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#### China dominates Cuban nickel exports now --- US influence is blocked by status quo enforcement of the embargo

Cuba Standard, 1AC author, in 10

Cuba Standard, “U.S. steel group uses embargo to hammer China”, 5-14, http://www.cubastandard.com/2010/05/14/u-s-steel-group-uses-embargo-to-hammer-china //bghs-ms

In written testimony during a House Ways and Means Committee hearing Thursday, a U.S. steel trade group denounced Chinese steel imports containing Cuban nickel, the Export Law Blog first reported. At the same time, the group said the embargo puts U.S. stainless steel companies at a “competitive disadvantage.” China is the largest consumer of Cuban nickel. Nickel is a crucial ingredient in stainless steel. Specialty Steel Industry of North America (SSINA) “encouraged stricter enforcement of the U.S. regulations on trade with Cuba, particularly with respect to China,” the Washington-based group said in a press release. However, written testimony by the SSINA chairman also says that the embargo hurts U.S. stainless steel companies. The U.S. embargo “places the domestic specialty metals industry at a distinct competitive disadvantage by allowing one of its biggest foreign competitors an opportunity to avail itself of [Cuba's] nickel reserves, while simultaneously denying the U.S. industry the same access,” said SSINA Chairman Sunil Widge in his testimony. ”As long as the embargo remains U.S. law, it must be enforced, otherwise U.S. stainless steel producers and producers of other nickel-bearing metals will remain disadvantaged by the failure to apply the embargo.”

#### US engagement with Cuba decrease Chinese influence in the region

Benjamin-Alvadaro ‘6 (Jonathan, Report for the Cuban Research Institute, Florida International University, PhD, Professor of Political Science at University of Nebraska at Omaha, Director of the Intelligence Community Centers of Academic Excellence Program at UNO, Treasurer of the American Political Science Association, “The Current Status and Future Prospects for Oil Exploration in Cuba: A Special,” http://cri.fiu.edu/research/commissioned-reports/oil-cuba-alvarado.pdf)

Additionally, Venezuela remains the fourth largest importer of oil to the United States and one can surmise that the existing trade arrangements between the U.S. and Venezuela will remain intact, the evolution of the Bolivarian revolution under Chavez and a growing Chinese presence in the region notwithstanding. Additionally, pursuing such a path would allow United States policymakers to take advantage of what Cuba has to offer in the following areas: domestic technical capabilities; continuing human capital development; strategic positioning in the Caribbean, and an improved diplomatic stature. Cuba, by any measure, possesses a largely untapped technical capacity owing to advanced training and education in the core mathematic and scientific areas. This was clearly demonstrated by its attempt to develop a nuclear energy capability in the 1980s and 1990s whereby thousands of Cubans pursued highly technical career paths leaving Cuba with among the highest ratios of scientists and engineers to the general population in all of the Americas. Moreover, the foundation of Cuba’s vaunted public education system remains intact and increased investment under various scenarios suggests that Cuba will continue to produce a welleducated workforce that will be critical to its future economic vitality. This raises an important consideration that being the role that Cuba will play in the region in the 21st century. It suffices to say that Cuba remains the strategically important state by virtue of its geographical location alone, in efforts against drug and human trafficking and related national and regional security matters. The extent to which a stable Cuban government has cooperated with the U.S. in drug interdiction efforts in the past suggests that the results from improved diplomatic relations between neighbors would have the effect of improving national security concerns related to terrorist activity, illicit weapons transfers and the like. Ultimately, a successful normalization of relations between the U.S. and Cuba in these areas may well enhance and stabilize regional relations that could possibly lessen (or at a minimum, balancing) fears of a Chinese incursion in hemispheric affairs. To lessen those fears it may be useful to review the present structure of joint-venture projects in the energy sector in Cuba to ascertain the feasibility and possible success of such an undertaking become available to American firms. Moreover, it is interesting to note that U.S. firms in the agriculture sector have successfully negotiated and consummated sales to Cuba totaling more than $1 billion dollars over the past four years under conditions that are less than optimal circumstances but have well-served the commercial interests of all parties involved.

#### China’s engagement in Latin America is key to its economy

Farnsworth, 12 – Vice-president of the Council of the Americas in Washington DC (Eric, “Memo to Washington: China's Growing Presence in Latin America,” Americas Quarterly, Vol. 6, No. 1, Winter, 2012, http://www.americasquarterly.org/Farnsworth)//VP

What is China doing in the Americas? It’s a good question—and an increasingly important one for policymakers in Washington. According to one U.S. analyst, it’s about “goodwill, good business and strategic position.”1 Perhaps. But the jury is still out, mostly because China’s interest in the Western Hemisphere is barely a decade old. For many years, beyond attempts to wean Latin American and Caribbean nations away from support for Taiwan and efforts to build Third World solidarity, China’s footprint in the Americas was light. That has now changed. Since then-President Jiang Zemin’s 13-day trip to Latin America in April 2001 and the subsequent visits of President Hu Jintao in 2004 and 2011, Chinese engagement with the region has exploded. Today, China is the top trade partner of Brazil and Chile, and the second trade partner of Argentina and Peru. By late 2010, Chinese enterprises had invested almost $44 billion in the region, according to China’s National Development and Reform Commission, almost a quarter of which was invested in 2010 alone. Top investment targets included Brazil, but also Argentina, Chile, Ecuador, Panama, Peru, and Venezuela. Innovative financing by Chinese entities was often behind the deals—and in some cases, such as Ecuador and Venezuela, investments took the form of loans secured by guaranteed future deliveries of oil. That is a marked change from 2003, the year before Hu’s first visit, when China invested just $1 billion in all of Latin America. By now the outlines of the story are well known. As part of the dash for economic growth that the Chinese Communist Party believes will help to maintain its legitimacy—an average annual rate of 9.8 percent from 1979 to 2009, including an 8.7 percent growth rate in 2009 when much of the rest of the world faced economic collapse—Beijing is on a global quest to lock in the natural resources that fuel its growth. From Southeast Asia to Africa to Latin America and beyond, China is scouring the globe to invest in primary commodities. By the end of 2011, more than $3 trillion in foreign exchange reserves provided an impressive war chest from which to purchase the global assets that China’s leaders believe they need to support economic growth—and thus political stability—for the medium to longer term. As China faces its own near-term leadership transition, efforts to purchase domestic political stability with foreign trade and investment are likely to intensify. At the same time, Latin American nations that have been the primary trade and investment partners with China have also gained handsomely, at least in the short term, in the sectors that produce primary goods. Longer term questions abound regarding the balance and terms of trade, the nature of the investments that China is making, and the values that are being promoted or undermined by such investments.2 Additionally, nations that are not supplying significant amounts of commodities to China, including Mexico and Central America, view China more as an aggressive competitor than as an economic partner. The costs and benefits of trade with China are unequally distributed across the Americas.

#### That solves global economic collapse and nuclear lashout

Buzan and Foot 04 **–** professor of International Relations at the London School of Economics and Political Science; professor of International Relations at St. Anthony College, (Barry and Rosemary, “Does China Matter? A Reassessment: Essays in Memory of Gerald Segal”, ed., Questia, p. 145-147, USC Libraries)

China, East Asia and the world The underlying argument in this section is that there is a strong link between the global standing of a major power and the way that power relates to the other states in its home region. As a general rule, the status of great power, and more so superpower, requires not only that the state concerned be able and willing to project its political influence beyond its immediate region, but that it also be able in some sense to manage, and perhaps lead, its region (Buzan and Wæver, 2003). The U.S. clearly does this in North America, and more arguably for the Western hemisphere as a whole, and the EU does it in Europe. The Soviet Union did it from 1945 to 1989, and the possible inability of Russia to do it (and its desperation to do so) explain the current question marks around its status. India's failure to do it is a big part of what denies it the great-power recognition it craves. During the Cold War, and up to a point still, Japan could exploit its political geography to detach itself from much of Asian politics, and float free as a kind of economic great power. China does not have that kind of geopolitical option. Like Russia and India, it cannot escape regional politics. China's global standing thus depends crucially on what kind of relationship it has with its neighbours. If China is able to reassert some form of hegemony over twenty-first century Asia - getting most or all of its neighbours to bandwagon with it - then its global standing will be hugely enhanced. But if China inspires fear in its neighbours - causing them to balance against it - then like India, and possibly Russia, it will be locked into its region, and its global standing will be diminished. Since the U.S. is strongly present in Asia, its influence also plays into this equation. Indeed, if China is at odds with its neighbours then its position will be worse than that of Russia and India. In their immediate regions, those two have only to deal with powers much smaller than themselves. In China's region there are several very substantial powers whose antagonism would be a real burden. The importance of regional relations for a major power's global standing is easily shown by two extreme scenarios for China's future. In the first, China's development provides it with the strength and the identity to become the central hub of Asia, in the process largely displacing the U.S.. It projects an acceptable political and economic image, and its neighbours bandwagon with it out of some combination of fear, prudence, admiration and hope for economic advantage. Its economy becomes the regional locomotive, and in political and military terms it is acknowledged as primus inter pares by Japan, Korea and the ASEAN states. Japan takes up a similar subordinate relationship with China to that it now has with the U.S., and China is able to use the regional institutions created by ASEAN rather as the U.S. uses the Organization of American States. If the other Asian states fear to antagonize China, and don't balance against it, then China is both free to play a larger global role, and is insulated against pressure from the West. And if China succeeds in positioning itself at the centre of an Asian economy, then it can claim 'locomotive' status along with the U.S. and the EU in the global economy. In the second scenario, China inspires fear in its neighbours. Japan's alliance with the U.S. deepens, and India, Southeast Asia, Japan and possibly Russia coordinate their defences against China, probably with U.S. support. Under the first set of conditions, China acquires a stable regional base which gives it both the status and the capability to play seriously on the global political stage. Under the second set of conditions, China may still be the biggest power in East Asia, but its ability to play on the global stage would be seriously curtailed. The task for this section is thus to examine the social and material forces in play and ask how they might support or block a move in either of these directions. Is it likely that China will acquire hegemony in East Asia, or is its rise to power more likely to produce U.S.-backed regional balancing against it? I will examine the factors playing into this question on three levels: China's capabilities and the trajectory of its internal development; China's relations with its Asian neighbours; and its relationships with the U.S. and the other great powers. China's capabilities and the trajectory of its internal development Debates about China's capability and prospects for development can be placed within a matrix formed by two variables: • Does China get stronger (because its economic development continues successfully) or weaker (because its development runs into obstacles, or triggers socio-political instability)? • Does China become a malign, aggressive, threatening force in international society (because it becomes hypernationalist or fascist), or does it become more benign and cooperative (because economic development brings internal democratization and liberalization)? If China's development falters and it becomes weak, then it will neither dominate its region nor project itself on to the global stage. Whether it is then politically benign or malign will be a much less pressing issue in terms of how others respond to it in the traditional politico-military security domain. What could happen in this scenario is that a breakdown in the socio-political order, perhaps triggered by economic or environmental troubles, might well trigger large-scale migrations, political fragmentations, or wider economic crises that would pose serious threats to China's neighbours. A major political collapse in China could also pose threats at the global level, via the scenario of a failed nuclear weapon state. But, if China becomes strong, then the malign or benign question matters a great deal. The benign and malign options could be alternative paths, or could occur in sequence, with a malign phase giving way to a benign one, as happened with Germany and Japan during their comparable phases of industrialization. The likelihood of just such a sequence was what underpinned Gerry's concern to promote constrainment.

#### US presence in Latin America kills US-China relations

Hilton, 13 – Latin America correspondent (Isabel, “China in Latin America: Hegemonic Challenge?”, 2/20, http://www.peacebuilding.no/var/ezflow\_site/storage/original/application/26ff1a0cc3c0b6d5692c8afbc054aad9.pdf)//VP

The United States is Latin America’s traditional hegemonic power, but China’s influence in the region is large and growing. How far does China’s presence in the U.S. backyard represent a hegemonic challenge? China is important in the region as a buyer of Latin American resources, primarily from four countries, an important investor and an exporter of manufactured goods. The impact of China’s activities varies in degree from country to country. In several countries local manufacturing has suffered from cheaper Chinese imports; several countries have benefited from Chinese demand for resources, others from large investments, and China is having an important impact on the region’s infrastructure. The risks to the region include resource curse, distorted development and environmental degradation due to a lowering of environmental and social standards. Despite its significant economic presence, China has been careful to keep a low political and diplomatic profile to avoid antagonising the U.S. and to maintain a benign environment for its economic activities. Chinese support, however, has been important for partners, such as Cuba and Venezuela, that do not enjoy good relations with the U.S. So far the two powers have sought cooperation rather than confrontation, but rising tensions with U.S. allies Japan and Vietnam could have repercussions in Latin America if China feels the U.S. is becoming too assertive in its own East Asian backyard.

#### Sino-U.S. relations are key to solve warming

Sydney Morning Herald, 13- Newspaper (“China, US pledge joint climate change action”, June 1, http://www.smh.com.au/environment/climate-change/china-us-pledge-joint-climate-change-action-20130601-2ni5s.html)//TL

China and the US, the world’s two biggest emitters of carbon dioxide, pledged to cooperate in addressing climate change amid stalled international talks on protecting the environment. The two nations in April established a climate-change working group, National Development and Reform Commission Vice Chairman Xie Zhenhua said today after meeting Todd Stern, the US special envoy on climate change. The working group will report its findings to US-China Strategic and Economic Dialogue talks in July, Stern said. “We will further move forward the climate change process of the world,” under the framework of the United Nations, Xie, China’s lead climate negotiator, said in Beijing. “We hope that this can become a new highlight of the China-US bilateral relationship.” China has been reluctant to cap its carbon emissions, which scientists link to global warming, over fears doing so will curb economic growth. The country has drafted plans to put emission-intensity targets and caps in its five-year plan through 2020, the 21st Century Business Herald reported May 20. Action by China and the US “is particularly important as we intensify efforts in the multilateral negotiations on a new climate agreement for the post 2020-period,” Stern said. International negotiations on a climate-protection deal have so far failed to secure commitments. Envoys from more than 190 nations are scheduled to next meet at an annual UN climate summit in Warsaw in November to take forward talks on a global greenhouse-gas reduction treaty. The deal, which they aim to agree by 2015, would come into force from 2020. Stern will return to Beijing on June 18 for more talks, Xie said.

#### Warming cooperation is key and the main area of coop now

Tian and Lan, 13- Wei Tian and Lan Lan are writers for China Daily (“China, US step up climate change cooperation”, China Daily, 6/1/13, http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/china/2013xivisit/2013-06/01/content\_16554434.htm)//TL

Senior officials from China and the United States, the world's two largest economies and greenhouse gases emitters, agreed on Friday to intensify their cooperation on climate change. "On the basis of existing cooperation between the two countries, we will further explore areas and programs with potential for further cooperation," said Xie Zhenhua, vice-minister of the National Development and Reform Commission, after a meeting with Todd Stern, the US special envoy for climate change. The meeting came just days before President Xi Jinping and his US counterpart President Barack Obama are due to meet in California. "We will expand cooperation both in band and scope, and work with each other to solve difficulties," added Xie. Xie and Stern are leading the Climate Change Working Group, which was initiated after the visit of US Secretary of State John Kerry to China in April. The working group has been deciding and finalizing ways in which the two countries can work closely together on technology, research, conservation, and alternative and renewable energy. "The establishment of the working group shows that the leaders attach great importance to the issue of climate change, and regard the issue as an important content of bilateral relations. "Climate change will become a new highlight of the Sino-US bilateral relationship," Xie said. Stern said that "forceful cooperative action between the US and China is more critical now than ever", adding that "such action will be good for each of the countries individually, and good for the whole world". Xie and Stern will meet again in China on June 18, before the group's results and recommendations are presented to the fifth Strategic and Economic Dialogue, which is to be held in Washington DC on July 8. Experts said the joint action taken by China and the US, the two largest greenhouse gase emitters, on how to address climate change was a profound step. China and the US together emit about 40 percent of global greenhouse gas emissions. He Jiankun, director of the Institute of Low Carbon Economy at Tsinghua University in Beijing, said such an initiative would be significant for promoting global ecological security and sustainable development.
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#### The United States federal government should

**- extend aviation pollution emission regulations to the oceans**

**- broker a global emission regulations deal with Europe**

**- fully develop natural gas, oil, coal, and nuclear power**

**- approve the Keystone XL pipeline**

**- ensure that federal regulations do not unilaterally raise the cost of domestic energy sources**

**- incentivize companies to move their business operations to Massachusetts by offering business friendly financing and increasing awareness of the region’s business benefits**

**- foreclose Cuba’s option to export Cuban nickel to the United States**

**- invest in the F-35 program**

**- create a prize system for electricity production of space solar power in the United States**

#### Planks 1 and 2 solve aviation pollution

Hemmings, 13

Bill Hemmings, Transport & Environment’s Programme Manager - Aviation & Shipping; “America must lead global fight against aviation carbon pollution,” 5/8/2013, http://www.transportenvironment.org/newsroom/blog/america-must-lead-global-fight-against-aviation-carbon-pollution //bghs-ms

Things must change. The Obama administration has to shut the door on industry lobbyists and champion action to control emissions from a global sector that threatens to do long-term climate damage. Such a move should not be a pipe dream. The U.S. is actually making some of the right moves now at the International Maritime Organization on shipping, another major international source of climate pollution. Airlines also need to wise up. The industry must realise that its mounting contribution to global warming poses a grave danger to its own commercial future no matter how much everyone likes to fly. Indeed, a recent scientific study published in Nature found that climate change will significantly increase turbulence in transatlantic flights, with similar problems likely in other key areas. Instead, short-termism and a lack of vision has major airlines and their lobbyists working against consensus-building at ICAO while mouthing platitudes about how nice a global deal would be. Europe says it won't be pushed around and will restart the clock next year if ICAO fails to deliver. If ICAO fails again, we hope that happens. But the prognosis is worrisome. The U.S. and its coalition insist on limiting any regional emissions regulations to covering international flights only while flying over other countries' sovereign airspace. Such a restriction would leave emissions over the world's oceans completely unregulated and cut the environmental effectiveness of Europe's scheme by two-thirds. Notably, no such concerns about regulating non-U.S. carriers were voiced in Congress when Kerry/Liebermann proposed a climate law that would have put a carbon price on the full-flight fuel uplifted by all aircraft departing the United States --an approach similar to Europe's. By pressing the 'airspace' geographical scope on Europe, an approach that contradicts American methods for calculating its own aviation emissions, the U.S. is helping ensure there is no political way forward. The United States has a political, historical and moral obligation to show leadership. It should work with Europe to broker a global deal that is fair and acceptable to ICAO members and separately agree with Europe, as the two largest global aviation emitters historically, to joint early action across the Atlantic. Time is almost up

#### Planks 3, 4, and 5 solve steel, manufacturing, and the economy

Gibson, 9/5

Thomas J. Gibson, President and CEO of the American Iron and Steel Institute, Senior Vice former President of Advocacy for the American Chemistry Council, Senior Vice President, Government Affairs for the Portland Cement Association, and Chief of Staff for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; “How Congress can support America's manufacturing renaissance,” 9/5/2013, http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/economy-a-budget/320461-how-congress-can-support-americas-manufacturing-renaissance //bghs-ms

For our new energy reality, CEA predicts that while “technology will play a leading role in boosting domestic supplies... the real variable in it all is public policy.” As such, Congress must: \* Promote an abundant and affordable energy supply by fully developing domestic natural gas, oil, coal, and nuclear power resources; including, harnessing the energy and economic benefits of natural gas from shale formations. It is also essential that Congress act to ensure the approval of the Keystone XL Pipeline without further delay. \* Ensure that federal regulations do not unilaterally raise the cost of all domestic energy sources. Several EPA regulations of the utility sector, including for greenhouse gas emissions, could raise the costs of electricity to large industrial customers like steel while potentially lessening the reliability of electricity supply. Proposals to subject shale gas drilling to new federal regulations must maximize the potential economic and environmental benefits of this important domestic resource. Manufacturing on the whole supports an estimated 17.2 million jobs in the United States—about one in six private-sector jobs. Nearly 12 million Americans are employed directly in manufacturing. Greater development of energy resources means greater demand for manufactured goods, including steel. **That** **translates into more jobs**, and that’s good for everyone.

#### Plank 6 solves manufacturing --- their 1AC uniqueness evidence identifies Massachusetts as the reason that manufacturing might decline now

Graham, 9/21

Jordan, Correspondent – Boston Herald, Citing MIT Study, “MIT study: U.S. needs to step up manufacturing”, Boston Herald, 2013, http://bostonherald.com/business/business\_markets/2013/09/mit\_study\_us\_needs\_to\_step\_up\_manufacturing //bghs-ms

The nation’s booming innovation economy is in danger of losing steam and moving overseas unless there is a significant increase in manufacturing in the U.S., according to a new study from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, but **Massachusetts is poised to take advantage of such an increase**, a state official says. “We think there’s no task more urgent in the United States than rebuild the capabilities in the industrial ecosystem,” said Suzanne Berger, MIT professor and author of the book-length global manufacturing study released yesterday. “What we need is the kind of production that will allow us to get the great ideas ... out into the world rapidly.” Berger and a group of MIT professors who spent two years researching to produce the Production in the Innovation Economy report said the decline in manufacturing not only means companies are looking overseas for production, they also are being enticed to move overseas. Many industries require tight integration between manufacturing and research and development, Berger said. If manufacturing does not increase in the U.S., companies could relocate to be close to their manufacturing facilities, significantly affecting the future of innovation in the country. “If there’s this pull abroad, what does that mean for the next generation of innovations?” Jason Miller, special assistant to the president for manufacturing policy, said in a panel discussion after the release of the report.

**\*\*GBN’s card ends here\*\***

Massachusetts Secretary of Housing and Economic Development Greg Bialecki said because so much R&D already happens here, particularly in the biotech sector, it would be a natural fit for companies to expand their manufacturing in the Bay State. “The opportunity is there, if you’re thoughtful about how to address the issue,” he said. The objective, Bialecki said, is to “allow companies to do manufacturing close enough to their R&D so there’s this continuous cycle of innovation that the manufacturing process itself yields.” He said the state can do more to entice companies to move, including offering business friendly financing to companies and increasing awareness about the benefits of manufacturing locally. “If we want to thrive and compete in a growing economy in a sustainable way, that’s what we’re fighting for here,” said acting U.S. Deputy Secretary of Commerce Patrick Gallagher.

#### SPS is key to air power – the perception alone solves great power war

Garretson 12 – Lt Col Peter Garretson is an airpower strategist currently serving on the CSAF’s Strategic Studies Group (HAF/CK). His previous assignment was at the Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses in New Delhi as an Air Force Fellow examining Indo–US long-term space collaboration under the sponsorship of the Council on Foreign Relations. Prior to that he was the chief of future science and technology exploration for the HQ USAF Directorate of Strategic Planning (AF/A8XC), Spring 2012, "Solar Power in Space?" Strategic Studies Quarterly Spring, http://www.au.af.mil/au/ssq/2012/spring/garretson.pdf

But so far at least, the reaction seems more consistent with the worry expressed by Friedman that the United States, as compared to China, had lost its “can-do” spirit in the early twenty-first century.29 Airmen, as stewards of America’s aerospace power, should not be so complacent. Understanding the critical link between dual-use infrastructure that contributes to access and on-orbit capabilities, an Air Force strategist might then take a much less complacent view of international competition. There are no battles in this strategy; each side is merely trying to outdo in performance the equipment of the other. . . . Its tactics are industrial, technical, and financial. . . . A silent and apparently peaceful war is therefore in progress, but it could well be a war which of itself could be decisive. —General d’Armee Andre Beaufre For years **the Air Force has kept the** United States **out of** a **major war and kept the world from another** global conflict **by maintaining technological preeminence** and overmatch, practicing what a Cold War textbook called a “Strategy of Technology”: The Technological War is the decisive struggle in the Protracted Conflict. Victory in the Technological War **gives supremacy in all other phases of the conflict**. . . . The Technological War creates the resources to be employed in all other parts of the Protracted Conflict. It governs the range of strategies that can be adapted in actual or hot war. . . . Military superiority or even supremacy is not permanent, and never ends the conflict unless it is used. The United States considers the Technological War as an infinite game: one which is not played out to a decisive victory. We are committed to a grand strategy of defense, and will never employ a decisive advantage to end the conflict by destroying our enemies. Consequently, we must maintain not only military superiority but [also] technological supremacy. The race is an alternative to destructive war, not the cause of military conflict. . . . The United States is dedicated to a strategy of stability. We are a stabilizing rather than a disturbing power, and our goal is preserving the status quo and the balance of power rather than seeking conquest and the final solution to the problems of international conflict through occupation or extermination of all opponents. In a word, the U.S. sees the Technological War as an infinite game, one played for the sake of continuing to play, rather than for the sake of “victory” in the narrow sense. 30 That is not to imply that Airmen should recommend a zero-sum orientation toward SBSP competition, only that America should get its head in this game. Because it is the policy of the United States to pursue international cooperation in space and take the lead in multilateral efforts which enhance stability and transparency in space, Airmen must consider not only the threat of losing an important technical competition but also the opportunity international cooperation could provide to advance US interests through partnerships in the domains under their stewardship. Aerospace competition is not only technical; it also has an aspirational moral dimension, as nations are measured, admired, and respected not only by their accomplishments but also by their ambitions. Former USAF strategist Col John Boyd made clear the strategic value of vision: “What is needed is a vision rooted in human nature so noble, so attractive that it not only **attracts the uncommitted and magnifies** the spirit and **strength of** its **adherents, but also undermines** the dedication and **determination of any** competitors and **adversaries.**” 31
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#### Yellen likely to be nominated now but residual opposition makes Obama’s political capital necessary

Mason and Felsenthal, 10/9

Jeff Mason and Mark Felsenthal, news reporters for Reuters; “Obama's Fed pick Yellen puts focus on jobs, stability,” 10/9/2013, http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/10/10/us-usa-fed-idUSBRE99312G20131010 //bghs-ms

(Reuters) - Federal Reserve Vice Chair Janet Yellen, President Barack Obama's pick to lead the U.S. central bank, said on Wednesday that strengthening the economic recovery and boosting employment would be priorities if she is confirmed as Fed leader.¶ Yellen, an advocate of the central bank's aggressive actions to stimulate economic growth through low interest rates and large-scale bond purchases, would replace Fed Chairman Ben Bernanke, whose second term ends on January 31.¶ The nomination would put Yellen on course to be the first woman to lead the institution and the first to head a central bank in any Group of Seven industrial nation.¶ At a White House ceremony where Obama announced her nomination, Yellen said she would promote maximum employment, stable prices, and a sound financial system as the top U.S. central banker and noted there was more to do to ensure people who were out of work could find jobs.¶ "While we have made progress, we have farther to go. The mandate of the Federal Reserve is to serve all the American people, and too many Americans still can't find a job and worry how they'll pay their bills and provide for their families," the 67-year-old former professor said.¶ Yellen will provide continuity with the policies the Bernanke-led Fed has pursued, and is likely to move cautiously in reining in the extensive monetary stimulus the central bank put in place to shore up the world's largest economy.¶ Her fealty to the extraordinary policy tactics the Fed employed in an effort to beat back the 2007-2009 recession and spur faster job growth concerns some Republican who fear the measures will unleash inflation or fuel asset bubbles.¶ Despite such opposition, **Yellen has strong support from fellow Democrats and is expected to be confirmed by the Senate**.¶ "Janet is exceptionally well qualified for this role," Obama said with a beaming Yellen by his side. "She doesn't have a crystal ball, but what she does have is a keen understanding about how markets and the economy work, not just in theory but also in the real world. And she calls it like she sees it."¶ EASY MONEY, CONTINUITY¶ The U.S. central bank has held interest rates near zero since late 2008. It has also roughly quadrupled its balance sheet to about $3.7 trillion through three rounds of massive bond purchases to press down longer-term borrowing costs.¶ "Yellen's nomination is a clear signal that the highly accommodative monetary policy stance will likely remain in place," wrote Barclays economist Michael Gapen in New York.¶ While analysts said Yellen's policy approach should be supportive for stock markets that have come to rely on easy money from the Fed, the market reaction on Wednesday did not provide a clear read on investor sentiment.¶ Stocks closed modestly higher, lifted in part by rising hopes that Congress could break a political impasse that has led to a partial government shutdown and now threatens a possible default. The U.S. Treasury has warned it could run out of cash quickly to pay the nation's bills if lawmakers do not raise the government's $16.7 trillion debt ceiling soon.¶ The Fed is currently buying bonds at a monthly pace of $85 billion. It surprised investors in September when it delayed an anticipated reduction in its purchases.¶ Economists, watching tepid signals on growth and hiring, wonder if a decision to scale back might be delayed until Yellen is in charge next year, but minutes of the Fed's September meeting released on Wednesday showed policymakers were close to acting.¶ Obama settled on Yellen after his former economic adviser Lawrence Summers withdrew from consideration in the face of fierce opposition within the president's own Democratic Party that raised questions about his chances of congressional confirmation. Summers would have been expected to pull back the Fed's support for the economy more quickly.¶ With markets jittery about a potential U.S. default, Obama appeared to want to provide reassurance with his words about Yellen. He noted her ability to reach consensus with colleagues - something Summers' opponents say he lacked - and her success at predicting the risks of a major recession before it happened.¶ "Given the urgent economic challenges facing our nation, I urge the Senate to confirm Janet without delay," Obama said. "I am absolutely confident that she will be an exceptional chair of the Federal Reserve."¶ "LIBERAL SCHOOL OF THOUGHT"¶ Yellen's focus on efforts to boost growth has riled some Republican lawmakers who think the Fed has already pumped too much money into the economy.¶ "Ms. Yellen subscribes to the liberal school of thought that the best way to handle our nation's fiscal challenges is to throw more money at them," said Senator John Cornyn of Texas, the body's No. 2 Republican.¶ The Republican opposition could lead to a tense hearing when Yellen goes before the Senate Banking Committee, which needs to weigh her nomination before sending it to the full Senate for a final confirming vote.¶ **In the end, however, Yellen is expected to gain enough support to secure the 60 votes needed to overcome any procedural hurdles**. Democrats control the chamber 54-46.¶ Senator Susan Collins, a Maine Republican, called Yellen "clearly a very experienced, qualified individual."

#### Plan drains capital – empirics prove – this card is awesome

LeoGrande, 12

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

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

#### Yellen’s key to the fragile global economy --- and the confirmation will be a fight

AP, 10/9

Associated Press; “If approved as Fed chair, Yellen must confront tough challenges on stimulus, economic recovery,” 10/9/2013, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/whitehouse/hard-challenges-yellen-must-clear-senate-decide-on-stimulus-cut-face-tough-economy/2013/10/09/c156444e-310d-11e3-ad00-ec4c6b31cbed_story.html> //bghs-ms

WASHINGTON — If she becomes the next Federal Reserve chair, the challenges that lie ahead for Janet Yellen will require both the steely intellect and the personable style that many attribute to her.¶ The job as the world’s most important banker comes with a daunting to-do list: deciding when to slow the Fed’s stimulus, forging consensus from a fractious policy committee and calculating the effects of any economic slowdown from Washington’s budget fight. That’s in addition to monitoring volatile financial markets and fine-tuning the Fed’s communications.¶ First, though, Yellen will have to get there. She will need to overcome Washington’s toxic political environment and win confirmation from the Senate to succeed Ben Bernanke when his term ends Jan. 31.¶ It’s almost enough to make you wonder why she would want the job.¶ Yellen is widely seen as a “dove” on Fed policy. She stresses the need to use the Fed’s tools to boost growth and reduce unemployment in the sluggish aftermath of the Great Recession, rather than worry about igniting future inflation.¶ That view came through in her brief remarks Wednesday after President Barack Obama announced her nomination. Yellen said more needed be done to strengthen the economy. She added, though, “We have made progress. The economy is stronger, and the financial system is sounder.”¶ In part for her perceived dovishiness, Yellen has been outspokenly backed by many Democrats in Congress and opposed by some Republicans.¶ She wasn’t Obama’s first choice to lead the Fed. That was Larry Summers, a former Treasury Secretary and chief White House economic adviser who withdrew from consideration in the face of widespread opposition.¶ Brian Gardner, Washington political analyst for Keefe, Bruyette & Woods, predicts that Yellen, widely respected as an academic economist and veteran policymaker, will be easily confirmed despite some Republican no votes.¶ Then the hard stuff begins.¶ Fed policymakers have been debating when and how to scale back their $85 billion a month in bond purchases designed to spur economic growth by reducing long-term interest rates, driving up stock prices and encouraging borrowing and spending. Yellen was a key architect of this strategy.¶ Last month, the Fed surprised financial markets by deciding not to scale back its bond purchases. It concluded that that the U.S. economy wasn’t yet healthy enough for the Fed to ease its stimulus even slightly. Fed officials also worried about the budget stalemate that’s since led to a partial shutdown of the government and threatens to trigger a default on government debt.¶ Many analysts now don’t think the Fed will reduce its stimulus before next year. And with the dovish Yellen as chairman, the Fed would likely be cautious about any pullback in early 2014.¶ For now, there’s another problem, too. There isn’t much official economic data to go on. The shutdown that began Oct. 1 forced the Labor Department to cancel its all-important jobs report for September. It’s still unclear when the jobs report will come out.¶ The choice of Yellen to lead the Fed also comes amid worry and uncertainty about how much damage the shutdown might cause the U.S. economy. Graver yet is fear that lawmakers won’t raise the government’s borrowing limit this month. If they don’t, the government could eventually default on its debt, possibly causing another recession and financial crisis.¶ As chairman of the Fed, an independent agency that steers clear of Congress’ affairs, Yellen can be little more than a spectator.¶ “There’s really nothing she could do about the debt ceiling,” noted Joseph Gagnon, senior fellow at the Peterson Institute for International Economics.¶ One especially delicate challenge for Yellen will be to refine the Fed’s communications with the public. Bernanke opened the once-secretive Fed to far more public scrutiny. He was the first chairman, for example, to hold regular news conferences. And the Fed went much further to signal its likely policy actions.¶ This hasn’t always gone smoothly. The Fed has sometimes rattled investors instead of calming them. In fact, according to minutes of the Fed’s September meeting, Fed officials worried about delaying a pullback in its bond purchases last month because they feared this might confuse investors.¶ A finely calibrated communications strategy will likely be high on Yellen’s list of goals.¶ Further down the list could be another huge challenge: How and when to start shrinking the Fed’s portfolio of bonds. The Fed’s purchases have swollen its investment portfolio to $3.7 trillion, a record by far. Eventually, perhaps under Yellen, the Fed will have to start unloading the bonds without shaking financial markets. It will be a tough task.¶ Yellen would also take over the Fed at a critical time for China, the world’s No. 2 economy after the United States, and other developing nations.¶ The International Monetary Fund, citing slower growth in China, India and Brazil, downgraded its forecast this week for global economic growth to 2.9 percent this year and 3.6 percent in 2014. Both are 0.2 percentage point weaker than the IMF’s previous forecast in July.¶ Investors have been pulling money out of developing markets, partly to take advantage of rising interest rates in the United States. The Fed might be called upon to help calm worldwide financial volatility.¶ “The role of the Fed chair is so critical,” said Greg McBride, senior financial analyst at Bankrate.com. “**We’re not just talking about the U.S. economy. We’re talking about the** global economy.”¶ Yellen will also have to establish herself as chair at a time when the Fed is experiencing unusual turnover. When Bernanke leaves Jan. 31, but there could be up to four vacancies that Obama would need to fill on the seven-member Fed board.¶ One board member, Elizabeth Duke, left in August. Another, Sarah Bloom Raskin, has been nominated by Obama to become deputy Treasury secretary. The term of a third, Jerome Powell, will be up Jan. 31, though he can remain on the board until a successor is confirmed by the Senate.¶ And Sandra Pianalto, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland, has announced that she will leave early next year.¶ Most analysts say they’re confident Yellen can handle the many challenges.¶ “By temperament, by mannerism and by extensive experience, I think she is better prepared for that job than almost anybody on the face of the earth,” says Alan Blinder, a Princeton University economist and former Fed vice chairman who served with Yellen at the Fed in the 1990s.

#### Economic decline causes nuclear war

Merlini 11 (Cesare Merlini, BA in humanities, holds a diploma for industrial engineering, nonresident Senior Fellow at the Center on the United States at the Brookings Institute, Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Italian Institute of International Affairs, President of the Italian Institute of International Affairs, founder and former Executive-Vice-Chairman of the Council for the United States and Italy, former co-editor of Global-FP, an Italian magazine associated with Foreign Affairs, former member of the Trilateral Commission, member of the Board of the International Institute for Strategic Studies, previously held the chair of Nuclear Technologies at the Polytechnic University of Turin, nuclear scientist at the Argonne National Laboratory in Illinois, expert on transatlantic relations, European integration, nuclear non-proliferation, and the impact of change in society on international relations, 2011, “A Post-Secular World?”, published in Survival volume 53 number 2, page 117, http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/Files/rc/articles/2011/04\_international\_relations\_merlini/04\_international\_relations\_merlini.pdf)

Two neatly opposed scenarios for the future of the world order illustrate the range of possibilities, albeit at the risk of oversimplification. The first scenario entails the premature crumbling of the post-Westphalian system. One or more of the acute tensions apparent today evolves into an open and traditional conflict between states, perhaps even involving the use of nuclear weapons. The crisis might be triggered by a collapse of the global economic and financial system, the vulnerability of which we have just experienced, and the prospect of a second Great Depression, with consequences for peace and democracy similar to those of the first. Whatever the trigger, the unlimited exercise of national sovereignty, exclusive self-interest and rejection of outside interference would likely be amplified, emptying, perhaps entirely, the half-full glass of multilateralism, including the UN and the European Union. Many of the more likely conflicts, such as between Israel and Iran or India and Pakistan, have potential religious dimensions. Short of war, tensions such as those related to immigration might become unbearable. Familiar issues of creed and identity could be exacerbated. One way or another, the secular rational approach would be sidestepped by a return to theocratic absolutes, competing or converging with secular absolutes such as unbridled nationalism. One symptom that makes such a scenario plausible has become visible. Many commentators have identified anger or anxiety as a common driver of the Tea Party movement in the United States and the rise of xenophobic parties in Europe, perhaps stemming from a self-perception of decline. Anger (directed towards the neo-colonialist or pro-Israeli West or – especially recently – domestic authoritarian regimes) has also been associated with grievances in the Middle East, following the failure of earlier reformist and secular movements. 10 Despite relative popular optimism, anger can also be detected in Asia, hand in hand with chauvinism and a sense of lack of appropriate recognition by others, stemming from a self-perception of rising influence and power.
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Warming is real, anthropogenic, and causes extinction

Deibel 7(Terry L, Professor of IR @ National War College, “Foreign Affairs Strategy: Logic for American Statecraft”, Conclusion: American Foreign Affairs Strategy Today)

Finally, there is one major existential threat to American security (as well as prosperity) of a nonviolent nature, which, though far in the future, demands urgent action. It is the threat of global warming to the stability of the climate upon which all earthly life depends. Scientists worldwide have been observing the gathering of this threat for three decades now, and what was once a mere possibility has passed through probability to near certainty. Indeed not one of more than 900 articles on climate change published in refereed scientific journals from 1993 to 2003 doubted that anthropogenic warming is occurring. “In legitimate scientific circles,” writes Elizabeth Kolbert, “it is virtually impossible to find evidence of disagreement over the fundamentals of global warming.” Evidence from a vast international scientific monitoring effort accumulates almost weekly, as this sample of newspaper reports shows: an international panel predicts “brutal droughts, floods and violent storms across the planet over the next century”; climate change could “literally alter ocean currents, wipe away huge portions of Alpine Snowcaps and aid the spread of cholera and malaria”; “glaciers in the Antarctic and in Greenland are melting much faster than expected, and…worldwide, plants are blooming several days earlier than a decade ago”; “rising sea temperatures have been accompanied by a significant global increase in the most destructive hurricanes”; “NASA scientists have concluded from direct temperature measurements that 2005 was the hottest year on record, with 1998 a close second”; “Earth’s warming climate is estimated to contribute to more than 150,000 deaths and 5 million illnesses each year” as disease spreads; “widespread bleaching from Texas to Trinidad…killed broad swaths of corals” due to a 2-degree rise in sea temperatures. “The world is slowly disintegrating,” concluded Inuit hunter Noah Metuq, who lives 30 miles from the Arctic Circle. “They call it climate change…but we just call it breaking up.” From the founding of the first cities some 6,000 years ago until the beginning of the industrial revolution, carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere remained relatively constant at about 280 parts per million (ppm). At present they are accelerating toward 400 ppm, and by 2050 they will reach 500 ppm, about double pre-industrial levels. Unfortunately, atmospheric CO2 lasts about a century, so there is no way immediately to reduce levels, only to slow their increase, we are thus in for significant global warming; the only debate is how much and how serious the effects will be. As the newspaper stories quoted above show, we are already experiencing the effects of 1-2 degree warming in more violent storms, spread of disease, mass die offs of plants and animals, species extinction, and threatened inundation of low-lying countries like the Pacific nation of Kiribati and the Netherlands at a warming of 5 degrees or less the Greenland and West Antarctic ice sheets could disintegrate, leading to a sea level of rise of 20 feet that would cover North Carolina’s outer banks, swamp the southern third of Florida, and inundate Manhattan up to the middle of Greenwich Village. Another catastrophic effect would be the collapse of the Atlantic thermohaline circulation that keeps the winter weather in Europe far warmer than its latitude would otherwise allow. Economist William Cline once estimated the damage to the United States alone from moderate levels of warming at 1-6 percent of GDP annually; severe warming could cost 13-26 percent of GDP. But the most frightening scenario is runaway greenhouse warming, based on positive feedback from the buildup of water vapor in the atmosphere that is both caused by and causes hotter surface temperatures. Past ice age transitions, associated with only 5-10 degree changes in average global temperatures, took place in just decades, even though no one was then pouring ever-increasing amounts of carbon into the atmosphere. Faced with this specter, the best one can conclude is that “humankind’s continuing enhancement of the natural greenhouse effect is akin to playing Russian roulette with the earth’s climate and humanity’s life support system. At worst, says physics professor Marty Hoffert of New York University, “we’re just going to burn everything up; we’re going to heat the atmosphere to the temperature it was in the Cretaceous when there were crocodiles at the poles, and then everything will collapse.” During the Cold War, astronomer Carl Sagan popularized a theory of nuclear winter to describe how a thermonuclear war between the Untied States and the Soviet Union would not only destroy both countries but possibly end life on this planet. Global warming is the post-Cold War era’s equivalent of nuclear winter at least as serious and considerably better supported scientifically. Over the long run it puts dangers from terrorism and traditional military challenges to shame. It is a threat not only to the security and prosperity to the United States, but potentially to the continued existence of life on this planet.

#### Turns Cuban economy- China is key to Cuban economic reforms

Hearn 12 - Senior Research Fellow at the University of Sydney (Adrian H., “China, Global Governance and the Future of Cuba”, 01/07, http://journals.sub.uni-hamburg.de/giga/jcca/article/viewFile/498/496)//VP

State cooperation with China has helped Cuba to establish the basic infrastructure it needs for economic growth. The challenge now facing the island is to employ this platform to support private initiative and harness the productive potentials of the market. As Robert B. Reich famously wrote three decades ago, “Economies are like *bicycles*. The faster they move, the better they maintain their balance unaided” (Reich 1982). The Chinese government adopted this strategy of gradual liberalisation at home in the early 1980s, and has repeatedly advocated it to Cuban officials ever since Fidel Castro’s 1995 meeting with Premier Li Peng in Beijing (Cheng 2007; Jiang 2009). After 15 years of hearing their advice, Cuba’s reformers – led by Raúl Castro – are now listening. Cuba’s sixth Communist Party Congress, which took place in April 2011, showed a growing acceptance of the market as a catalyst for national development. The Economic and Social Policy Guidelines approved by the congress declared that ownership of private property, long considered antithetical to socialism, is now considered acceptable on the condition that it is not “concentrated” (República de Cuba 2011: 5, 11). The critical concern has therefore become how the state might leverage its considerable institutional capacities to optimise and guide economic performance. Critics argue that unlike China, Cuba’s commitment to “updating the socialist system” constitutes a justification for maintaining the 50year-old status quo, and that in light of the regime’s longevity, “nothing much will change” (Azel 2011). Others view the 2011 reforms as “a significant realignment of the paternalistic relationship that has existed between the state and its citizenry since the revolutionary period began in 1959” (Laverty 2011: 4). Even Cuba’s long-time critic, Freedom House, has found that “the opening of a private sector, while still limited, is driving genuine change in Cuba” (Moreno and Calingaert 2011: 25). Especially significant, argues Cuba analyst Arturo Lopez-Levy, is the loosening of restrictions on the sale of real estate and automobiles: There is much political continuity in Raúl Castro’s government, but the recent announcement that Cubans will be able to sell and buy houses and their used carsrepresents an important change. These are visible economic reforms with direct impacts on Cuban lives. The marketisation of these assets unleashes Cuban entrepreneurial spirit and might increase the remittances received from relatives and friends abroad (Lopez-Levy 2011a). Effective implementation of the 2011 reforms will require a phased and coordinated approach, and in this regard China can provide some useful lessons. Among the insights Cuba has derived from China – with varying degrees of attentiveness – are the gradual sequencing of reforms under the management of a state-appointed reform commission (Laverty 2011: 65; Lopez-Levy 2011b: 9, 2011c: 43-44), the adaptation of socialist principles to national conditions (Mao et al. 2011: 199), the military management of commercial activities (Klepak 2010), the attraction of investment from emigrants (Ratliff 2004: 21-22), and the testing of liberalisation in target territories prior to wider implementation (Heilmann 2008).

#### Chinese growth is key to solve global environmental problems

Gerth 11– Karl Gerth is a fellow at Merton College and teaches modern Chinese history at Oxford University, (“Can China Save the World, Twice”, January 1, 2011, http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2011/01/01/chinas-environmental-problems-and-economic-growth.html)//sawyer

\*Renminbi is the currency of the PRC

\*PRC is the People’s Republic of China

\*the People’s Republic of China is a sovereign state in East Asia

With the global economy stalled, all eyes are on Chinese consumers, who professor Karl Gerth says are needed to jump-start growth worldwide—and **maybe also solve the environmental crisis**, too. World business and political leaders are making **major efforts to get China to save the global economy**. From international trade organizations such as the World Bank to politicians including President Obama as well as China’s own rulers—all are pushing China to succeed the U.S. and Western Europe as the next nation of **consumers who will drive world economic growth**. Since the 2008 financial crisis, the international pressure for China to rescue the global economy has only intensified and is certain to continue this year. There has been serious pressure for another round of efforts to persuade China to re-evaluate its currency**, the renminbi, which Washington hopes will effectively give Chinese consumers more money to buy imports.** But as the spending power of Chinese consumers grows, so do China’s environmental problems. China has 16 of the world’s most polluted cities, its lakes and rivers are disappearing, and although it is the world’s largest energy user and carbon-emitter, but it’s still only the 18th per capita emitter.In other words, as Chinese consumers save the world’s economy, China’s environmental problems may get worse, much worse. Take water, the ultimate consumer product. In addition to consuming potable water by cup or bottle, the Chinese, like their counterparts worldwide, consume water indirectly as a critical ingredient in their new and more water-intensive diets based on meat. It takes approximately 1,000 tons of water to produce a single ton of grain and 7 tons of grain to produce a ton of beef. An upshot, then, of China’s switching from their pre-1978 bean-protein-based diets to Kung Pao chicken or McDonald’s hamburgers is that it uses much more water. Many Chinese industries also use massive amounts of water. It takes, for instance, 400,000 liters (or 105,000 gallons) of water to manufacture a single car. And last year, for the first time, Chinese consumers surpassed their American counterparts by buying the most cars**. Any hope for environmental progress will depend on the Chinese managing, against the odds, to excel as stewards of the environment with as much enthusiasm as they have learned to become first-rate consumers.** The market responses to China’s water crisis have created additional environmental problems. Gone are the days when visitors to China struggled to find a store that could sell them something to drink. Now water vendors are everywhere, and the waste bins alongside roads are brimming over with discarded plastic bottles. Even more than in Western countries, fewer and fewer consumers appear to trust tap water, or “Tap-ian,” to coin a pun on Evian, the French water brand that has became a fashion statement for the brand-conscious wealthy in China. The habit of buying bottled water is spreading worldwide, with Americans still leading the way, consuming 8.7 billion gallons of bottled water in 2008, almost double what they drank at the start of the decade. But while the U.S. market for bottled water began to actually decline in 2008, China consumed over 5.2 billion gallons that year and is now by far the fastest growing market. This is only likely to grow, as China drinks only about half the global average of 7.9 gallons of bottled water per person, significantly behind the U.S. (28.5) and the world leader, Mexico (59.1).But as always with China, per-capita matters: If Chinese consumers begin to drink even one-fourth the per capita rate of bottled water as the average American, China will become the world’s largest consumer. But might we also look to China to save the world environmentally? **An environmental protection movement there shows signs of life. The national government has begun to ban certain types of disposable items, and hundreds of small companies in China now manufacture more sustainable alternatives, including biodegradable disposable articles such as chopsticks made from yam starch and tableware made from rice husks, starch, and cardboard**. Most importantly, China now has thousands of local and national environmental non-governmental organizations, most established in the last few years. Organizations like Friends of Nature work tirelessly to protect and restore China’s environment and raise public awareness. But just as China is emulating Western consumer lifestyles, if the history of environmental NGOs in the West offers clues to China’s future, there is ample reason to worry that Chinese environmentalism is likely to be absorbed by consumer culture, creating new markets for ecotourism, sustainable housing, and consumer products sold as “green.” And China is less likely to fundamentally challenge a way of life that remains deeply dependent on ecologically destructive and non-renewable resources. It’s not hard to imagine a day in the near future when Chinese tourists heading for weekend vacations in Paris will have the option to buy carbon offsets. Like Western nations before them, the more likely expectation is that the Chinese will drag their feet, make token changes, and outsource their industrial pollution to the “next Chinas” in Vietnam, Zambia, Indonesia, and places with weaker labor laws and environmental protections. Or perhaps they’ll follow the European lead with a “cap and trade” market that mostly shuffles the problem around. Yet although it’s easy to be pessimistic, the scale and relative suddenness of China’s environmental problems linked to that country’s changing consumer habits may also make it easy to imagine how the world’s consciousness—reflected in consumer behavior—needs to change. A large part of any hope for environmental progress will depend on the Chinese managing, against the odds, to excel as stewards of the environment with as much enthusiasm as they have learned to become first-rate consumers. Certainly, there is evidence that China understands the odds and the consequences. We read in the newspapers nearly daily how China is leading the world in renewable energy, as it must if it is to continue its economic growth. The latest: It’s building six gigantic wind farms that will generate the equivalent of 100 coal-fired power plants worth of electricity. China is to be commended for its green efforts. But whether this commitment to renewable energy will be able to catch up with the speed and size of its emerging consumer demand is still an open question. No other nation in the developed world has yet found a way to reverse the ecologically destructive effects of its way of life faster than any off-setting commitment to correcting, let alone reversing them. So this is yet another way in which we can only hope that China will lead the way with consumers who save the world economically without destroying its environment.

#### Chinese influence in Latin America quells tensions over Taiwan

Ellis ‘11 (R. Evan. Assistant Professor of National Security Studies in the Center for Hemispheric Defense Studies at the National Defense University. “Chinese Soft Power in Latin America: A Case Study” Joint Force Quarterly, Vol 60. 2011. http://www.ndu.edu/press/chinese-soft-power-latin-america.html)

Diplomatic Recognition of Taiwan. For the PRC, the government of Taiwan represents an important issue of political legitimacy and internal security. Currently, 12 of the 23 nations in the world that diplomatically recognize the government of Taiwan are found in Latin America and the Caribbean. Although the People's Republic of China does not publicly threaten to block investment in or loans to countries that do not recognize the PRC, China repeatedly emphasizes the issue in its public diplomacy in the region, and makes such investments and market access difficult for those countries that do not recognize it, while simultaneously nurturing expectations regarding the opportunities that diplomatically recognizing the PRC could bring. When Costa Rica changed its diplomatic recognition from Taiwan to the PRC in May 2007, for example, it received an aid package that included an $83 million soccer stadium, the purchase of $300 million in government bonds, various highway, public works, and aid projects, and a $1 billion joint venture to expand the country's petroleum refinery, as well as PRC aid in facilitating access to Chinese markets by traditional Costa Rican products such as coffee. In part, such Chinese generosity was directed toward the other countries in the region that still recognized Taiwan in order to demonstrate the types of benefits that could be made available if they too were to change their diplomatic posture.13 Although the PRC and Taiwan have informally agreed to refrain from the use of economic incentives to competitively "bid" for diplomatic recognition, since Costa Rica's switch, the allure of the PRC has prompted declarations of interest in changing diplomatic posture by Panamanian president Richard Martenelli, Paraguayan president Fernando Lugo, and Salvadoran president Maricio Fuenes—although all did so prior to assuming office.

F35 can’t solve—it’s a mess

Rajiv Chandrasekaran, Washington post, 3/9/**13**, F-35’s ability to evade budget cuts illustrates challenge of paring defense spending, www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/f-35s-ability-to-evade-budget-cuts-illustrates-challenge-of-paring-defense-spending/2013/03/09/42a6085a-8776-11e2-98a3-b3db6b9ac586\_print.html

Pentagon officials accepted Lockheed’s claim that computer simulations would be able to identify design problems, minimizing the need to make changes once the plane actually took to the sky. That, in turn, led to an aggressive plan to build and test the aircraft simultaneously.

Cautioning that all of those assumptions were flawed, Spinney and other defense analysts urged the Pentagon to see the plane in flight before committing to buy it. But senior Defense Department officials in the George W. Bush administration did not heed the warnings.

Within months, the program began veering off course.

The Air Force, Marines and Navy all sought additional modifications to meet their needs, reducing commonality among the three models. A bigger problem was the fundamental concept of building one plane, with stealth technology, that could fly as far and fast as the Air Force wanted while also being able to land on the Navy’s carriers and take off vertically from Marine amphibious assault ships.

Instead of meeting the original plan of being about 70 percent similar, the three versions now are 70 percent distinct, which has increased costs by tens of billions and led to years-long delays. “We have three airplane programs running in parallel,” Bogdan said. “They are very, very different airplanes.”

Even with three variants, the plane’s design has forced serious compromises. To remain stealthy, bombs and missiles must be placed inside a weapons bay, which limits the volume of munitions that can be carried. The use of a single engine, required for the Marine version, restricts speed.

With an even more complex engineering challenge than initially envisioned, Lockheed and the Pentagon took a hands-off approach to managing the program, according to several people involved in the process.

An electrical engineer who worked as a manager at Lockheed’s F-35 program headquarters in Fort Worth beginning in 2001 said the development effort was beset with “tremendous organizational inadequacies” and “schedule and cost expectations that never were achievable.” In his unit, he said, there were no firm development timetables and no budgets. “It was all on autopilot,” he said. “It was doomed from the beginning.”

In 2005, the engineer, who spoke on the condition of anonymity because of concerns he will risk job opportunities in the close-knit aviation industry, participated in a two-week-long assessment of the program.“There were reds and yellows across the board,” he recalled. But when he briefed his superiors, “nobody was interested,” he said. And when he gave a copy of the assessment to those at the Pentagon office responsible for the plane, he said, “they didn’t want to hear it.”

A senior Defense Department official acknowledged the office “didn’t have the capacity or the understanding to manage such a complicated program” at the time. Lockheed executives also make little excuse for those years. “It was a very different program from what we are executing today,” said Steve O’Bryan, Lockheed’s vice president of F-35 business development.

With wars raging in Iraq and Afghanistan, and military budgets growing year over year, Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld paid little attention to the program. His successor, Robert M. Gates, took the same approach during his first few years on the job. In 2007, the Defense Department permitted Lockheed to begin producing the fighter — before the first flight tests had even begun. Frank Kendall, who is now the Pentagon’s chief weapons buyer, has called that decision “acquisition malpractice.”

Early tests uncovered flaws unnoticed by the computer simulations. Key engineering tasks, including the vertical takeoff and landing system, were taking much longer to complete. All the while, costs were rising at supersonic speeds.

In 2009, Gates grasped the dysfunction. The following year, he withheld $614 million in fees from Lockheed, fired the two-star Marine general in charge of the program and brought in a Navy vice admiral, David Venlet, to clean house. In 2011, Gates placed the Marine plane on probation, warning that it would be killed if problems with its propulsion system were not fixed quickly.

Bogdan, who served as Venlet’s deputy until December, when he took charge of the development effort, was astounded by what he found when he delved into the program.

“It was an unimaginable mess,” he said.