnerability to¶ natural disasters.vi¶ The need for global action to eradicate poverty and make growth and consumption sustainable, while¶ combating climate change and respecting planetary¶ boundaries, is urgent and clear. Major changes are¶ required in order to incorporate inclusive, resilient and sustainable development in global and national¶ development policies, and in institutions, attitudes, and decision-making processes.vii

#### Regardless, *perception* of U.S. leadership *spurs* global action – checks short-term extinction

Khosla 9 (Ashok Khosla, President, International Union for Conservation of Nature, former Director, United Nations Environment Programme, recipient of the 2002 Sasakawa Prize, the Nobel Prize of the environmental community, authored over 300 professional papers, including 30 official UNEP documents, Ph.D. experimental physics, Harvard University, “A new President for the United States: We have a dream,” 1-27-2009, http://www.iucn.org/news\_homepage/?2595/new-President-for-the-United-States-We-have-a-dream)

With all the fanfare and show business skills they possess, Americans last week welcomed their new President with an unprecedented display of support and joy. The remarkable resonance President Obama has evoked with his fellow citizens should also encourage a new hope beyond their nation -- and indeed throughout the world.¶ A rejuvenated America, with a renewed purpose, commitment and energy to make its contribution once again towards a better world could well be the turning point that can reverse the current decline in the state of the global economy, the health of its life support systems and the morale of people everywhere. This extraordinary change in regime brings with it the promise of a deep change in attitudes and aspirations of Americans, a change that will lead, hopefully, to new directions in their nation’s policies and action. In particular, we can hope that from being a very reluctant partner in global discussions, especially on issues relating to environment and sustainable development, the United States will become an active leader in international efforts to address the Millennial threats now confronting civilization and even the survival of the human species.¶ For the conservation of biodiversity, so essential to maintaining life on Earth, this promise of change has come not a moment too soon.¶ It would be a mistake to put all of our hopes on the shoulder of one young man, however capable he might be. The environmental challenges the world is facing cannot be addressed by one country, let alone by one man. At the same time, an inspired US President guided by competent people, who does not shy away from exercising the true responsibilities and leadership his country is capable of, could do a lot to spur the international community into action. To paraphrase one of his illustrious predecessors, “the world asks for action and action now.” What was true in President Roosevelt’s America 77 years ago is even more appropriate today.¶ From IUCN’s perspective, the first signals are encouraging. The US has seriously begun to discuss constructive engagement in climate change debates. With Copenhagen a mere 11 months away, this commitment is long overdue and certainly very welcome. Many governments still worry that if they set tough standards to control carbon emissions, their industry and agriculture will become uncompetitive, a fear that leads to a foot-dragging “you go first” attitude that is blocking progress. A positive intervention by the United States could provide the vital catalyst that moves the basis of the present negotiations beyond the narrowly defined national interests that lie at the heart of the current impasse.¶ The logjam in international negotiations on climate change should not be difficult to break if the US were to lead the industrialized countries to agree that much of their wealth has been acquired at the expense of the environment (in this case greenhouse gases emitted over the past two hundred years) and that with the some of the benefits that this wealth has brought, comes the obligation to deal with the problems that have resulted as side-effects. With equitable entitlement to the common resources of the planet, an agreement that is fair and acceptable to all nations should be easy enough to achieve. Caps on emissions and sharing of energy efficient technologies are simply in the interest of everyone, rich or poor. And both rich and poor must now be ready to adopt less destructive technologies – based on renewables, efficiency and sustainability – both as a goal with intrinsic merit and also as an example to others.¶ But climate is not the only critical global environmental issue that this new administration will have to deal with. Conservation of biodiversity, a crucial prerequisite for the wellbeing of all humanity, no less America, needs as much attention, and just as urgently. The United States’ self-interest in conserving living natural resources strongly converges with the global common good in every sphere: in the oceans, by arresting the precipitate decline of fish stocks and the alarming rise of acidification; on land, by regenerating the health of our soils, forests and rivers; and in the atmosphere by reducing the massive emission of pollutants from our wasteful industries, construction, agriculture and transport systems.¶ Historically, American consumers have acquired highly inefficient habits in the way they use natural resources – energy, materials, water. And these consumers produce enough wastes, particularly greenhouse gases, to overwhelm nature’s capacity to absorb them. US corporations have invented remarkable products that have been the source of material wellbeing for hundreds of millions around the world, but have used production systems whose unintended fallout threatens the very viability of life on our planet. These consumption patterns and production methods must change, but that does not mean going back to the Stone Age. An average citizen of Switzerland, whose per capita GDP is higher than USA’s emits one third as much CO2 as an American. And in other societies and cultures, a full and happy life can be had for one third of what the Swiss consume. Doing more with less is possible – usually by doing it differently -- and now it has become essential, an issue of planetary survival.¶ Today, our self-worth seems largely to be measured by what we have, what we use and what we possess. Both nature and the economy are telling us that we have to identify ourselves with what we are, what we save and what we contribute – human beings living in harmony with each other and with nature. Judging from his inauguration address, President Obama has clearly understood this. Can we hope that the citizens of his great nation can also do so? The fact that they elected him suggests, hopefully, that they have affirmed with a resounding “Yes, we can!”¶ And surely they and the rest of us have no longer a choice: just as clearly, we must.

#### The way we have discussed the environment is good – it increases public awareness, spurs coalition-building, and is educational

Matthew 02 (Richard A, associate professor of international relations and environmental political at the University of California at Irvine, Summer, ECSP Report 8:109-124)

In addition, environmental security's language and findings can benefit conservation and sustainable development."' Much environmental security literature emphasizes the importance of development assistance, sustainable livelihoods, fair and reasonable access to environmental goods, and conservation practices as the vital upstream measures that in the long run will contribute to higher levels of human and state security. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) are examples of bodies that have been quick to recognize how the language of environmental security can help them. The scarcity/conflict thesis has alerted these groups to prepare for the possibility of working on environmental rescue projects in regions that are likely to exhibit high levels of related violence and conflict. These groups are also aware that an association with security can expand their acceptance and constituencies in some countries in which the military has political control, For the first time in its history; the contemporary environmental movement can regard military and intelligence agencies as potentialallies in the struggle to contain or reverse humangenerated environmental change. (In many situations, of course, the political history of the military--as well as its environmental record-raise serious concerns about the viability of this cooperation.) Similarly, the language of security has provided a basis for some fruitful discussions between environmental groups and representatives of extractive industries. In many parts of the world, mining and petroleum companies have become embroiled in conflict. These companies have been accused of destroying traditional economies, cultures, and environments; of political corruption; and of using private militaries to advance their interests. They have also been targets of violence, Work is now underway through the environmental security arm of the International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) to address these issues with the support of multinational corporations. Third, the general conditions outlined in much environmental security research can help organizations such as USAID, the World Bank, and IUCN identify priority cases--areas in which investments are likely to have the greatest ecological and social returns. For all these reasons, IUCN elected to integrate environmental security into its general plan at the Amman Congress in 2001. Many other environmental groups and development agencies are taking this perspective seriously (e.g. Dabelko, Lonergan& Matthew, 1999). However, for the most part these efforts remain preliminary.' Conclusions Efforts to dismiss environment and security research and policy activities on the grounds that they have been unsuccessful are premature and misguided. This negative criticism has all too often been based on an excessively simplified account of the research findings of Homer-Dixon and a few others. Homer-Dixon’s scarcity-conflict thesis has made important and highly visible contributions to the literature, but it is only a small part of a larger and very compelling theory. This broader theory has roots in antiquity and speaks to the pervasive conflicts and security implications of complex nature-society relationships. The theory places incidents of violence in larger structural and historical contexts while also specifying contemporarily significant clusters of variables. From this more generalized and inclusive perspective, violence and conflict are revealed rarely as a society’s endpoint and far more often as parts of complicated adaptation processes. The contemporary research on this classical problematic has helped to revive elements of security discourse and analysis that were marginalized during the Cold War. It has also made valuable contributions to our understanding of the requirements of human security, the diverse impacts of globalization, and the nature of contemporary transnational security threats. Finall,y environmental security research has been valuable in myriad ways to a range of academics, policymakers, and activists, although the full extent of these contributions remains uncertain, rather than look for reasons to abandon this research and policy agenda, now is the time to recognize and to build on the remarkable achievements of the entire environmental security field.

#### Independently, cooperation on travel is key to *data sharing* and global pandemic *containment*

Discovery News 13 (Discovery News, “Could Cuba Help U.S. Fight Tropical Diseases?” 2-11-2013, http://news.discovery.com/human/cuba-help-fight-tropical-diseases-dengue-fever.htm)

When it comes to issues like the spread of infectious disease, increased collaboration with Cuba may just be good medicine. The Gist U.S. scientists and doctors are looking to Cuba for help with infectious diseases.¶ Cuban scientists are experts on diseases like dengue fever, which has become more common in the U.S.¶ Political relations with the Communist country and recent shakeups in Congress may stand in the way of cross-country collaboration.¶ In the wake of this month's Republican electoral shakeup in Congress, talk of lifting the U.S. travel ban to Communist Cuba is pretty much off the table. But President Barack Obama still has the executive power to ease the amount of red tape faced by U.S. medical researchers who can travel to the island.¶ For some, such a move might awaken fears of radical socialism, but others say when it comes to issues like the spread of tropical and infectious disease from global warming, increased collaboration with a neighbor is just good medicine.¶ "I think because of climate change, because some of these infectious diseases are coming through in epic forms, collaboration between all countries is more needed than ever," said Gail A. Reed, the International Director of MEDICC, an American non-profit organization working to enhance global health cooperation with Cuba.¶ Hepatitis, chikungunya, bird flu and H1N1 are all diseases that concern U.S. epidemiologists. But dengue fever, the most common of mosquito-born illnesses, is one of the biggest. This summer, the Centers for Disease Control reported that five percent of residents in Key West, Fla. had been exposed to the deadly virus.¶ Dengue was eradicated in the United States in the 1940s, with just a few cases creeping across the U.S.-Mexico border in the 1980s. It is endemic to most of the Caribbean, but not to Cuba. In fact, strong research and preventative measures have won Havana's Pedro Kouri Cuban Tropical Medicine Institute special status as a World Health Organization Collaborating Center for Dengue Study and Control.¶ "In that sense, U.S. scientists are very interested in collaborating with Cuba because they have a history of investigations and successful research not only into the impact but the viral origins," Reed said.¶ That interest dates to before the 1959 Cuban Revolution that brought Fidel Castro to power. In 1889, the American Public Health Association requested that the United States government annex Cuba from Spain to protect Americans from Yellow Fever.¶ Panic over the disease helped fuel the 1898 Spanish American War, says Pedro Orduñez, a Cuban doctor who has published extensively on U.S.-Cuba medical research in both Washington and Havana.¶ "Health in Cuba is the icon of the revolution," noted Orduñez, explaining that Cuba's invention of a broad-based primary care system helped it assert its sovereign identity.¶ That faltered during the 1991 collapse of the Soviet Union, Cuba's main economic backer. Thousands of Cuban rafters set sail for Florida, and many of the Cubans who remained began to suffer epidemics such as optic neuropathy, a temporary blindness associated with certain nutritional deficiencies.¶ As a result, the U.S. government loosened some U.S. travel and trade restrictions on humanitarian aid. That, in turn, pried open collaborative doors a little further, allowing new organizations such as MEDICC to create U.S.-Cuba medical exchanges. In 2001, Cuba offered full-ride scholarships for up to 500 U.S. students at its Latin American Medical School, and the U.S. government obliged.¶ Dr. Sitembile Sales, a 2010 U.S. graduate of the Latin American Medical School in Havana, is grateful both nations allowed her to access the Cuban government's medical scholarship. She says it gave her invaluable training for crises and epidemics anywhere. During her third year of medicine, she was thrown onto 24-hour hospital rounds for two dengue fever epidemics.¶ "There were meetings with our professors saying this is war, we have an attack … there's no room for mistakes," she told Discovery News. "The good thing is that people never dropped like flies because we never let them get to that point."¶ Obstacles still abound. Sales needed a special student license to travel to Cuba, and a general license that allows American professionals to conduct research there is not as general as it sounds.¶ Researchers must scrutinize every aspect of their trip to make sure their spending and collaborative habits do not infringe upon U.S. sanctions. That means knowing what research equipment they can carry without a separate license, how much money they can spend in country and on what, how their work will be disseminated later, and under what specific contexts they can collaborate with or learn from the Cuban people.¶ For example, researchers have to ask for a different license if they plan to attend a Cuba-sponsored science conference or workshop, and in Cuba, most events are government run. Obtaining a U.S. license for conferences or research equipment involves mounds of paperwork and an answer can take months. Interest groups say these factors slow down the process of participating in projects that would otherwise prove to be a quick and efficient way of obtaining important medical data or learning new methods for curbing an epidemic.¶

#### Lack of Cuban medical data ensures containment failure – the *only country* which doesn’t report

Porcelain 13 (Sherri L. Porcelain, Adjunct Professor and Senior Lecturer in Global Public Health in World Affairs, and Director of the Disaster Research Program for Global Public Health, Department of International Studies, Senior Research Associate at the Institute for Cuban and Cuban-American Studies, and Instructor, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, Miller School of Medicine, University of Miami, Ph.D. International Relations, International Development, and International Health Policy, University of Miami, Masters in Public Health, University of Miami, Certification in Primary Health Care Strategies in Developing Countries, University of London, Certification in Disaster Assistance Response Team Field Assessment Training, Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance / USAID, “Cuba’s Silence is Dangerous to Your Health,” Focus on Cuba, Iss.197, 8-5-2013, http://ctp.iccas.miami.edu/FOCUS\_Web/Issue197.htm)

After a century hiatus, cholera, malaria and dengue have returned to Cuba. This is no surprise since Cuba’s deteriorated water, sewage, sanitation and housing systems all create the ideal environment for rapid disease spread. Dengue, a mosquito borne viral disease, and cholera, a bacterial infection contracted by drinking water or eating food contaminated with a strain of cholera, present threats to both the local population and tourists visiting the island.¶ Luis Suarez Rosas, a physician with Cuba’s National School of Medicine, accurately captures the paradox of Cuban health care today in using the term epidemiologic silence to describe Cuba’s official position on disease outbreak information. Cuba is a unique case study because of its long history of highly trained infectious disease specialists as seen in the yellow fever response in the early 1900s, and the prominence of the Pedro Kouri Tropical Medicine Institute founded in 1937. Yet, today, the policy to call dengue euphemistically as a febrile illness or cholera as a gastrointestinal illness represents an unethical national public health policy affecting individuals beyond their national borders. This choice to withhold information derails global public health goals to inform and protect travelers; it also encourages rumors and creates confusion. Suarez Rosas, using dengue as a recent example, explains how this artificial epidemiologic silence does not help patients, nor does it address the risk or the perception of the severity of the disease. Additionally, it does not respond to the culprit, the aedes aegypti mosquito, which also carries the yellow fever virus.¶ While both the Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and the Pan American Health Organization (PAHO) provide health alerts and identify health problems, their information often relies upon the official reporting of information. However, the Program for Monitoring Emerging Diseases (ProMED), operating under the International Society for Infectious Disease, is an internet-based information system created in 1994 with the purpose of sharing emerging and re-emerging infectious disease information. ProMED mail welcomes all sources of information, including independent journalists who have reported outbreaks long before the Cuban government forced to make an official statement. ProMED continues to share information about the re-emergence of cholera in Cuba’s Manzanillo (Granma) Province in 2012 that spread through eastern provinces, and reached the western capital of Havana.¶ In June 2013, an independent journalist from Hablemos Press reported approximately 30 cases of malaria in Cuba. The Cuban government claimed these cases are imported by tourists or from returning residents that traveled to an endemic area. Imported cases of malaria are not new; however, the history of Cuba’s denials of other re-emerging diseases compels one to question the veracity of the government’s official report.¶ Malaria expert John Beier, Professor of Public Health Sciences at the University of Miami Miller School of Medicine, states that Cuba is receptive to malaria since the mosquito has not been eliminated. It is also important to acknowledge that local pocket of transmissions can exist through imported cases from other areas in the region, such as Hispaniola where malaria is known to exist. During rainy season, and when vector population increases, the risk of transmission increases as well. Still no official government report exists.¶ Sharing good epidemiologic evidence in a timely fashion is a reasonable expectation for global public health cooperation to be maintained. Promoting global health security begins with greater transparency on potential health threats. These are not state secrets as proposed during the 1980s and 1990s denial of Cuba’s dengue re-emergence, along with the incarceration of health professionals who released such data.¶ Cuba’s policy to withhold information on infectious disease threats for the purpose of protecting their health image, or their tourism industry is unacceptable in an era where rapid and frequent transport across borders occurs. International travelers and concerned citizens everywhere must realize that mosquitoes and microbes do not require their own passport stamp for entry into the United States, and the intrepid stowaways may arrive with their presence undetected.¶ Based upon what we know and don’t know-¶ We need to:¶ Promote greater awareness about mosquito avoidance and cholera, dengue and malaria prevention for travelers to Cuba. While other countries may have higher reported cases, their risk is documented through transparency in their reporting. On June 27, 2013 the U.S. Interests Section in Havana, Cuba posted an alert message for U.S. citizens regarding road safety and traffic related deaths and injuries. This is an important health and safety message, so why not extend this to other public health issues such as dengue, malaria, and cholera?¶ Become more proactive and use Rapid Diagnostic Kits (RDK) for early identification of diseases such as dengue and malaria. This could be especially important to Travel Medicine Clinics where licensed and trained health professionals have the ability to do accurate testing and patient histories. Dr. Kunjana Mavunda, Medical Director and Tropical Disease Specialist at International Travel Clinic in South Miami, Florida supports this approach. “I’ve been looking at these rapid diagnostic kits as part of the patient care and it is important that you get a good history of the patient and identify potential exposure risks.” She indicated that Cuba’s neglected infrastructure makes it ripe for potential disease spread.¶ Generate a wider dialogue concerning Cuba’s epidemiologic silence. Notwithstanding the issues surrounding dengue, malaria and cholera, a bird flu spread remains a possibility. The 2003 Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) coronavirus scare originated in South China and today the Middle East Respiratory Syndrome (MERS), another coronavirus, lurks nearby. Will anyone hold Cuba accountable for failure to report early outbreaks? What about possible impact in South Florida?¶ Global health security depends upon the rigor of good science, the willingness of nations to uphold policies to protect both their citizens and visitors, and the timely reporting of potential health threats. A world that is forced to rely on rumors puts everyone at risk. Consequently, silence is dangerous to your health.

#### Drug-resistant pandemics are *inevitable* and have an *invisible threshold*

Conniff 13 (Richard Conniff, science journalist, writes for Time, Smithsonian, Atlantic Monthly, The New York Times Magazine, National Geographic, Audubon Magazine, included in The Best American Science and Nature Writing in 2000, 2002, and 2006, Guggenheim Fellowship, Loeb Journalism Award, “Guardians Against a Global Pandemic: Inside the battle to protect all of us from the next Superbug,” Men’s Health, 4-8-2013, http://www.menshealth.com/health/guardians-against-global-pandemic?fullpage=true)

Last September, a 49-year-old Qatari man who'd recently traveled to Saudi Arabia was hospitalized in Doha with a nasty respiratory illness. He deteriorated rapidly, and doctors promptly airlifted him to a London hospital, where he wound up on life support with kidney and lung failure. From respiratory tract samples, investigators soon teased out an unknown coronavirus—the same one that had just killed an otherwise healthy 60-year-old in Saudi Arabia.¶ For one tense moment, epidemiologists thought they might be witnessing a replay of the devastating 2003 SARS epidemic, also brought on by a coronavirus. But the threat this time looked worse: Three million people were about to descend on Saudi Arabia for the hajj, a Muslim pilgrimage to Mecca already well known for the overnight global redistribution of illnesses via passenger jet.¶ Disease detectives of all specialties caught the next available flights into the heart of the potential outbreak. Epidemiologists tracked down anyone who had been even remotely associated with the victims. Veterinarians wearing protective gear went to a farm that one of the victims had visited; they took samples from hundreds of domestic and wild animals in order to identify the species from which the virus had jumped to humans. This effort, unseen by the public but involving hundreds of experts around the world, soon established that the disease did not, in fact, spread easily from one person to another. The hajj wasn't a hot zone after all.¶ It was a lucky break. As of early March, the new virus had sickened only 14 people and killed eight. But the episode was also a reminder that the supply of emerging diseases in the modern world is almost eye-bleedingly endless, and that they can turn up anywhere. One such pathogen, West Nile virus, killed 243 people in the United States last year. And a Denver hospital last summer experienced an alarming outbreak of a notorious New Delhi "superbug," a bacteria with broad resistance to almost all antibiotics. Health officials will tell you that the Big One, a disease outbreak on the order of the influenza pandemic of 1918, could happen any day—and that sooner or later it almost certainly will.¶ They'll also tell you that men in particular need to pay attention to the potential hazards: We travel more than women, particularly for business. Our trips tend to take us to more-remote destinations. So maybe it shouldn't come as a surprise that we also have a much higher incidence of malaria, dengue fever, hepatitis, and Legionnaires' disease (which last year killed 13 people in Quebec City, and three at a downtown Chicago Marriott hotel)—and perhaps other diseases yet unknown. (Nervous about germs? Pick up a copy of Don't Get Sick, a panic-free pocket guide to living in a germ-filled world.)¶ The good news? Science has become remarkably adept at identifying and containing potential outbreaks right at the start, even in the most remote locations, and often when only a handful of people—rather than hundreds—have become sick. In other words, they generally halt the outbreak before it can turn up on a 747 bound for New York City.¶ Some of the credit goes to rapidly advancing technologies, from Internet data mining to DNA fingerprinting. In the early 1980s, for instance, it took 3 devastating years to identify the virus that causes AIDS. With modern gene sequencing, says Columbia University virus hunter W. Ian Lipkin, M.D., it would take just 48 hours today. And part of the credit belongs to governments, which have learned painful lessons about the consequences of allowing a new disease to get out of hand: Since 1981, AIDS has killed more than 30 million people worldwide, with no end in sight. (How dangerous is AIDS in 2013? Here's What You Need to Know About HIV Today.) ¶ But if we are lucky enough to see another year pass without some pandemic lurching up out of nowhere to kill vast swaths of humanity, it's mainly because of the people who now constantly watch for early signs of trouble—as well as the ones who parachute in when things go wrong to save lives and stop epidemics. They tend to be unusual characters, people who can chat casually about "flavors" of Ebola and about the addictive thrill of their work on the front lines of possible outbreaks. But they also know firsthand what it takes to keep the world safe—and how to stay healthy themselves, even as people all around them die.¶ At CDC headquarters in Atlanta one day recently, as the coronavirus investigation was wrapping up, a daily map of trouble spots included an Ebola outbreak in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Marburg fever in Uganda, cholera in Haiti, polio in Pakistan, and dengue fever in Portugal. Hantavirus, which is transmitted through urine, droppings, or saliva mainly from deer mice (and which also disproportionately affects men), had recently killed three vacationers at Yosemite National Park, and a case of Crimean-Congo hemorrhagic fever had just turned up in, of all places, Glasgow, Scotland.¶ It is a dangerous world out there, especially because of the kinds of travel we now consider normal. In his office in the division of global migration and quarantine at the CDC, director Martin Cetron, M.D., plays a computerized display tracking a single day's passenger flights, streams of yellow lights gently flowing in from the farthest corners of the earth, coalescing in bright megalopolitan splotches of light, then radiating outward again. "This is what makes me nervous," he says.¶ Nearly a billion people a year cross international borders, some of them inevitably carrying infections. Each international flight landing on U.S. runways also carries, on average, 1.6 live mosquitoes. In 1999, one theory holds, some of these jet-setting mosquitoes may have delivered West Nile encephalitis to New York. West Nile has since spread to 48 states and killed about 1,500 in the United States. As bad as that outbreak was, afflictions that are far more widespread may yet come if what Dr. Cetron calls the "invisible infrastructure" of disease prevention ever falters.

#### The impact is *extinction* – reporting and containment are key

Collins 10 (Brenda Collins, Science Writer at Henry M. Jackson Foundation, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, National Institutes for Health, former Adjunct Professor of Microbiology, Marymount University, Ph.D. Microbiology, Meharry Medical College, B.A. Biology, University of Evansville, “The perfect microbial storm,” Baltimore Biology Examiner, 4-8-2010, http://www.examiner.com/article/the-perfect-microbial-storm)

According to the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID), infectious diseases remain a worldwide problem and leading causes of death for the following reasons:¶ 1) emergence of new infectious diseases, examples HIV/AIDS, severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS), Lyme borreliosis (Lyme disease)¶ 2) re-emergence of old infectious diseases, examples, dengue, tuberculosis (TB), malaria¶ 3) persistence of intractable infectious diseases, examples, Guillain-Barre syndrome (GBS), sexually transmitted diseases, Hepatitis B.¶ Emerging infectious diseases or more aptly, newly recognized diseases, and re-emerging infectious diseases, also known as previously recognized diseases have significantly increased in the last two decades. These infections include “deliberately emerging diseases,” namely, bioterrorism like anthrax.¶ Emerging diseases are not unique to modern life, but have appeared as notable epidemics, e.g., the Black Death (plague), smallpox, cholera, throughout recorded history. The common denominator among these emerging diseases over the ages is probably a set of circumstances that in combination contributed to or created the arrival of disease in abundance. In today’s complex world, a variety of factors continue to provide ample opportunities for disease emergence, and with international travel, present a case for the “perfect microbial storm.”¶ In addition to the increasing globalization with people, animals, and products traversing the world, other factors that give impetus to emerging and re-emerging diseases are: climate changes, war and civil unrest, poverty, urbanization, decreased vaccination compliance, and indiscriminate use of antimicrobials and pesticides among others. Also, impinging wildlife and the commingling of multiple species, particularly under stressful conditions, has facilitated the extended range of hosts of pathogens and promoted species jump.¶ About 60% of emerging human pathogens are zoonotic, meaning acquired from animals, and more than 70% of those are from wildlife. The zoonotic source is not limited to animal contact but more often arises from consumption of infected meat or animal products such as unpasteurized dairy products. Of major concern are vector-borne (e.g., ticks, mosquitoes) infections that can be transmitted from wildlife to domestic animals and to humans. Extremely large populations of deer in the eastern U.S. (for instance, Missouri) are a considerable factor in the emergence of new tick-borne diseases such as STARI, the putative etiological agent being the bacterium, Borrelia lonestari.¶ Virulence traits can also evolve resulting in wider transmission and altered pathogenicity. Gene mutation acted upon by natural selection, recombination, and other evolutionary forces serve to further variation in the genetic constitution of potential pathogens. High mutation rates are especially notable in viruses because of their relatively small genomes and short generation times.¶ Emerging and re-emerging diseases have been and probably will always be a challenge to human survival. To mitigate the “perfect microbial storm,” strategies are needed to increase and integrate disease surveillance systems from the local level to global networks. For instance, the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) has initiated a program assigning veterinarians with human public health experience to international agencies and hotspots around the world. Monitoring and response activities to areas of concern should greatly impact the prevention of disease emergence.

#### Our rhetoric of disease is important – it educates us about public safety and encourages coalitions

Alexander Kelle, July 2005, Lecturer in International Politics (MA, PhD Frankfurt) and Professor, Department of Peace Studies, University of Bradford, Bradford Regime Review Paper No.2, Bioterrorism and the Securitization of Public Health in the United States of America - Implications for Public Health and Biological Weapons Arms Control, <http://www.bradford.ac.uk/acad/sbtwc/regrev/Kelle_SecuritizationinUS.pdf>

This paper set up to trace the securitization of public health in the US. As has been shown, the Sarin gas attack in Tokyo and the Oklahoma City bombing in 1995 triggered calls for an expansion of countermeasures to the perceived rise in the bioterrorist threat, with these measures increasingly focussing on the merger of public health and biodefense. One indicator for the successful securitization of parts of the US public health system can be found in the terminology employed for some of the legislative measures enacted or organisational structures set up in response to these calls: the Metropolitan Medical Strike Teams established under the 1996 Nunn-Lugar-Domenici Act are an early example in this process of utilizing a terminology traditionally reserved for military or security forces to describe a newly established public health unit. Likewise, following the change in language used to label legislative measures shows a development from acts of Congress primarily concerned with Weapons of Mass Destruction in general terms in the mid-1990s – in which public health preparedness plays a secondary role at best – to the primary concern about health and biosecurity expressed in titles like the 2002 Public Health Security and Bioterrorism Preparedness and Response Act. The changing discourse about public health and biodefense has, as shown above, alsoled to a substantial increase in funding and shifting budgeting priorities. Thus,not only have a new threat – bioterrorism – and a new object to be secured – the public’s health – been identified, but also new countermeasures to address the new threat been enacted. To use the terminology of Waever,the threat-defense sequence of successful securitization has come full circle. The securitization of public health in the United States is a fact of life and not likely to be reversed in the foreseeable futureas it is a function of bioterrorism being perceived as the number one security threat to US security.Given the probable durability of the underlying threat perception the question arises what the potential implications will be for public health. For the increased federal funding for public health preparedness to result in a positive development of the public health infrastructure in general it would have to increase cooperation among the three levels of government(federal-state-local), address the basic needs of the public health system and not just focus on specialized anti-bioterrorism measures or equipment and provide the increased funding made available since 2002 on a continuous basis. However, it is questionable whether such a positive course of developments is likely to materialize. As far as the cooperation between the federal, state, and local levels of government is concerned,recent studies have shown the problems to be overcome for the public health system to be effectively integrated in the anti-bioterrorism effort. One report focussing on the strategic national stockpile (SNS) for example concluded thatthere is a clear disconnect between the provision of the medicines and other supplies by the federal government on one hand, and the capacities to distribute these supplies on the state and local level.99However, the coordination problem does not seem to be limited to capabilities to logistically handle a public health emergency on the state and local levels. Rather, there still seems to be confusion about the threat assessment underlying the anti-bioterrorism policies of the federal government. This complicates planning of the response to this threat across the three levels of government. In addition, as one recent survey has revealed, there is still a sigificant proportion of public health officials on the state and local levels which do not rank bioterrorism as one of the most important public health issues. They instead identify behavioral health, chronic diseases, and access to basic health care as their top priorities in the coming years.100 Not surprisingly then, these members of the public health workforce – instead of preparing for an event of bioterrorism which might never materialize –see a greater utility in concentrating resources on public health’s long established core missions. The US is one of the most important actors in the BW prohibition regime. Seen in a historical perspective, the US unilateral renunciation of BW was instrumental in paving the way for the 1972 BWC, and ever since successive US governments have placed a heavy emphasis during BWC review conferences on treaty compliant behavior of other BWC states parties. One of the normative guideposts for states to follow in order to be in compliance with their obligations under the BWC stems from the convention’s Article IV, which gives expression to the internalization norm.101 On first glance, it could seem that the expansion of public health related programs, the search for better BW countermeasures through the massive increase in biodefense related biomedial research activities is in line with the regime’s internalization norm. However, as the above quoted criticism by Leitenberg and others shows, some of these very activities are pushing the boundaries of what is permissible under the provisions of the BWC. To the extent that other states will follow the US lead in these activities, the meaning of another regime norm, that of BW non-acquisition, might become increasingly contested over time. On a more positive note, one could argue that another regime norm, identified in the previous briefing paper as a potential beneficiary of the securitization of public health, i.e.the assistance norm, might be strengthened as a result of US policies at the intersection of public health and national security. One could argue that all these civilian biodefense efforts will ultimately lead to improved defensive capabilities to counter a BW attack. Under BWC Article VIIthis should put the US in a much better position to come to other states’ assistance**.**

#### Even if our predictions aren’t perfect, acting on relative confidence of scenarios materializing is good – the alt is either political gridlock or pure reaction

Ulfelder 11 Jay Ulfelder is Research Director for the Political Instability Task Force, Science Applications International Corporation "Why Political Instability Forecasts Are Less Precise Than We’d Like (and Why It’s Still Worth Doing)" May 5 dartthrowingchimp.wordpress.com/2011/05/05/why-political-instability-forecasts-are-less-precise-than-wed-like-and-why-its-still-worth-doing/

If this is the best we can do, then what’s the point? Well, consider the alternatives. For starters, we might decide to skip statistical forecasting altogether and just target our interventions at cases identified by expert judgment as likely onsets. Unfortunately, those expert judgments are probably going to be an even less reliable guide than our statistical forecasts, so this “solution” only exacerbates our problem.¶ Alternatively, we could take no preventive action and just respond to events as they occur. If the net costs of responding to crises as they happen are roughly equivalent to the net costs of prevention, then this is a reasonable choice. Maybe responding to crises isn’t really all that costly; maybe preventive action isn’t effective; or maybe preventive action is potentially effective but also extremely expensive. Under these circumstances, early warning is not going to be as useful as we forecasters would like.¶ If, however, any of those last statements are false–if responding to crises already underway is very costly, or if preventive action is (relatively) cheap and sometimes effective–then we have an incentive to use forecasts to help guide that action, in spite of the lingering uncertainty about exactly where and when those crises will occur.¶ Even in situations where preventive action isn’t feasible or desirable, reasonably accurate forecasts can still be useful if they spur interested observers to plan for contingencies they otherwise might not have considered. For example, policy-makers in one country might be rooting for a dictatorship in another country to fall but still fail to plan for that event because they don’t expect it to happen any time soon. A forecasting model which identifies that dictatorship as being at high or increasing risk of collapse might encourage those policy-makers to reconsider their expectations and, in so doing, lead them to prepare better for that event.¶ Where does that leave us? For me, the bottom line is this: even though forecasts of political instability are never going to be as precise as we’d like, they can still be accurate enough to be helpful, as long as the events they predict are ones for which prevention or preparation stand a decent chance of making a (positive) difference.

#### Commonly accepted methodological standards are sufficient to demonstrate the truth value of our advantage claims – reject totalizing claims about their knowledge base

Majone 81 (Giandomenico Majone, “Policies as Theories,” Policy Studies Review Annual, vol.5, ed. Irving Louis Horowitz, p.16-17, googlebook)

Some form of conventionalism is the ines-¶ capable logical consequence of fallibilism. If¶ there is no demonstrative certainty for the con-¶ clusions of science, their ‘truth' or, at any rate,¶ their acceptability as scientific results, must be¶ established by convention: through a con-¶ sensus of experts in the field, and the fulfilment¶ of certain methodological and professional¶ canons the rules of the scientific game.¶ The problem of testing the correctness of a¶ policy or decision is analogous to that of¶ determining the truth of a scientific theory.¶ According to the received view of policy analy-¶ sis—in which policy-making is equated to deci-¶ sion-making, and the latter is formalized as a¶ means-end relationship - a decision is correct¶ “if it can be shown to attain some specific¶ objective, where the objective can be specified¶ without describing the decision itself” [12,¶ p. 49]. Such a proof requires that three condi-¶ tions be simultaneously satisfied: (a) it must be¶ possible to detect the specific effects of the¶ decision against a noisy background of con-¶ comilant decisions, measurement errors, and¶ random fluctuations of the system; (b) a well-¶ tested theory connecting means and ends is¶ available; and (c) there is agreement on goals.¶ If even one of these conditions is violated, no¶ objective test of correctness is possible. It has¶ been argued that in such a case agreement on¶ policy is the only practicable test of ‘good\*¶ policy: policy-makers may agree on policy¶ itself, even if they do not agree on goals or¶ theory. But even more important than such di-¶ rect agreement on policy as a test of correct-¶ ness, is agreement on procedures, on the rules¶ of the policy game. In the law, in public admin-¶ istration and. to an increasing extent, also in¶ business administration, decisions are accepted¶ not because they can be shown to produce¶ desired outcomes, but because of a generalized¶ agreement on decision-making procedures.¶ Reliance on detailed procedures, whether in en-¶ vironmental regulations, in the licensing of¶ nuclear power plants, or in industrial quality¶ control, greatly increases the costs of decision-¶ making but it is also an unavoidable conse-¶ quence of the cognitive and social complexity¶ of today's problems. As long as the correctness¶ or fairness of the outcome can be determined¶ unambiguously, the manner in which the deci-¶ sion is taken is largely immaterial: only results¶ count. But when the factual or value premises¶ are moot, when no objective criterion of truth¶ exists, procedural aspects acquire special sig-¶ nificance.¶ Belief in the possibility of discovering correct¶ solutions for a wide variety of problems has¶ probably served a useful ideological function in¶ the early stages of development of systems and¶ policy analysis. Today, the traditional preoc-¶ cupation with analytic methods stressing out-¶ come rather than process must give way to a¶ broader approach, in which procedural design¶ (alternative methods of structuring the decision¶ process) assumes primary importance. Natur-¶ ally, the criteria for choosing among decision-¶ making procedures are not the same as those¶ used in choosing among alternatives for a par-¶ ticular decision. While in the latter case effec-¶ tiveness and efficiency are the dominant cri-¶ teria of choice, the metacriterion for evaluating¶ procedures is legitimacy -the capacity of a¶ procedure to elicit generalized acceptance for¶ the decisions it produces, regardless of their¶ substantive consequences. One hopes, of¶ course, that good procedures will increase the¶ probability of good decisions, but, as Popper¶ has often remarked, it is impossible to justify¶ the rules of a game (including the rules of the¶ scientific game) only in terms of success.¶ Science as craft work¶ The work of the scientist requires knowledge¶ that is acquired only through practice and pre-¶ cept and which therefore is not scientific in¶ character. Earlier traditions in the philosophy¶ of science, being mainly concerned with the¶ epistemological problem of truth, have ignored¶ the craft aspects of scientific knowledge. Yet.¶ without an appreciation of these aspects “there¶ is no possibility of resolving the paradox of the¶ radical difference between the subjective, inten-¶ sely personal activity of creative science, and¶ the objective, impersonal knowledge which¶ results from it” [15. p. 75].¶ Craft knowledge is a repertoire of proce-¶ dures and judgments that are partly personal,¶ partly social. Thus, when a scientist¶ decides whether a batch of data is of acceptable¶ quality, he applies standards that derive from¶ his own experience, but also reflect the profes-¶ sional norms of his teachers and colleagues, as¶ well as culturally determined criteria of ade-¶ quacy. Personal and social judgments are also¶ involved in data manipulation, in the choice of¶ tools and models, in the selection of evidence,¶ and in the construction of an argument.¶ The importance of craft knowledge and ex-¶ perience is even greater in policy analysis.¶ Because the conclusions of a policy study can-¶ not be proved in the sense in which a theorem¶ is proved, or even in the manner of the pro-¶ positions of natural science, they must satisfy¶ generally accepted criteria of adequacy. Such¶ criteria are derived not from abstract logical¶ canons but from craft experience, depending as¶ they do on the special features of the problem,¶ on the quality of data and limitations of avail-¶ able tools, on the time constraints imposed on¶ the analysts, and on the requirements of the¶ client.

#### The alternative to science is genocide – it promotes open thinking and discussion that is key to preventing fear-mongering and fascism

Gleick 9 Dr. Peter Gleick is president of the Pacific Institute, an internationally recognized water expert and a MacArthur Fellow, “New McCarthyism: Fear of science and the war on rationality,” <http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/blogs/gleick/detail??blogid=104&entry_id=47022>

As more and more of the world looks to knowledge, education, and science as the routes out of poverty and conflict, parts of America seems to be slipping back toward the Dark Ages, when fear of knowledge and science led to an impoverishment of civilization that had lasting effects for centuries. I've recently returned from two weeks in northern Europe and a series of scientific water meetings and discussions with people from over 130 countries. They read the news from the United States with incredulity. America is still seen as the place to come for aspiring students and scientists around the world. Our public universities, despite assaults on budgets, independence, and knowledge, still struggle to maintain their excellence. But my friends and colleagues from overseas are increasingly shocked, as are many of us in the U.S., by the expanding efforts of home-grown extremists to undermine rational discourse, eliminate the use of fact and science in policymaking, and shut down public debate over the vital issues of our times through hate, vitriol, and ad hominem attacks. Looking through the eyes of my overseas colleagues, what do we see? We see a debate over providing health care to every American that is based -- not on facts or civilized discourse -- but on screaming mobs shutting down public discussions and the use of straw man arguments to promote fear among the public and policymakers. Yet every major country of Europe provides basic health care for its population. We see President Obama appoint one of the nation's best scientists in the areas of energy, environment, and national security -- Dr. John Holdren -- to be his Science Advisor, and then have right-wing mouthpieces like Glenn Beck spread ad hominem lies about him because of their fear that facts and actual science may once again inform Presidential action. This should be a recognizable tactic to us -- lying about a person to diminish their effectiveness. In fact, these extremists want to undermine the forward-looking policies that would prevent the very draconian measures they say they deplore. We see unambiguous evidence that climate change is already affecting human health and the global economy -- evidence often collected by world-leading American scientists and scientific institutions -- while public opinion polls show that the American people continue to be misled about the risks facing us by conservative pundits who ignore, misunderstand, or intentionally misuse that science to mislead the public into fear of change. Yet we already see huge economic and environmental opportunities in adapting to the reality of climate change. Fear is an effective tool -- as hate groups and extremists know. It is no accident that repressive regimes of all kinds -- fascists, the Nazis, Stalin, religious states, madrasses -- use tools of hatred, anti-intellectualism, and fear to control knowledge, universities, and intellectuals. Fear grows best when sown in fields of ignorance, while science, rationality, and education are the greatest weapons modern societies have against irrational fear. No wonder Beck and his ilk have intellectuals in their sights; so do the leaders of Iran, and Burma, and the Taliban, and North Korea, for similar reasons. What does this have to do with water -- the ostensible focus of my blog? Nothing and everything. I try to focus on numbers here and what they mean for international and local water issues. Yet water policy, or any policy, must also be based on rationality, facts, and civil discourse. Similarly, solving any bad water contamination problem requires one of two approaches: don't let the contamination into our water supply in the first place, or apply the right filters to clean it up when it does. The same rule applies to those who would pollute our public discourse with hate and noise: don't let their vitriol into our media supply or filter it out before it can poison our democracy.

#### Debate over global problems is good – it teaches us about global issues and encourages ethical activism. Their attempt to restrict the focus of the ballot to a more local model discourages that participation

Ruiz and Minguez 01 (Prof. Dr Pedro Ortega Ruiz, Facultad de Educacio´ n, Campus de Espinardo, Universidad de Murcia, “Global Inequality and the Need for Compassion: issues in moral and political education” *Journal of Moral Education, Vol. 30, No. 2, 2001*)

In addition to the reality of the dominant presence of instrumental reason in modern society, another closely linked phenomenon is shaping life at the level of the individual and society, individuals and peoples. We refer to the phenomenon of the increasing globalisation of ways of life in our complex societies which derive as much from the new forms of production as from the influence of science and technology upon life and social organisation (Waters, 1995). This explains the problems we find in guaranteeing a base of social solidarity in a general sense and the provision of forms of identity sufficiently strong for the social agents. It is difficult to represent the society in which we live in a unified manner. As individuals we belong to diverse communities, at times mutually contradictory. It is difficult to escape the need of having to choose between diverse forms of identity and belonging (Bafircena, 1997). The phenomenon of globalisation has invalidated the autistic, localist-focused procedures for highlighting and resolving problems because the great part of our social life is determined by global processes; that is to say, in those processes in which the influence of cultures, political economies, media and national frontiers are all weakened. The emergence of globalisation has made it possible to overcome the concept of nation states, giving way to another, wider reality: humanity, world citizenship or human family to foster the birth of new areas of identity beyond that of the nation state (Luhmann, 1997). During the last few decades it could be thought that the relationships and obligations of the citizen started and finished in their local community, in their *polis*, or at most in their national community. Now, on the other hand, we are concerned by problems occurring far from our frontiers or the conventional established limits. We have become aware that we are immersed in problems of such magnitude (environmental pollution, poverty and marginalisation of a large part of the world’s population, ethnic–cultural con- flicts, etc.) that we seriously question localist attempts and have thrown to the winds the recipes so long applied to solve our problems. A new concept of citizenship and the citizen has been imposed on us. Our *polis* has become too small. The diversity of cultures and national frontiers are no longer barriers to the recognition of our inter-dependency and implication in problems which we now must share. These features (primacy of instrumental reason and globalisation) cannot go unnoticed in our pedagogy. Youth cannot be educated according to out-dated localist schemes already undermined by the real situation; nor offer educational models which place the learners in the position of open-mouthed spectators at what happens around them, distanced from the social reality which is supposedly impossible to change, governed by the implacable laws of market forces. To educate, as we understand it, is above all a praxis orientated towards enabling the learners to “read” and interpret reality and furthermore to take responsibility in the face of this reality. It is to help them grow in responsibility, to honour our obligations toward others.

### 1ac solvency

#### Contention 2 is SOLVENCY

#### The executive can *unilaterally* ease restrictions on *non-tourist* travel

Sullivan 12 (Mark P. Sullivan, Specialist in Latin American Affairs, Congressional Research Service, “Cuba: U.S. Restrictions on Travel and Remittances,” CRS Report for Congress RL31139, 11-9-2012, http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL31139.pdf)

Overview of the U.S. Restrictions¶ Since the United States imposed a comprehensive trade embargo against Cuba in the early 1960s,¶ there have been numerous policy changes to restrictions on travel to Cuba. The embargo¶ regulations do not ban travel itself, but place restrictions on any financial transactions related to¶ travel to Cuba, which effectively result in a travel ban. Accordingly, from 1963 until 1977, travel¶ to Cuba was effectively banned under the Cuban Assets Control Regulations (CACR) issued by¶ the Treasury Department’s Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) to implement the embargo.¶ In 1977, the Carter Administration made changes to the regulations that essentially lifted the¶ travel ban. In 1982, the Reagan Administration made other changes to the CACR that once again¶ restricted travel to Cuba, but allowed for travel-related transactions by certain categories of¶ travelers. Under the Clinton Administration, there were several changes to the Treasury¶ Department regulations, with some at first tightening the restrictions, and others later loosening¶ the restrictions.¶ Under the George W. Bush Administration, the travel regulations were tightened significantly,¶ with additional restrictions on family visits, educational travel, and travel for those involved in¶ amateur and semi-professional international sports federation competitions. In addition, the¶ categories of fully-hosted travel and people-to-people educational exchanges unrelated to¶ academic coursework were eliminated as permissible travel to Cuba. The Bush Administration¶ also cracked down on those traveling to Cuba illegally, further restricted religious travel by¶ changing licensing guidelines for such travel, and suspended the licenses of several travel service¶ providers in Florida for license violations.¶ Under the Obama Administration, Congress took action in March 2009 (P.L. 111-8) to ease[d]¶ restrictions on travel by Cuban Americans to visit their family in Cuba and on travel related to the¶ marketing and sale of agricultural and medical goods to Cuba. In April 2009, President Obama¶ went even further by announcing that all restrictions on family travel and on remittances to family¶ members in Cuba would be lifted, and on September 3, 2009, the Treasury Department issued¶ regulations implementing these policy changes. In January 2011, President Obama took further¶ action to ease[d] restrictions on travel and remittances to Cuba by providing new general licenses for¶ travel involving educational and religious activities and restoring a specific license authorizing¶ travel for people-to-people exchanges. The Administration also restored a general license for any¶ U.S. person to send remittances to Cuba (up to $500 per quarter) and created a general license for¶ remittances to religious organizations. Finally, the Administration also expanded the U.S. airports¶ eligible to provide services to flights to and from Cuba. In most respects, with the exception of¶ the expansion of eligible airports, these new measures appear to be similar to policies that were¶ undertaken by the Clinton Administration in 1999 but were subsequently curtailed by the Bush¶ Administration in 2003 and 2004.¶ The President has the authority to ease restrictions on travel to Cuba. For example, the President¶ could choose to authorize travel to Cuba under a general license for all eligible categories of¶ travel. Lifting all the restrictions on travel, however, would require legislative action. This is¶ because of the codification of the embargo in Section 102(h) of the Cuban Liberty and¶ Democratic Solidarity Act of 1996 (P.L. 104-114); that act conditions the lifting of the embargo,¶ including the travel restrictions, on the fulfillment of certain democratic conditions in Cuba.¶ Although the Administration retains flexibility through licensing authority to ease travel¶ restrictions, the President may not lift all restrictions on travel as set forth in the CACR.¶ Moreover, a provision in the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000¶ (§910(b) of P.L. 106-387, Title IX) prevents the Administration from licensing travel for tourist¶ activities, and defines such activities as any activity not expressly authorized in the 12 broad¶ categories of travel set forth in the CACR regulations. This legislative provision essentially¶ circumscribes the authority of the executive branch to issue travel licenses for activities beyond¶ the broad categories of travel allowed, and would have to be amended, superseded by new¶ legislation, or repealed in order to expand categories of travel to Cuba or lift travel restrictions¶ altogether.

#### Travel is *increasing* – no offense

Gibson 13 (William E. Gibson, Sun-Sentinel's Washington bureau chief for 25 years, has covered six presidential elections and 13 sessions of Congress, studied journalism at the University of Kansas and Columbia University, “Jay-Z and Beyoncé tour stokes desire to visit Cuba,” Sun-Sentinel, 6-2-2013, http://www.sun-sentinel.com/fl-cuba-travel-congressional-push-20130602,0,7448204.story)

Jay-Z and Beyoncé's controversial trip to Cuba four weeks ago has stoked public interest in traveling to the forbidden island, prompting more Americans to seek similar "people-to-people" culture tours.¶ Insight Cuba, the first and largest of the Cuba tour groups, estimates that public inquiries and bookings have grown by 10 percent to 15 percent since Jay-Z and Beyoncé's tour in early April.¶ "It's had a huge impact. Everything from our call center to our website to our blog to our Facebook page just lit up," said Tom Popper, president of Insight Cuba. "People were Googling it and curious. The debate got heightened, and also people's awareness of this kind of tour was heightened."¶ The rapper/singer celebrity couple popularized a small but growing travel phenomenon that taps a pent-up demand to visit Cuba, an exotic time-locked land still off-limits to U.S. tourists. Their highly publicized adventure — while sharply criticized by U.S. Sen. Marco Rubio, R-Fla., and other Cuban-American leaders — also reinforced attempts by many members of Congress to make it easier for almost any American to legally visit Cuba.¶ Despite a five-decade trade embargo, Americans are allowed to travel to Cuba. But the rules don't make it easy, unless you are Cuban-American.¶ Roughly 400,000 Cuban-American passengers went to Cuba last year, taking advantage of a 2009 rule change by President Barack Obama that allows unlimited visits to family members.¶ Another rule change in 2011 allows groups licensed by the U.S. Treasury Department to lead cultural tours of Cuba. The idea was to put more Americans in contact with the Cuban people. Some proponents hoped this closer engagement would build pressure for economic and political reforms in the island nation.¶ An estimated 90,000 Americans made these "people-to-people" visits last year, up slightly over previous years. Insight Cuba projects that its bookings will increase to 5,000 this year from about 3,000 in 2012.¶ But the rules are rigorous for these tours, including the one taken by Beyoncé and Jay-Z. They arranged their trip through Academic Arrangements Abroad, a nonprofit group based in New York, one of more than 230 organizations licensed to sponsor travel to Cuba.¶ At the insistence of Rubio and other embargo defenders, all such tours must have an approved itinerary heavy on "purposeful" activities — such as visits to senior centers, schools and artist studios.¶ It's not supposed to be a day at the beach.¶ Beyoncé and Jay-Z, while celebrating their fifth wedding anniversary on the three-day trip, reportedly stuck to their itinerary, visiting a school, a children's theater group and a jazz club while meeting musicians.¶ Rubio and other embargo defenders — who want to sharply limit even family visits — say all these trips put money in the hands of a repressive Castro regime.¶ Rubio last year stalled Senate confirmation of an Obama nominee — Roberta Jacobson to be assistant secretary of state for Western Hemisphere affairs — until the State Department agreed to impose tighter requirements on tour groups.¶ Under the new rules, applications to obtain or renew "specific" tour licenses went from about six pages to as many as 600 pages. And they can take weeks or months to process.¶ "Every day has to be chock-full of approved activities, pretty much from 9 to 5," Popper said. "It's a rigorous day. People are mentally and physically exhausted, but incredibly stimulated and inspired.¶ "Not everybody wants to travel that way," he acknowledged.¶ But, Popper added, Beyoncé and Jay-Z's trip helped overcome the biggest hurdle to travel by making Americans aware that they can visit Cuba legally through these culture tours.¶ Hoping to further ease travel, 59 Democrats in the U.S. House wrote Obama in April urging him to let anyone go to Cuba on their own without prior approval by the U.S. government.¶ The House members — led by Sam Farr, D-Calif. — want to allow travelers to go under a "general" license. As Cuban-Americans do now, visitors could book their trip through a charter airline and sign an affidavit to affirm they have a permissible purpose.¶ Administration officials have not responded. They have been reluctant to make further changes in policy until Cuban authorities release Alan Gross, of Maryland, who was jailed in December 2009 for alleged "crimes against the state" for bringing satellite-communications equipment to the island.¶ But proponents of expanded travel hope that recent reforms in Cuba — notably a new policy this year that allows Cubans to leave the island on a passport without prior approval — will spur Obama to further loosen U.S. travel rules.¶ "The Cuban government remains repressive. They have serious human-rights issues," said U.S. Rep. Kathy Castor, D-Tampa, after returning from Havana in April. "But I think the policy of embargo and isolation over 50 years hasn't improved that situation. We need to try something new."

#### This *avoids* AND *empirically denies* any turns – simply *returns* to Clinton-era policy

Gibson 10 (William E. Gibson, Sun-Sentinel's Washington bureau chief for 25 years, has covered six presidential elections and 13 sessions of Congress, studied journalism at the University of Kansas and Columbia University, “Cuba travel promoters gear up,” Sun-Sentinel, 9-2-2010, http://weblogs.sun-sentinel.com/news/politics/dcblog/2010/09/cuba\_travel\_promoters\_gear\_up\_1.html)

The unofficial word in Washington is that the Obama administration plans to relax limits on travel to Cuba for professional, educational and artistic purposes.¶ Some travel promoters are gearing up to handle potentially hundreds of thousands more visits.¶ Cuba Education Tours, a Canadian outfit, is urging Americans to start booking trips before the anticipated rules change. ¶ “There is no need to wait for changes from Washington and be left out on account of overbooked tours and too few rooms and services,” the group says in an e-mail message touting their licensed services.¶ The tour group promotes a Boomers Whole Cuba Tour, a Havana International Jazz Festival Tour, a New Years Teachers Introduction to Cuba Tour and others detailed at http://CubaFriends.com/.¶ “Cubans are eager to meet you and make friends with their northern cousins,” says Marcel Hatch, education director for the group.¶ Canadians have long traveled to Cuba without restraint.¶ The administration has not announced the change, but sources say it will come later this year, perhaps after the mid-term elections in November.¶ The new rules would not undo the U.S. embargo, nor would they open the floodgates to American tourists. They would ease restrictions on visas for selected purposes -- business, educational or artistic -- that were imposed by former President George W. Bush.¶ Essentially, U.S. officials would return to the policy of the Bill Clinton administration, which encouraged people-to-people encounters with Cubans.¶ Most Cuban-American leaders in South Florida support limits on travel to try to isolate Cuba and deprive the Castro regime of tourism dollars. But many in Congress are pressing to remove the travel ban for all Americans, saying more contact and communication would encourage reforms in Cuba.¶ Obama last year fulfilled his campaign promise to allow Cuban-Americans to visit their families and to send unlimited amounts of money to Cuba. ¶ Relaxed rules that make it easier for special groups to visit the island is the next incremental step toward closer engagement with Florida’s estranged neighbor.

# 2AC

### Imperialism

#### Death outweighs

Zygmunt **Bauman 95,** University of Leeds Professor Emeritus of Sociology, Life In Fragments: Essays In Postmodern Morality, p. 66-71

The being‑for is like living towards‑the‑future: a being filled with anticipation, a being aware of the abyss between future foretold and future that will eventually be; it is this gap which, like a magnet, draws the self towards the Other,as it draws life towards the future, making life into an activity of overcoming, transcending, leaving behind. The self stretches towards the Other, as life stretches towards the future; neither can grasp what it stretches toward, but it is in this hopeful and desperate, never conclusive and never abandoned stretching‑toward that the self is ever anew created and life ever anew lived. In the words of M. M. Bakhtin, it is only in this not‑yet accomplished world of anticipation and trial, leaning toward stubbornly an‑other Other, that life can be lived ‑ not in the world of the `events that occurred'; in the latter world, `it is impossible to live, to act responsibly; in it, I am not needed, in principle I am not there at all." Art, the Other, the future: what unites them, what makes them into three words vainly trying to grasp the same mystery, is the modality of possibility. A curious modality, at home neither in ontology nor epistemology; itself, like that which it tries to catch in its net, `always outside', forever `otherwise than being'. The possibility we are talking about here is not the all‑too‑familiar unsure‑of‑itself, and through that uncertainty flawed, inferior and incomplete being, disdainfully dismissed by triumphant existence as `mere possibility', `just a possibility'; possibility is instead `plus que la reahte' ‑ both the origin and the foundation of being. The hope, says Blanchot, proclaims the possibility of that which evades the possible; `in its limit, this is the hope of the bond recaptured where it is now lost."' The hope is always the hope of *being fu filled,* but what keeps the hope alive and so keeps the being open and on the move is precisely its *unfu filment.* One may say that the paradox *of hope* (and the paradox of possibility founded in hope) is that it may pursue its destination solely through betraying its nature; the most exuberant of energies expends itself in the urge towards rest. Possibility uses up its openness in search of closure. Its image of the better being is its own impoverishment . . . The togetherness of the being‑for is cut out of the same block; it shares in the paradoxical lot of all possibility. It lasts as long as it is unfulfilled, yet it uses itself up in never ending effort of fulfilment, of recapturing the bond, making it tight and immune to all future temptations. In an important, perhaps decisive sense, it is selfdestructive and self‑defeating: its triumph is its death. The Other, like restless and unpredictable art, like the future itself, is a *mystery.* And being‑for‑the‑Other, going towards the Other through the twisted and rocky gorge of affection, brings that mystery into view ‑ makes it into a challenge. That mystery is what has triggered the sentiment in the first place ‑ but cracking that mystery is what the resulting movement is about. The mystery must be unpacked so that the being‑for may focus on the Other: one needs to know what to focus on. (The `demand' is *unspoken,* the responsibility undertaken is *unconditional;* it is up to him or her who follows the demand and takes up the responsibility to decide what the following of that demand and carrying out of that responsibility means in practical terms.) Mystery ‑ noted Max Frisch ‑ (and the Other is a mystery), is an exciting puzzle, but one tends to get tired of that excitement. `And so one creates for oneself an image. This is a loveless act, the betrayal." Creating an image of the Other leads to the substitution of the image for the Other; the Other is now fixed ‑ soothingly and comfortingly. There is nothing to be excited about anymore. I know what the Other needs, I know where my responsibility starts and ends. Whatever the Other may now do will be taken down and used against him. What used to be received as an exciting surprise now looks more like perversion; what used to be adored as exhilarating creativity now feels like wicked levity. Thanatos has taken over from Eros, and the excitement of the ungraspable turned into the dullness and tedium of the grasped. But, as Gyorgy Lukacs observed, `everything one person may know about another is only expectation, only potentiality, only wish or fear, acquiring reality only as a result of what happens later, and this reality, too, dissolves straightaway into potentialities'. Only death, with its finality and irreversibility, puts an end to the musical‑chairs game of the real and the potential ‑ it once and for all closes the embrace of togetherness which was before invitingly open and tempted the lonely self." `Creating an image' is the dress rehearsal of that death. But creating an image is the inner urge, the constant temptation, the *must* of all affection . . . It is the loneliness of being abandoned to an unresolvable ambivalence and an unanchored and formless sentiment which sets in motion the togetherness of being‑for. But what loneliness seeks in togetherness is an end to its present condition ‑ an end to itself. Without knowing ‑ without being capable of knowing ‑ that the hope to replace the vexing loneliness with togetherness is founded solely on its own unfulfilment, and that once loneliness is no more, the togetherness ( the being‑for togetherness) must also collapse, as it cannot survive its own completion. What the loneliness seeks in togetherness (suicidally for its own cravings) is the foreclosing and pre‑empting of the future, cancelling the future before it comes, robbing it of mystery but also of the possibility with which it is pregnant. Unknowingly yet necessarily, it seeks it all to its own detriment, since the success (if there is a success) may only bring it back to where it started and to the condition which prompted it to start on the journey in the first place. The togetherness of being‑for is always in the future, and nowhere else. It is no more once the self proclaims: `I have arrived', `I have done it', `I fulfilled my duty.' The being‑for starts from the realization of the bottomlessness of the task, and ends with the declaration that the infinity has been exhausted. This is the tragedy of being‑for ‑ the reason why it cannot but be death‑bound while simultaneously remaining an undying attraction. In this tragedy, there are many happy moments, but no happy end. Death is always the foreclosure of possibilities, and it comes eventually in its own time, even if not brought forward by the impatience of love. The catch is to direct the affection to staving off the end, and to do this against the affection's nature. What follows is that, if moral relationship is grounded in the being-for togetherness (as it is), then it can exist as a project, and guide the self's conduct only as long as its nature of a project (a not yet-completed project) is not denied. Morality, like the future itself, is forever not‑yet. (And this is why the ethical code, any ethical code, the more so the more perfect it is by its own standards, supports morality the way the rope supports the hanged man.) It is because of our loneliness that we crave togetherness. It is because of our loneliness that we open up to the Other and allow the Other to open up to us. It is because of our loneliness (which is only belied, not overcome, by the hubbub of the being‑with) that we turn into moral selves. And it is only through allowing the togetherness its possibilities which only the future can disclose that we stand a chance of acting morally, and sometimes even of being good, in the present.

#### Democracy checks

#### Modern democratic structures check their impacts

Dickinson ‘4 (Edward Ross Dickinson, professor of modern history, University of Cincinnati, “Biopolitics, Fascism, Democracy”, Central European History, 37(1), 2004, ejournals)

In short, the **continuities between early twentieth-century biopolitical discourse and the practices of the welfare state in our own time** are unmistakable. Both are instances of the "disciplinary society" and of biopolitical, regulatory, social-engineering modernity, and they share that genealogy with more authoritarian states, including the National Socialist state, but also fascist Italy, for example. And it is certainly fruitful to view them from this very broad perspective. But that analysis **can easily become superficial and misleading, because it obfuscates the profoundly different** strategic and local **dynamics of power in the two kinds of regimes**. **Clearly the democratic welfare state is not only formally but also substantively quite different from totalitarianism**. Above all, again, **it has nowhere developed the** fateful, **radicalizing dynamic** that characterized National Socialism (or for that matter Stalinism), the psychotic logic **that leads from economistic population management to mass murder**. Again, there is always the potential for such a discursive regime to generate coercive policies. In those cases in which the regime of rights does not successfully produce "health," such a system can -- and historically does -- create compulsory programs to enforce it. But again, **there are political and policy** potentials and **constraints** in such a structuring of biopolitics that are very different from those of National Socialist Germany. **Democratic biopolitical regimes require, enable, and incite a degree of** self-direction and **participation that is functionally incompatible with** authoritarian or **totalitarian structures**. And **this pursuit of biopolitical ends through** a regime of **democratic citizenship** **does appear, historically, to have imposed increasingly narrow limits on coercive policies**, and to have generated a "logic" or imperative of increasing liberalization. Despite limitations imposed by political context and the slow pace of discursive change, I think this is the unmistakable message of the really very impressive waves of legislative and welfare reforms in the 1920s or the 1970s in Germany.(n90) Of course it is not yet clear whether this is an irreversible dynamic of such systems. Nevertheless, such regimes are characterized by sufficient degrees of autonomy (and of the potential for its expansion) for sufficient numbers of people that I think it becomes useful to conceive of them as productive of a strategic configuration of power relations that might fruitfully be analyzed as a condition of "liberty," just as much as they are productive of constraint, oppression, or manipulation. At the very least, **totalitarianism cannot be the sole orientation point for our understanding of biopolitics**, the only end point of the logic of social engineering. This notion is not at all at odds with the core of Foucauldian (and Peukertian) theory. Democratic welfare states are regimes of power/knowledge no less than early twentieth-century totalitarian states; these systems are not "opposites," in the sense that they are two alternative ways of organizing the same thing. But they are two very different ways of organizing it. The concept "power" should not be read as a universal stifling night of oppression, manipulation, and entrapment, in which all political and social orders are grey, are essentially or effectively "the same." Power is a set of social relations, in which individuals and groups have varying degrees of autonomy and effective subjectivity. And discourse is, as Foucault argued, "tactically polyvalent." Discursive elements (like the various elements of biopolitics) can be combined in different ways to form parts of quite different strategies (like totalitarianism or the democratic welfare state); they cannot be assigned to one place in a structure, but rather circulate. The varying possible constellations of power in modern societies create "multiple modernities," modern societies with quite radically differing potentials.(n91)

#### Criticizing Western “colonialism” obscures more insidious practices by regional powers

Shaw 2 **–** Sussex IR Professor (Martin, The Problem of the Quasi-Imperial State, www.martinshaw.org/empire.htm)

Nor have many considered the possibility that if the concept of imperialism has a relevance today, it applies to certain aggressive, authoritarian regimes of the non-Western world rather than to the contemporary West. In this paper I fully accept that there is a concentration of much world power - economic, cultural, political and military - in the hands of Western elites. In my recent book, Theory of the Global State, I discuss the development of a 'global-Western state conglomerate' (Shaw 2000). I argue that 'global' ideas and institutions, whose significance characterizes the new political era that has opened with the end of the Cold War, depend largely - but not solely - on Western power. I hold no brief and intend no apology for official Western ideas and behaviour. And yet I propose that the idea of a new imperialism is a profoundly misleading, indeed ideological concept that obscures the realities of power and especially of empire in the twenty-first century. This notion is an obstacle to understanding the significance, extent and limits of contemporary Western power. It simultaneously serves to obscure many real causes of oppression, suffering and struggle for transformation against the quasi-imperial power of many regional states. I argue that in the global era, this separation has finally become critical. This is for two related reasons. On the one hand, Western power has moved into new territory, largely uncharted -- and I argue unchartable -- with the critical tools of anti-imperialism. On the other hand, the politics of empire remain all too real, in classic forms that recall both modern imperialism and earlier empires, in many non-Western states, and they are revived in many political struggles today. Thus the concept of a 'new imperialism' fails to deal with both key post-imperial features of Western power and the quasi-imperial character of many non-Western states. The concept overstates Western power and understates the dangers posed by other, more authoritarian and imperial centres of power. Politically it identifies the West as the principal enemy of the world's people, when for many of them there are far more real and dangerous enemies closer to.

#### The AFF is key to promote human rights and freedom of travel – this should come first

Freedom House 09 (Freedom House, organization dedicated to the expansion of freedom, “Is it Time to Lift the Ban on Travel to Cuba? Statement to the Committee on Foreign Affairs U.S. House of Representatives,” Freedom House, November 19, 2009, <http://democracyinamericas.org/pdfs/FreedomHouseCubaTravelBan.pdf> | Danco)

East Germany, at the time of its collapse, was as repressive as Cuba is today. Both countries received the lowest rating for political rights in the Freedom in the World survey (for 1989 and 2009 respectively) and the next lowest rating, 6 out of 7, for civil liberties. Cuba’s restrictions on travel are among the tightest of any country. Cuban citizens may travel outside their country only with explicit government permission. These travel restrictions, along with strict controls on the flow of information, greatly limit the exposure of Cuban citizens to the outside world, particularly to the values and experiences of freedom that will point Cuba toward a brighter future. ¶ Freedom House wants to see the U.S. ban on travel to Cuba lifted, so that the flow of information to Cuban citizens will increase and the spread of the ideas of liberty will be far more difficult for the Cuban government to contain. Removal of this travel ban, as Freedom House declared in its January 7, 2009 statement, will reinvigorate efforts to advance human rights and democracy in Cuba. Moreover, freedom of movement is a fundamental right. Repeal of the U.S. ban on travel to Cuba will reaffirm the right of all Americans to travel wherever they want. ¶ Cuba remains one of the most repressive countries on earth. It is among the 17 countries worldwide labeled by Freedom House as the Worst of the Worst in 2009. The Communist Party of Cuba, under the leadership of Raul Castro, maintains a monopoly on political power. There is no tolerance for any political organization outside of the Communist Party. Neighbor-watch groups, known as Committees for the Defense of the Revolution, extend the regime’s reach throughout society to monitor and limit opposition activity. The unauthorized assembly of more than three people is punishable by law with up to three months in prison. Critics of the regime risk arrest or physical assault. Press freedom is sharply curtailed, and access to the internet is tightly controlled. In Freedom House’s survey of Freedom on the Net in 15 countries, released earlier this year, Cuba received the lowest rating for internet and digital media freedom, even below China, Tunisia, and Iran. ¶ Although Raul Castro has introduced modest reforms, they are primarily aimed at improving Cuba’s macroeconomic performance and have had a minimal effect, if any, in loosening the Communist regime’s grip on society. The reforms have done nothing to loosen constraints on political rights in Cuba. The regime continues to crack down brutally on dissent. Just two weeks ago, for instance, prominent bloggers Yoani Sanchez, Orlando Luis Pardo, and Claudia Cadelo were thrown into the back of a car by plain clothes government security agents while they were walking to participate in a peaceful march in downtown Havana. They were punched in the head, chest, and kidneys and were taken to a place 20 minutes away, where they were thrown out of the car.

#### Cuba’s Socialist government controls terms of foreign investment – has control to check worst neoliberal abuses.

Feinberg ‘12

Richard E. Feinberg is professor of international political economy at the School of International¶ Relations and Pacific Studies, University of California, San Diego. He is also the book reviewer for the Western Hemisphere section of Foreign Affairs magazine. HERE’S A LITTLE BIT ON THE EPISTEMOLOGY OF THIS STUDY. IT’S FAR FROM THE CAPITALIST FRONT THEY’LL ACCUSE IT OF BEING. From the author: This project is deeply indebted to the Cuban economists who have devoted their careers to studying their nation’s insertion into the global economy. ¶ Most notably, the experts of the Center for the Study of the Cuban Economy (CEEC) of the University of Havana provided essential¶ theoretical insights and empirical inputs. Pioneers who have led the way in the study of foreign investment in¶ Cuba – they include Paolo Spadoni and Julio Cerviño. I would also like to express my deep gratitude to those many¶ professionals in the foreign investment community who have, understandably, preferred to remain¶ anonymous but without whose candor this study would not have been possible. “The New Cuban¶ Economy What Roles for Foreign Investment?” – December – http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/papers/2012/12/cuba%20economy%20feinberg/cuba%20economy%20feinberg%209.pdf

All seven case studies claim successful, profitable operations. Yet all find it challenging to operate¶ in the Cuban context. The top complaint by far is the labor contract system. Other common complaints¶ include price controls that cap profit margins, state interference with the supply chain, and¶ tensions with their Cuban partners over business priorities.¶ • In capitalist societies, there is constant jockeying among firms, governments, and workers’¶ associations over the rules governing labor markets. For JVs operating in Cuba, there¶ is no debate: the state exercises total control. JV management bristles at its inability to set¶ wages and bonuses to optimize productivity and labor discipline. Of even greater concern¶ is the exorbitant tax on labor extracted through the dual currency system, which attacks¶ profitability and seriously impairs international competitiveness. For some JVs, the high¶ labor tax is patently inconsistent with the Cuban insistence on export performance requirements.

#### Discussions of American Latin American policies are non-violent and educationally beneficial

Giordano and Li 12 - \*Paolo, PhD in Economics from the Institut d'Etudes Politiques de Paris, Lead Economist @ the Integratoin and Trade Sector of the IADB, \*\*Kun, Research Fellow @ IADB

(“An Updated Assessment of the Trade and Poverty Nexus in Latin America,” p. 375-377)

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

#### ALT causes hyper-conservativism

Robert J. Lifton 11, 2011, Witness to an Extreme Century: A Memoir, p. 405-406

With all of the American angst during the first year or so of the Obama administration, one may readily forget the power of the historical moment of his election in 2008. BJ and I had a few friends in to watch the returns on the sleek television set in our living room, which we had purchased four years earlier for a similar gathering that had resulted in a roomful of despair and suspicion of fraud in relation to the Bush victory. But this time, in 2008, the television set did not betray us, and my reaction of not just joy but ecstasy, including tears, was hardly mine alone. What was special to me, though, was the quick realization that the outcome meant an end to the country's superpower syndrome. But was that the case? Only partly, it turns out. Certainly Obama and his administration have renounced the principle of American omnipotence in favor of more modest claims about our capacities and influence in the world. Apocalypticism and totalistic behavior have given way to something closer to Camus's "philosophy of limits" with an acceptance of ambiguity, nuance, and complexity. And most important, there has been a specific rejection of nuclearism and a call for abolition of the weapons.¶ Yet despite all that, the syndrome lingers in crucial areas that specifically connect with my work. Concerning nuclear abolition, Obama has not followed through with clear American policies, despite an impressive convocation of world leaders on the subject of nuclear danger. On revelations of torture, and more recently of illegitimate medical experiments in relation to torture, Obama has mostly tried to sidestep the issue and avoid legal culpability of those involved. Finally, his decision to send added troops to Afghanistan seems to me to be the stuff of war-making, and atrocity-producing, blunder. In all three cases there is a certain clinging to the very American omnipotence being renounced. I have found myself torn between joining a considerable segment of the left in a condemnation of shortcomings that perpetuate elements of the superpower syndrome, and an alternative inclination to defend Obama as an incremental reformer who needs more time.¶ I took the latter position in a series of discussions with Howard Zinn, who denounced Obama as "a Chicago politician" and a hypocrite. I still don't agree with that judgment but I am also willing to take a public stand of strong opposition to Obama policies on Afghanistan and on American torture and recently revealed experimentation. Yet I remain sensitive as well to the importance of supporting the Obama administration in the face of new waves of right-wing American totalism and potential violence in the backlash over the election of our first African-American president.

#### even if individual life is worthless, that can’t be true for all of humanity.

Arendt ’54 “Europe and the Atom Bomb” The Commonweal 60:578-580

Ultimately, this argument rests on the conviction that it is better to be dead than to be a slave. It is based on a political philosophy that, since the ancients, has considered courage to be the political virtue par excellence, the one virtue without which political freedom is wholly impossible. Originally, the time-honored conviction that courage is the highest political virtue was based on a pre-Christian philosophy which deemed that life is not the most sacred good and that there are conditions on which it is not worth having. For the ancients such conditions existed whenever the individual man was utterly delivered to the necessities of preserving sheer animal life, and therefore was judged incapable of freedom. This could happen in the case of slavery, say, or in the case of incurable illness; in both instances, suicide was considered to be the appropriate solution demanded by courage as well as by human dignity. With the victory of Christianity in the Western World and especially of the originally Hebrew conviction of the sacredness of life as such, this code of individual morality as it had been known throughout the ancient world lost its absolute validity. Wars could be justified on religious grounds, but not on the ground of secular political freedom as such. By the same token wholesale slaughter, so well known in the ancient world, might happen, but it could no longer be justified. By and large, Western civilization was agreed that, in the words of Kant, nothing should happen during a war that would make a future peace impossible. This agree­ment is no longer universal. With the appearance of atomic weapons, both the Hebrew-Christian limitation on violence and the an­cient appeal to courage have for all practical purposes become meaningless, and with them, the whole political and moral vocabulary in which we are accustomed to discuss these matters. Limitations can be applied in reality only to foreseeable developments; they cannot reckon with that "surprise technique" which Raymond Aron recently analyzed as the central event of the first World War, and which, as long as we are caught in the process of progressing technicalization, will inev­itably produce new "miracle" weapons. Under existing circumstances, as a matter of fact, nothing is more probable than these "miracles." In fact, of course, even our present potentialities for destruction have already far outstripped the matter-of­course limitations of previous wars. And this situation has placed in jeopardy the very value of courage itself. The fundamental human condition of courage is that [hu]man[ity] is not immortal, that he sacrifices a life that one day will be taken from him in any case. No human courage would be conceivable if the condition of in­dividual life were the same as that of the species. Greece's immortal gods had to leave this one virtue, courage, to mortal men; all other human virtues could appear in divine shape, could be deified and wor­shipped as divine gifts. Courage alone is denied to the immortals; because of the everlasting presence of their existence, the stakes are never high enough. If life were not normally taken from mortal man one day anyhow, he could never risk it. The stakes would be too high, the courage required would be literally inhuman, and life would not only appear to be the highest good, it would become the central human concern, overruling all other considerations. CLOSELY connected with this fact is another limitation of human courage—the conviction that posterity will understand, remember and respect the individual mortal's sacrifice. Man can be courageous only as long as he knows he is survived by those who are like him, that he fulfills a role in something more permanent than himself, "the enduring chronicle of mankind," as Faulkner once put it. Thus in antiquity, when wars were likely to end with the extermination or enslavement of whole peoples, the victor felt obliged to preserve for posterity the deeds and the greatness of the enemy. So Homer sang the praise of Hector, and Herodotus reported the history of the Persians. Courage, under the circumstances of modern war­fare, has lost much of its old meaning. By putting in jeopardy the survival of [humanity]~~mankind~~ and not only indi­vidual life or at the most the life of a whole people, modern warfare is about to transform the individual mortal [hu]man into a conscious member of the human race, of whose immortality he needs to be sure in order to be courageous at all and for whose survival he must care more than for anything else. Or, to put it another way, while there certainly are conditions under which individual life is not worth having, the same cannot be true for [humanity]~~mankind~~. The moment a war can even conceivably threaten the continued existence of [hu]man[ity] on earth, the alternative between liberty and death has lost its old plausibility

#### Value to life is inevitable, subjective, and they don’t control the link to it.

**Shermer, 8** –Michael, founder of the Skeptics Society and Editor of Skeptic Magazine, “"The Meaning of Life, the Universe, and Everything"”—Commencement Speech at Whittier College, 5/23/08 http://www.whittier.edu/News/Articles/2008CommencementSpeech.aspx

Purpose is personal, and there are countless activities people engage in to satisfy this deep-seated need.There are, however, a handful of powerful means by which we can bootstrap ourselves toward higher goals that have proven to be especially beneficial to both individuals and society. Science tells us that there are five things you can do to create meaning and purpose in your life. Here they are: 1. Love and family—the bonding and attachment to others increases one's sphere of moral inclusion to care about others as much as, if not more than, oneself. And here I shall take a moment to acknowledge the courage of the California State Supreme Court to increase the possibility of marital happiness to the tens of thousands of gays and lesbians in our state who wish to enjoy the same rights and liberties as everybody else. 2. Meaningful work and career—the sense of purpose derived from discovering one's passion for work drives people to achieve goals so far beyond the needs of themselves that they lift all of us to a higher plane, either directly through the benefits of the work, or indirectly through inspiration. And here let me shift my politics slightly rightward to tell you that not only is it okay to make a lot of money, it is a moral virtue to earn your way to wealth and prosperity, and that market capitalism—conjoined with liberal democracy—is the best hope for humanity's future that we have. 3. Recreation and play—it is vital to take time off from work, get away from the office, hang out with your friends, see new places, veg out, goof off, and explore new activities with no purpose other than their shear enjoyment. (In other words, build into your purpose no purpose at all.) 4. Social and political involvement—as a social primate species endowed by evolution with the moral emotions of guilt and pride, shame and joy, we have a social obligation to our local community and our larger society to participate in the process of determining how best we should live together, and a moral duty to reach out and help those in need. Research shows that those who do so are happier and more fulfilled people. 5. Transcendency and spirituality—a capacity unique to our species, as far as we can tell, that includes aesthetic appreciation, spiritual reflection, and transcendent contemplation through a variety of expressions such as art, music, dance, exercise, meditation, prayer, quiet contemplation, and religious revere, connecting us on the deepest level with that which is outside of ourselves.

#### Value to life is inevitable and only their depiction of it allows autonomy to be decreased – we’ll set our value to life at 100%

**Schwartz – 2** (Lisa, professional metaphysician, Medical Ethics: A case based approach, “The Value of Life: Who Decides and How?”, p. 112)

The second assertion made by supporters of the quality of life as a criterion for decision making is closely related to the first, but with an added dimension. This assertion suggests that the determination of the value of the quality of a given life is a subjective determination to be made by the person experiencing that life. The important addition here is that the decision is a personal one that, ideally, ought not to be made externally by another person but internally by the individual involved. Katherine Lewis made this decision for herself based on a comparison between two stages of her life. So did James Brady. Without this element, decisions based on quality of life criteria lack salient information and the patients concerned cannot give informed consent. Patients must be given the opportunity to decide for themselves whether they think their lives are worth living or not. To ignore or overlook patients’ judgment in this matter is to violate their autonomy and their freedom to decide for themselves on the basis of relevant information about their future, and comparative consideration of their past. As the deontological position puts it so well, to do so is to violate the imperative that we must treat persons as rational and as ends in themselves.

### Saturation

#### Psychoanalysis has ignored every study against it

**Boudry, Ghent university philosophy department, 2011**

(Maarten, “The Epistemic Predicament of a Pseudoscience: Social Constructivism Confronts Freudian Psychoanalysis”, <http://biblio.ugent.be/input/download?func=downloadFile&fileOId=1108943&recordOId=1108932>, DOA: 10-22-11, ldg)

The Freudian unconscious is an entity that actively resists interpretation, and that will always try to deceive us in unexpected and cunning ways (Gellner, 1985).8 Thus, when Freud was unable to find traces of a pathological complex or unconscious desire to account for a patient's behaviour, he was undeterred and treated this as a token of unconscious resistance. The more the material offered by a patient resisted interpretation, the more it counted in favour of the theory. This characteristic pattern of reasoning in psychoanalysis bears a striking resemblance to conspiracy theorizing (Farrell, 1996). For example, consistent with his account of the unconscious, Freud believed that his patients (and his critics) harboured a secret and unconscious wish to see his theories and interpretations proven wrong, and so never to see their own unconscious desires exposed. For instance, one of Freud's patients dreamt that she had to spend her holidays with her despised mother-in-law. This seemed to belie Freud's claim that every dream is an unconscious wish-fulfilment, but within the framework of psychoanalytic thinking it could be turned into a confirmation of the theory. As Freud himself explained, The dream showed that I was wrong. Thus it was her wish that I might be wrong, and her dream showed that wish fulfilled. (Freud, 1953a, p. 151; original emphasis) Freud argued that “these dreams appear regularly in the course of my treatments when a patient is in a state of resistance to me” and he predicted that the same would happen to his readers (Freud, 1953a, pp. 157–158).9 Indeed, Freud and his followers became infamous for explaining away criticism from their opponents as tokens of unconscious resistance to the theory, thus further attesting to the truth of psychoanalysis: They [the critics] are therefore bound to call up the same resistance in him as in our patients; and that resistance finds it easy to disguise itself as an intellectual rejection and to bring up arguments like those which we ward off in our patients by means of the fundamental rule of psycho-analysis. (Freud, 1957, p. 39) What is important for our purposes is that such moves are not merely immunizing gambits which can be neatly disentangled from the theory, but are instead perfectly legitimate, explanatory moves within the psychoanalytic framework, and instantly recognizable as genuine psychoanalytic interpretations (Boudry and Braeckman, 2010). This pattern of reasoning, which bears a striking resemblance to conspiracy thinking, is pervasive throughout psychoanalytic literature, and it follows directly from the characterization of the unconscious as an intentional and deceitful mental entity.

#### No distinctions apply

**Boudry, Ghent university philosophy department, 2011**

(Maarten, “The Epistemic Predicament of a Pseudoscience: Social Constructivism Confronts Freudian Psychoanalysis”, <http://biblio.ugent.be/input/download?func=downloadFile&fileOId=1108943&recordOId=1108932>, DOA: 10-22-11, ldg)

Although we deliberately restrict our analysis to classical Freudian psychoanalysis, it should be noted that the divergent psychoanalytic schools that followed Freud's seminal theory have typically retained much of the problematic methodology and epistemology instituted by Freud: the existence of the psychodynamic unconscious, the notion of repression, the method of free association and symbolic interpretation as the gateway to the unconscious, etc. To the extent that these psychoanalytic schools have relied on the same defective aspects of the theory, our arguments apply with equal force (Macmillan, 1997; Cioffi, 1998).

#### Psychoanalysis is not scientific.

**Grunbaum, Pittsburgh University philosophy professor, 2007**

(Adolf, “THE RECEPTION OF MY FREUD-CRITIQUE IN THE PSYCHOANALYTIC LITERATURE”, Psychanalytic Psychology, 24.3, PsycArtciles, ldg)

Thus, the philosopher Peter Caws, with whom I had earlier occasion to take issue in these pages (Grünbaum, 2006, p. 258), intoned the red herring of “physics envy” (Caws, 2003, p. 620) to saddle me with epistemological misextrapolation as follows: “Grünbaum (1993) takes the straight philosophy of physics line and demolishes Freud with heavy artillery”(Caws, 2003, p. 624). But Caws' complaint springs from a fundamental misconception. As against his straw man, let me recall the point from my 2006 article (p. 258): As against Caws' phantom, note that ever since Francis Bacon four centuries ago, it has been clear that there is nothing at all endemic to physics in the requirements for the validation of causal hypotheses, with which psychoanalytic theory and therapy are replete. And I demanded the fulfillment of just these entirely legitimate epistemological and methodological requirements when I argued that the principal tenets of the Freudian corpus, which are causal, have not been validated even a century after their enunciation [emphases in original] (Grünbaum, 2006, p. 258).

#### Only evaluate what we can test as true – the alternative is mass violence

**Wilson, British cultural historian and columnist, 2000**

(A.N., The Sokal Hoax: The Sham that Shook Academia, pg 120-121, ldg)

Intellectuals are important and it does matter what we think. It is not purely accidental that most English intellectuals of the last century (even those who reacted against it) were influenced by the empirical traditions of the 18th century. and by the rigorous liberalism of Mi1l. They believed (per- haps absurdly in some cases) in "not entertaining any proposition with greater assurance than the proofs it is built upon will warrant" (Locke). Even the Idealists who reacted against the materialists believed this. For continental intellectuals it was otherwise. The ideas of Hegel, re- heated and mixed about in mad laboratory conditions by Marx and Nietzsche and other visionaries, really did have an effect. Russia, having stupefied its mind with irrational religion for 1,000 years, made the switch to Lenin- ism with pain-but they were used to the irrational. Germany, the birthplace of much brilliant nonsense, embraced Hitler because its intellectuals had been used to thinking rubbish for 100 years. Think rubbish and you start behaving foolishly. Educate a whole gen-ration to think rubbish-all the cleverest young people in American and European universities are confronted with the beguiling relativism of post- modemist doctrines-and you ask for trouble. The generation in Britain who looked to I. S. Mill as their master entered public life with a burning desire not to destroy society by Marxist revolution but to undo injustice and inequality by liberal means. The feminist movement, the growth in public education, sanitation, decent housing, moderate state socialism and welfare-the evolution of British society since the middle of the last century-happened in defiance of many politicians; it happened because of what a few intellectuals had taught. The ideas of Marx-that change could only come about when millions of people had been killed, when peasant-owners had been conned into a revolution and then themselves slaughtered-you can read them all in the books he scribbled while living in Kentish Town. Lenin followed them to the letter. Hitler in his different way was influenced by the same notion-that reason and decency had no place in public life; the world was not something to be viewed objectively it was a product of Spirit, it was a plaything, which could follow fairy stories from Grimm and doom-laden operas by Wagner. We are in a situation today in the West alarmingly like Europe 100 years ago. Many of our cleverest people are decadents. It has become fashion- able to decry intellectuals, and intellectuals themselves delight in the anti- intellectualism of post-modernism. One point of view is as good as another. The dull old Anglo~Saxon empirical tradition of common sense has gone quiet. Religious revivals, when they occur, are not of a reasonable but of a fanatical kind. It takes very little in such circumstances-a recession just a bit worse than the last one, :a war slightly fiercer than the one in Bosnia-for some master~ mind of nonsense, some Hitler or Lenin, to step on to the scene. As in Dostoyevsky's masterpiece on the subject, "The Devils," the intellectuals continue to jabber nonsense until, hoodwinked by the demagogue who despises them, they and the whole of society are led like Gaclarene swine to perdition.

#### Psychoanalysis doesn’t explain reality.

**Bunge, McGill University philosopher, 2010**

(Mario, “Should Psychoanalysis Be in the Science Museum?”, 10-5, <http://www.newscientist.com/article/mg20827806.200-should-psychoanalysis-be-in-the-science-museum.html>, DOA: 10-22-11, ldg)

We should congratulate the Science Museum for setting up an exhibition on psychoanalysis. Exposure to pseudoscience greatly helps understand genuine science, just as learning about tyranny helps in understanding democracy. Over the past 30 years, psychoanalysis has quietly been displaced in academia by scientific psychology. But it persists in popular culture as well as being a lucrative profession. It is the psychology of those who have not bothered to learn psychology, and the psychotherapy of choice for those who believe in the power of immaterial mind over body. Psychoanalysis is a bogus science because its practitioners do not do scientific research. When the field turned 100, a group of psychoanalysts admitted this gap and endeavoured to fill it. They claimed to have performed the first experiment showing that patients benefited from their treatment. Regrettably, they did not include a control group and did not entertain the possibility of placebo effects. Hence, their claim remains untested (The International Journal of Psychoanalysis, vol 81, p 513). More recently, a meta-analysis published in American Psychologist (vol 65, p 98) purported to support the claim that a form of psychoanalysis called psychodynamic therapy is effective. However, once again, the original studies did not involve control groups. In 110 years, psychoanalysts have not set up a single lab. They do not participate in scientific congresses, do not submit their papers to scientific journals and are foreign to the scientific community - a marginality typical of pseudoscience. This does not mean their hypotheses have never been put to the test. True, they are so vague that they are hard to test and some of them are, by Freud's own admission, irrefutable. Still, most of the testable ones have been soundly refuted. For example, most dreams have no sexual content. The Oedipus complex is a myth; boys do not hate their fathers because they would like to have sex with their mothers. The list goes on. As for therapeutic efficacy, little is known because psychoanalysts do not perform double-blind clinical trials or follow-up studies. Psychoanalysis is a pseudoscience. Its concepts are woolly and untestable yet are regarded as unassailable axioms. As a result of such dogmatism, psychoanalysis has remained basically stagnant for more than a century, in contrast with scientific psychology, which is thriving.

#### \Psychoanalysis is a closed system of assertion that doesn’t describe reality

**Perpich, Vanderbilt philosophy professor, 2005**

(Dian, “Figurative Language and the "Face" in Levinas's Philosophy”, Philosophy & Rhetoric, Vol. 38, No. 2, JSTOR, ldg)

Levinas's hesitations about the value of psychoanalysis - indeed, what might be called his allergic reactions to psychoanalysis - are similarly based. Psychoanalysis, he writes, "casts a basic suspicion on the most unimpeachable testimony of self-consciousness" (1987b, 32). Psychological states in which the ego seems to have a "clear and distinct" grasp of itself are reread by psychoanalysis as symbols for a "reality that is totally inaccessible" to the self and that is the expression of "a social reality or a historical influence totally distinct from its [the ego's] own intention" (34). Moreover, all of the ego's protests against the interpretations of analysis are themselves subject to further analysis, leaving no point exterior to the analysis: "I am as it were shut up in my own portrait" (35). Psychoanalysis threatens an infinite regress of meaning, a recursive process that leads from one symbol to another, from one symptom to another with no end in sight and no way to break into or out of the chain of signifiers in the name of a signified. "The real world is transformed into a poetic world, that is, into a world without beginning in which one thinks without knowing what one thinks" (35). Put less poetically, Levinas's worry is that psychoanalysis furnishes us with no fixed point or firm footing from which to launch a critique and to break with social and historical determinations of the psyche in order to judge society and history and to call both to account. Indeed, his uncharacteristic allusion to "clear and distinct" ideas betrays his inten- tion: to seek, against both religious and psychoanalytic participations, for a relationship in which the ego is an "absolute," "irreducible" singularity, within a totality but still separate from it, that is, still capable of a relation with exteriority. To seek such a relation is, Levinas says, "to ask whether a living man [sic] does not have the power to judge the history in which he is engaged, that is, whether the thinker as an ego, over and beyond all that he does with what he possesses, creates and leaves, does not have the sub- stance of a cynic" (35). The naked being who confronts me with his or her alterity, the naked being that I am myself and whose being "counts as such" is now naked not with an erotic nudity but with the nudity of a cynic who has thrown off the cloak of culture in order to present him- or herself di- rectly and "in person" through "this chaste bit of skin with brow, nose, eyes, and mouth" (41). Levinas picks up the thread of this worry about psychoanalysis in "Ethics and Discourse," the main section of "The Ego and the Totality." To affirm humankind as a power to judge history, he claims, is to affirm rationalism and to reject "the merely poetic thought which thinks without knowing what it things, or thinks as one dreams" (40). The impetus for psychoanalysis is philosophical, Levinas admits; that is, it shares initially in this affirmation of rationalism insofar as it affirms the need for reflec- tion and for going "underneath" or getting behind unreflected conscious- ness and thought. However, if its impetus is philosophical, its issue is not insofar as the tools that it uses for reflection turn out to be "some funda- mental, but elementary, fables . . .which, incomprehensibly, would alone be unequivocal, alone not translate (or mask or symbolize) a reality more pro- found than themselves" (40). Psychoanalysis returns one, then, to the irrationalism of myth and poetry rather than liberating one from them. It resubmerges one within the cultural and historical ethos and mythos in a way that seems to Levinas to permit no end to interpretation and thus no power to judge. He imagines psychoanalysis as a swirling phantasmagoria in which language is all dissimulation and deception. "One can find one's bearings in all this phantasmagoria, one can inaugurate the work of criticism only if one can begin with a fixed point. The fixed point cannot be some incontestable truth, a 'certain' statement that would always be subject to psychoanalysis; it can only be the absolute status of an interlocutor, a being, and not a truth about beings" (41). In this last claim, the fate of Heideggerian fundamental ontology that is an understanding of Being rather than a relation to beings (or to a being, a face) is hitched to the fate of psychoanalysis and both linked to participation, the "nocturnal chaos" that threatens to drown the ego in the totality