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#### ‘Economic engagement’ must be quid pro quo.

Helweg 2k – International Affairs Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations (M. Diana Helweg, 2000, “Taking Sanctions into the Twenty-First Century,” Economic Strategy and National Security: a next generation approach, ed. Patrick DeSouza, p. 143-145)

To fill the policy vacuum left by the reduced use of sanctions, the United States should adhere to a policy of political and economic engagement that balances "sticks" such as sanctions and other restrictive measures with additional "carrots" of trade and aid. Only broader economic engagement can open up the relationship with a country and create the mutual economic and strategic benefits that will enable subsequent restrictive policies to encourage the targeted regime to change its undesirable behavior. / Stated most simply, engagement is the opposite of isolation. It includes the flow of ideas, goods, and money under the umbrella of official diplomatic relations. Engagement can be effected through strategic and political dialogue, investment, trade, and even joining forces on appropriate issues in multilateral fora. Since the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, the United States has pursued a policy of political and economic engagement with some previously isolated regimes through dialogue, investment, and support of free trade. In doing so, the United States has indirectly helped promote democracy, freedom of association, freedom of speech, and civil and human rights. To be sure, progress has occurred slowly and with differing degrees of success. Although difficult to measure, engagement with democracies provides the citizens of closed countries the opportunity to learn what types of political freedoms and economic successes are possible. The past decade is replete with instances of ordinary people using that education to try to change their political worlds from Eastern Europe to Latin America and from Africa to Asia. / Countries that have initiated trade and diplomatic relations with the United States have definitely benefited more than those that remain isolated from the United States. For example, compare the civil reforms that have accompanied economic reforms in the former Soviet Union that have been triggered by Western investment and trade, against those that have yet to occur in an isolated Cuba. The same dichotomy can be seen when comparing the improvements in quality of life in a virtually capitalist China thriving on foreign investment with an unstable, famine-stricken North Korea. This argument does not suggest that further significant reforms are still not needed in Russia and China, but there have been improvements over the last decade. One of the keys to the gradual improvements in the Chinese and Russian regimes has been the coupling of economic and political engagement with economic restrictions for behavior incompatible with international norms.

### 2

#### Silencing is active white privilege – upholds structures of whiteness

Carrie Crenshaw, Assistant Professor in the Department of Speech Communication, The University of Alabama, Summer 1997, “Resisting whiteness' rhetorical silence,” Western Journal of Communication 61.3, ebsco

Helms' silence about whiteness naturalized the taken-for-granted assumptions contained in his framework for understanding who is harmed by this decision. The "colossal unseen dimensions [of] the silences and denials surrounding" whiteness are key political tools for protecting white privilege and maintaining the myth of meritocracy (Mcintosh 35). This silence is rhetorical and has important ideological implications. Scott observes that silence and speaking have symbolic impact and as such are both rhetorical. When considering the dialectic of speaking and silence, he thinks of silence as the absence of speech. Silence is active, not passive; it may be interpreted. Furthermore, silence and speech may be both simultaneous and sequential. The absence of speech about whiteness signifies that it exists in our discursive silences. It may often be intentional; it can be interpreted, and it can occur simultaneously with the spoken word. Whiteness' silence is ideological because it signifies that to be white is the natural condition, the assumed norm. Scott notes that silences symbolize the nature of things--their substance or natural condition. Silences symbolize "hierarchical structures as surely as does speech" (15). Indeed, the very structure of privilege generates silences, and "ironically, the most powerful rhetoric for maintaining an existing scheme of privilege will be silent" (10). Thus, silent rhetorical constructions of whiteness like Helms' protect material white privilege because they mask its existence.

#### Opposing racism is the precondition to moral coherence.

Albert **Memmi, 2000**, Racism, p. 159-161

Evidently, I am a moderate optimist. The struggle against racism will be long and probably never totally successful. Humans [Vhomme] being what they are, one cannot for the moment hope for a total end to racist behavior. Even mixed marriage is not a remedy; the example of Brazil is hardly encouraging. There, rather than disappear, racism has created a more complex color hierarchy. In the Caribbean, social classes correspond to a scale of colors. It is as if racism can always find, in each case, the tactic or machination that will work.21 / But yet, humans being what they are, the job can and should be undertaken. People are both angels and beasts; the angel must be assisted in prevailing over the beast. Or, more prosaically, reciprocal dependence must be strengthened as the foundation of the social bond. Whatever the importance of a conflict between individuals or groups, the relative stability of social structures confirms a reciprocal need to engender an inclusive common law of life. Racism represents precisely the invecrse process, since it is a temptation to exclude and the legitimation of exclusion. / The pessimist will object that this is pure rhetoric designed to repackage the same old conduct. But even rhetorical effort is not wasted. Beyond its perversity, the racist discourse is a defense mechanism [plaidoyer] and an alibi. But every search for an alibi also contains within it an implicit recognition of the law. Racism is a structure of aggression that claims, and is given, a presupposed rationality. This pretense is the sign of its cunning and its false assertion of its own humanity. That is why no one wishes to own up to being racist; no one wishes to consent, in their heart, to renounce all humanity. The most hardened racists at least have one ear that hears, a port directly connected to that part of themselves that does not totally approve of iniquity and oppression. The mania and the horror of Nazism comes from what it had renounced of all legitimization, that it had made racism a philosophy if not a total conception of humanity. / Is that all there is? The infinite task before us can be discouraging in that it must always be begun again. Up to now, all peace has only been a truce between two wars, yet still we hope and long for peace. Health is fragile, and death is always in the offing, yet still we struggle to keep ourselves in good health. The struggle against racism is the condition of our collective social health. It encompasses the fundamental moral discussions of love or hate of the other, of justice or injustice, equality or oppression, or, in a word, one's very humanity. The essence of morality is respect for the other. Our honor as humans will be to construct a more human world. In the meanwhile, so that even animals may some day find a world of peace and security, let us act so that no one is any longer treated like a beast.

### 3

#### US-Brazil Relations are high now.

John Kerry, 8-13-2013, Secretary of State of the United States, “Remarks With Brazilian Foreign Minister Antonio de Aguiar Patriota After Their Meeting,” <http://www.state.gov/secretary/remarks/2013/08/213105.htm>

Now, obviously we have also had some moments of disagreement, and I’m sure I’ll have an occasion in the questions to be able to address some of that with you. But the United States and Brazil – I want to emphasize, rather than focus on an area of disagreement – the United States and Brazil share a remarkable and dynamic partnership. Every single day we work together to advance economic opportunity, human rights, environment protection, regional peace and security, democracy, as well as major global challenges in the Middle East and elsewhere – Syria for instance and the question of the humanitarian challenge in Syria. The United States respects and appreciates that Brazil is one of the world’s largest free market democracies, and our partnership is only made stronger as all of the world continues to grow. The United States recognizes and welcomes and greatly appreciates the vital leadership role, the increasing leadership role, that Brazil plays on the international stage – excuse me – and that ranges from its participation in global peace initiatives to its stability operations and promotion of human rights and its efforts to try to help either promote the peace or keep the peace in certain parts of the world. Through the Global Peace Operations Initiative, we are working with Brazil and the United Nations to build the capacity of countries to be able to contribute themselves to peacekeeping operations. Brazil has provided more than 1,400 uniformed personnel to the stabilization mission in Haiti. We’re very grateful for that. And we’re also exploring opportunities for closer collaboration on peacekeeping in Africa. It’s fair to say that protecting universal rights is at the very heart of the shared values between Brazil and the United States. And together, we remain committed to advancing those rights and to advancing the cause of equality for all people. The United States also supports a very vibrant and active Organization of American States, and the OAS Charter reminds us of our responsibilities to offer our citizens liberty and to create the conditions in which all people can reach their aspirations, can live their aspirations. We believe that it is important that Brazil engage fully with the OAS and use its strong voice for a hemispheric vision of democracy and fundamental freedoms. Now, our relationship is not only rooted in shared values, it is literally strengthened every single day by our citizens. Each year thousands of people travel between the United States and Brazil, forging new ties between our countries. Student exchanges under President Rousseff’s Scientific Mobility Program, which I had the privilege of visiting this morning and sensing firsthand the amazing energy and excitement and commitment of these young people, that’s something we share in common. And together with President Rousseff’s program and President Obama’s 100,000 Strong in the Americas Initiative, we are encouraging together approaches to address the shared concerns of our young people to include social inclusion and to work towards things like environmental sustainability.

#### Unilateral interference in Latin America greatly upsets Brazil – collapses relations.

David Rothkopf, 3-xx-2009, President and CEO of Garten Rothkopf, an international advisory firm specializing in transformational global trends, notably those associated with energy, security, and emerging markets, “The Perils of Rivalry,” <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2009/03/pdf/brazil.pdf>

There are other areas in which tension could enter the relationship. How the United States interacts with the Americas writ large under President Obama will shape relations and create potential pitfalls, and so will domestic political considerations both in the United States and Brazil. Any real or perceived interference in the region by the United States would greatly upset Brazil. If the United States decided that heavy-handed political pressure or intervention were required in regard, for example, to Venezuela, Bolivia, or Ecuador, this could put Brazil in an uncomfortable position where it has to choose between the United States and its neighbors. Since Brazil has spent years arguing for South American unity, it would likely choose its neighbors or—even more likely—choose to interject itself as a third party with a third point of view.

#### US-Brazil relationship is key to successful Asia pivot.

Zachary Keck, 5-03-2012, deputy editor of e-International Relations and an editorial assistant at The Diplomat, “With Eye on Asia, U.S. Seeks Greater Global Security Role for Brazil,” <http://www.opeal.net/index.php?option=com_k2&view=item&id=10961%3Awith-eye-on-asia-us-seeks-greater-global-security-role-for-brazil&Itemid=149>

With Eye on Asia, U.S. Seeks Greater Global Security Role for Brazil Last week’s inaugural U.S.-Brazilian Defense Cooperation Dialogue was the latest example of the Obama administration’s efforts to enhance defense cooperation with Brazil. Though improving broader relations with Brazil has been a priority for the Obama administration, the U.S. emphasis on bilateral defense ties should also be seen as part of Washington’s ongoing effort to get Brazil to increase its global security profile as the U.S. focuses more of its strategic attention and shrinking defense resources on the Western Pacific. Even before announcing the U.S. pivot to Asia last fall, the Obama administration had actively pursued expanded security ties with Brazil. The two countries signed a defense cooperation agreement in April 2010 and another agreement the following November to facilitate information-sharing. Both agreements have already resulted in greater military-to-military cooperation, at times in new domains. Although the U.S.-Brazilian navies have a long history of cooperation, most recently jointly participating in a maritime security exercise near Africa in February, cooperation between their air forces is a relatively new phenomenon. In 2010, the U.S. Air Force participated in Brazil’s annual Cruzex multinational air exercise for the first time. Next year, Brazil will reciprocate by joining the annual multilateral Red Flag exercise in Nevada. Since the Asia pivot, however, the Obama administration’s efforts have taken on a greater urgency. The White House dispatched Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. Martin Dempsey to Brasilia last March to further expand military-to-military ties. It has also been urging Congress to loosen restrictions on technology transfers to Brazil. The bilateral Defense Cooperation Dialogue was subsequently publicly unveiled during Brazilian President Dilma Rousseff’s trip to Washington last month. The first meeting of the new initiative took place April 24, during the Brazilian leg of U.S. Defense Secretary Leon Panetta’s weeklong trip to Latin America. During his two-day visit, Panetta repeatedly called on Brazil to increase its role in global security. Washington’s interest in such an expanded Brazilian role stems from its need to increase its force posture in Asia while reducing overall defense spending. Brazil can help facilitate this shift in two ways. First, the U.S. will need to increase its arms sales if it hopes to maintain its defense industrial base in the face of its own budgetary constraints. Brazil’s robust economic growth and responsible global track record make it an attractive defense customer from Washington’s perspective. Brazil’s GDP in current dollars grew from $558 billion in 2000 to $1.78 trillion in 2010, a roughly 220 percent increase over the decade. Brazil is also wealthy relative to other large rising powers. As the world’s fifth-most-populous country, its GDP per capita is nearly equal to China and India’s combined. Brazil is already looking to purchase 36 multirole combat aircraft at a cost of $4 billion to $7 billion. The U.S.-based Boeing Corporation’s F/A-18 Super Hornet is competing with the French Rafale and Swedish Gripen for the contract. With Brazil’s decision expected in the coming weeks, Panetta wasn’t bashful in pushing for the Super Hornet during his trip, stating, “With the Super Hornet, Brazil's defense and aviation industries would be able to transform their partnerships with U.S. companies and . . . plug into worldwide markets." Second, by expanding its participation in international security operations, Brazil can help free up U.S. forces for the Western Pacific. The most obvious roles for the Brazilian military are in hemispheric security and patrolling the Atlantic Ocean. The latter is especially crucial as Washington stations more of its shrinking fleet in the Pacific. Interestingly, last week Panetta also said the U.S. wants Brazil to play a larger role in training African security forces. While the defense secretary justified this on the basis of Brazil’s historical ties to Africa -- Brazil was the largest destination of the Atlantic Slave Trade -- the main driver of U.S. policy is its pivot to Asia. Since the attacks of Sept. 11, U.S. Marines have taken the lead in training African partner nations for counterterrorism operations. With the U.S. looking to station more of its Marines in Asia, even as terrorist groups flourish in Africa, Washington needs others to perform this role. Once again, the Obama administration sees Brazil as a viable candidate.

#### Successful Asia pivot solves China war.

Friedberg 11 Princeton IA professor, 9-4-11, (Aaron L., “China’s Challenge at Sea,” http://www.nytimes.com/2011/09/05/opinion/chinas-challenge-at-sea.html?\_r=1, accessed 9-30-11)

If the United States and its Asian friends look to their own defenses and coordinate their efforts, there is no reason they cannot maintain a favorable balance of power, even as China’s strength grows. But if they fail to respond to China’s buildup, there is a danger that Beijing could miscalculate, throw its weight around and increase the risk of confrontation and even armed conflict. Indeed, China’s recent behavior in disputes over resources and maritime boundaries with Japan and the smaller states that ring the South China Sea suggest that this already may be starting to happen. Many of China’s neighbors are more willing than they were in the past to ignore Beijing’s complaints, increase their own defense spending and work more closely with one another and the United States. They are unlikely, however, to do those things unless they are convinced that America remains committed. Washington does not have to shoulder the entire burden of preserving the Asian power balance, but it must lead.

#### Otherwise, it goes nuclear.

Glaser 11 GW University Political Science Professor, 11 (Charles, HARLES GLASER is Professor of Political Science and International Affairs and Director of the Institute for Security and Conflict Studies at the Elliott School of International Affairs at George Washington University., "Will China's Rise Lead to War? ", Foreign Affairs, Mar/April 2011, Vol. 90, Issue 2, factiva, accessed 11-9-11, )

The prospects for avoiding intense military competition and war may be good, but growth in China's power may nevertheless require some changes in U.S. foreign policy that Washington will find disagreeable- particularly regarding Taiwan. Although it lost control of Taiwan during the Chinese Civil War more than six decades ago, China still considers Taiwan to be part of its homeland, and unification remains a key political goal for Beijing. China has made clear that it will use force if Taiwan declares independence, and much of China's conventional military buildup has been dedicated to increasing its ability to coerce Taiwan and reducing the United States' ability to intervene. Because China places such high value on Taiwan and because the United States and China-whatever they might formally agree to-have such different attitudes regarding the legitimacy of the status quo, the issue poses special dangers and challenges for the U.S.-Chinese relationship, placing it in a different category than Japan or South Korea. A crisis over Taiwan could fairly easily escalate to nuclear war, because each step along the way might well seem rational to the actors involved. Current U.S. policy is designed to reduce the probability that Taiwan will declare independence and to make clear that the United States will not come to Taiwan's aid if it does. Nevertheless, the United States would find itself under pressure to protect Taiwan against any sort of attack, no matter how it originated. Given the different interests and perceptions of the various parties and the limited control Washington has over Taipei's behavior, a crisis could unfold in which the United States found itself following events rather than leading them. Such dangers have been around for decades, but ongoing improvements in China's military capabilities may make Beijing more willing to escalate a Taiwan crisis. In addition to its improved conventional capabilities, China is modernizing its nuclear forces to increase their ability to survive and retaliate following a large-scale U.S. attack. Standard deterrence theory holds that Washington's current ability to destroy most or all of China's nuclear force enhances its bargaining position. China's nuclear modernization might remove that check on Chinese action, leading Beijing to behave more boldly in future crises than it has in past ones. A U.S. attempt to preserve its ability to defend Taiwan, meanwhile, could fuel a conventional and nuclear arms race. Enhancements to U.S. offensive targeting capabilities and strategic ballistic missile defenses might be interpreted by China as a signal of malign U.S. motives, leading to further Chinese military efforts and a general poisoning of U.S.-Chinese relations.

### 4

#### [CP TEXT: The United States federal government should ask the government of South Korea to diplomatically engage Cuba on its behalf over the question of whether or not the United States federal government ought to make Cuban nationals eligible to play organized baseball in the United States. The United States federal government should inform South Korea and Cuba that it will abide by the results of the negotiations, and implement any policy changes that negotiations between South Korea and Cuba recommend.]

#### It solves—engaging Cuba through an international ally solves best.

Iglesias, 12 – Commander, US Navy. Paper (Carlos, “United States Security Policy Implications of a Post-Fidel Cuba” http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA560408)//VP

Unlike the policy implications above, the major hurdle to this interest does not come from any continuation of the GOC, but from the rest of the world. International opposition to the perceived fairness and effectiveness of the economic sanctions has long posed an obstacle for U.S. policy. In the global scale, the problem is epitomized by the twenty consecutive years of near unanimous UN General Assembly resolution votes against the embargo. 96 More regionally, Spain and other European Union partners have strongly pushed to loosen sanctions. The arguments are straightforward and pragmatic, “since sanctions in place have not worked, it makes more sense to do things that would work, and (the next obvious one is to) change things.”97 Even more locally, Cuba has managed to generally retain positive feelings among the people of Latin American in spite of the country’s domestic realities.98 The rise of Raúl and any subsequent successions further complicated the problem of mustering international consensus. Several countries in the hemisphere see any new Cuban leadership as fresh opportunities to engage in common interests. The two largest Latin American countries, Brazil and Mexico, have both ascribed to this approach and have indicated their interests in forging new ties since Fidel’s stepped down.99 On the other hand, this international dissention does hold some prospect for leveraging U.S. soft power. An indirect approach would be to coordinate U.S. proxy actions with partner countries interested in Cuba. This has the double benefit of leveraging U.S. soft power without compromising legislated restrictions or provoking hard-line Cuban-American ire. In this approach, burgeoning relations with Brazil and Mexico would be strong candidates. Devoid of the “bullhorn diplomacy” that have marginalized U.S.-Cuban policy efficacy for decades, the U.S. could better engage the island through hemispherical interlocutors. At a minimum, U.S. interests would be advanced through the proxy insights of what is occurring on the island in addition to the potential displacement of anti-American influences (e.g. Chávez).100

#### Using South Korea as an intermediary allows it to become a pivot between Latin America and the United States—that’s key to increased Korea-Latin American cooperation and Korean economic growth.

Sarah K. Yun, 1-18-2012, Director of Public Affairs and Regional Issues for the Korea Economic Institute, “Korea: The Pivot in Latin America,” <http://blog.keia.org/2012/01/korea-the-pivot-in-latin-america/>

The economic relationship has been the most dynamic and salient aspect of Korea-Latin America relations over the past decade due to the natural complement between their respective markets. Latin America is a major source of natural resources, raw materials, and manufacturing, which are important to Korea’s manufacturing and high-technology industries. Latin American countries, such as Brazil, are an attractive export market for South Korean consumer products, such as computers, TVs, and cars. Furthermore, given increased competition from China and other Asian economies for the African and Southeast Asian mineral market, Latin America may provide a secure natural resource bedrock for Korea. Recognizing the advantage, Korea has been engaging in trade diplomacy with Latin America with an emphasis on establishing an architecture built around free trade agreements. Korea’s first FTA in 2003 was with Chile, and it recently concluded an agreement with Peru. At the same time, Korea is interested in reaching an agreement with MERCOSUR in South America. According to a recent Inter-American Development Bank report, principally authored by Mauricio Mesquita Moreira, trade between Korea and Latin America has grown at an annual average of 16.1% over the past two decades. Latin American countries are also beginning to recognize economic opportunities with Korea and diversification beyond North America and China. Political and cultural relationships, on the other hand, have been secondary to economic engagement. It was not until around 1996 when diplomatic ties began to form between the two regions, signaled by Korean presidential visits to Latin America. Cultural ties have also been limited, and unlike in Asia, the Korean Wave has not yet crested in Latin America. Regarding development aid, Korea’s official development aid (ODA) to Latin America in 2009 was less than a fifth of the ODA committed to Asia. Furthermore, only 5.9% of the cumulative total of loan commitments made by Korea between 1987 and 2009 were given to Latin America. In an environment where Korea is just beginning to establish partnerships in the region, ODA and other cooperative programs can be used as an avenue to increase awareness and presence of Korea in Latin America. In other words, Korea’s engagement via soft power and cultural diplomacy can create a multi-faceted and dynamic bilateral relationship. Consequently, Korea can create opportunities to capture the attention of Latin American governments and businesses. Korea can be the pivot point between the developed and the developing countries such as the U.S. and Latin America. In this regard, there are potential opportunities for U.S.-Korea collaboration in the region. The U.S. and Korea can boost public policy and development cooperation by assisting in areas that face challenges in Latin America such as educational institutions and technological development. Korea can also benefit from partnering with the U.S, who has had a long-time presence in Latin America. There are clear potential advantages for a deeper relationship between Latin America and Korea. Latin America would benefit from increased interaction with Korea to counterbalance economic and political forces from China and North America. On the other hand, Latin America is a promising market for Korea for its large consumer market and natural resources. In order to build a stronger foundation and synergy, the next step should be for both regions to engage in developmental projects and cultural diplomacy, as well as improve the existing architecture of trade and transactions. A balanced and multi-faceted economic, political and cultural strategy could lead to a successful and comprehensive relationship between Korea and Latin America.

#### South Korea economic growth is key to solve North Korea war—the impact is extinction.

Dr. Manzur Ejaz, 1-05-2006, World Bank Affiliate, Economist Pak Base, “Pakistan can learn from South Korea's economic woes,” <http://users.erols.com/ziqbal/jan_5.htm>

The East Asian currencies in general and South Korean in particular have lost about half of their value in the last few months. This means that their exported goods will become much cheaper and the goods produced in Japan and other industrialized countries will not be able to compete with them. Consequently, several production units in the industrialized countries will cease to produce, leading to layoffs and, hence, recession. Therefore, to prop up the battered currencies of South Korea and other East Asian countries is vital for the survival of the industrialized world. The collapse of South Korean and other East Asian economies will eliminate their ability to import goods from abroad. At present, the US produces high-value goods like machinery, airplanes and defense weapons etc. East Asia, having the sizeable economies and high per capita income, is one of the major markets for the US. If US exports suffer, not only its balance of trade will tilt against it--having serious economic implications-- but also its production will suffer giving rise to recession. Of course, US would like to avert such eventuality at any cost. --South Korea owes more than $160 billion to the foreign banks. If it defaults on its payments and goes bankrupt, many banks in Japan, US and other western nations will get into a serious crunch: many may burst. Although, it is claimed that US banks have not a major exposure in this situation but active maneuvering by the six US largest banks to get this package approved shows that the world banking system has very high stakes in this crisis. --US government officials are anxious to forestall a South Korean default because they fear it would cause a further loss of confidence in other emerging market economies, conceivably leading to worldwid recession. Further, US multinational corporations are major players in the world economy and a deterioration of the emerging markets can lower their profits triggering a downward spiral of the US stock and bond markets. East Asian crisis has already started showing its negative impact on the Wall Street: US stocks market has already lost about 8% to 10% of its value in the last few months. --The South Korean economy has to be propped up because North Korea is still conceived to be a potential threat to American interests. Commenting on this aspect US Treasury Secretary Robert E. Rubin argued, "If you have economic instability [in South Korea], you run the risk of political and social instability there, and that can have all kinds of national security implications."

### 5

#### [CP TEXT: The United States federal government should substantially increase its academic exchanges with Cuba.]

#### Solves the relations advantage.

Milagros Martinez Reinosa, Senior Advisor to the University of Havana’s Vice Rector of International Relations, Spring 2011, “Cuba and the United States: New Opportunities for Academic Diplomacy,” <http://lasa.international.pitt.edu/forum/files/vol42-issue2/OnTheProfession2.pdf>

In this context, the fundamental task of those who favor collaborative efforts should be the planning and implementation of orderly and coherent activities designed and enacted by prestigious institutions that serve to guarantee academic standards. Undoubtedly, these collaborative efforts will have the noble collateral effect of defusing the hostility that has prevailed for more than a half a century between the governments of the two nations. These considerations are crucial to prevent the academic collaboration between Cuba and the United States from becoming bogged down in an atmosphere of mistrust that weakens and distorts it. The academic and cultural exchange between Cuba and the United States has its own life and is part of the histories and identities of both countries.

### US-Cuba Relations Advantage

#### Too many problems with the US Cuban relations to solve

**Franks 10** (Jeff, “U.S.-Cuba relations under Obama fall to lowest point,” March 31, http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSTRE62U34W20100331?pageNumber=2)

U.S.-Cuban relations have fallen to their lowest point since Barack Obama became U.S. president and are in danger of getting worse unless the two countries take serious steps toward ending five decades of hostility, according to [Cuba](http://www.reuters.com/places/cuba) experts. After a brief warming last year, both countries appear to be falling back into old, antagonistic ways, obscuring whatever progress that has been made and hindering further advances, the experts said this week. "The past year has proven that when it comes to U.S.-Cuba relations, old habits die hard," said Dan Erikson of the Inter-American Dialogue think tank in Washington. Obama, who took office in January 2009 and has said he wanted to recast U.S.-Cuban relations, lifted restrictions on travel by Cuban Americans to the communist-ruled island and initiated talks on migration issues and direct postal service. Since then, Cuban Americans have flooded the island and the two longtime ideological foes have held their first high-level discussions in years. But recent developments have been mostly negative. Cuba jailed U.S. contractor Alan Gross in December on suspicion of spying and continues to hold him without charges. Cuba's government has been condemned internationally for its treatment of opponents, including imprisoned dissident Orlando Zapata Tamayo, who died in February from a hunger strike, and the "Ladies in White," wives and mothers of imprisoned dissidents, were shouted down by government supporters during protest marches this month. Obama rebuked the Cuban government in a strongly worded statement on March 24, saying Cuba continues "to respond to the aspirations of the Cuban people with a clenched fist." U.S. officials think they have done enough to elicit a more positive response from Cuba, while Cuba complains that Obama has done too little. 'GENUINE GOODWILL' Miami attorney Timothy Ashby, a former U.S. Commerce Department official in charge of trade with Cuba, said neither has done what is necessary to overcome 50 years of bitterness. "Neither government is willing to take a significant step that would serve as a demonstration of genuine goodwill," he said. Both nations have taken actions that have not helped the fragile improvement begun by Obama. Obama angered the Cuban government in November when he responded to questions via email from dissident Cuban blogger Yoani Sanchez, who Cuban leaders view as at least complicit with their enemies in Europe and the United States. In February, Assistant Secretary of State Craig Kelly provoked a bitter Cuban reaction when he met with dissidents following migration talks with Cuban officials in Havana. Cuba, in turn, has soured the political climate by harshly criticizing Obama for his lack of action while taking little of its own. Its detention of Gross, which U.S. officials say Cuba has refused to discuss, has called into question its desire for change even among those who want better relations. In a letter last week to Cuba's top diplomat in Washington, 41 members of the U.S. House of Representatives said the detention of Gross "has caused many to doubt your government's expressed desire to improve relations with the United States." "We cannot assist in that regard while Mr. Gross is detained in a Cuban prison," said the legislators, who included sponsors of pending legislation to end a U.S. ban on travel to Cuba. The United States has said Gross was in Cuba to expand Internet services for Jewish groups, but conceded he entered the island on a tourist visa that would not permit such work. His work was funded under U.S. programs aimed at promoting democracy in Cuba, which Cuban leaders view as part of a long U.S. campaign to topple their government. U.S. officials are saying behind the scenes that there will be no more initiatives with Cuba until Gross is released. Domestic political concerns are among the reasons cited for the lack of U.S.-Cuban progress, with Obama mindful of possible criticism from conservatives for moving too quickly and Cuban President Raul Castro dealing with anti-U.S. hardliners while he tries to fix Cuba's weak economy. "Sadly, there are reactionary forces on either side of the Florida Straits," Ashby said. The United States could move rapprochement along by removing Cuba from its list of nations considered state sponsors of terrorism, a designation that has long angered Cuba, Ashby said. At the same time, Cuba must release Gross either outright or, if necessary, on something like parole if it insists on putting him on trial, according to John McAuliff of the New York-based Fund for Reconciliation and Development, which promotes better relations between the two countries. Western diplomats in Havana also said Cuba must treat its dissidents better, saying another death would be a serious blow to relations with both the United States and Europe.

#### Alt causes – Human rights, Gitmo and Cuban exiles

**Hanson & Lee ’13** – Stephanie Hanson and Brianna Lee, Council on Foreign Relations, “U.S.-Cuba Relations”, 1/31/13 <http://www.cfr.org/cuba/us-cuba-relations/p11113>

What are the issues preventing normalization of U.S.-Cuba relations? Experts say these issues include: Human rights violations. In March 2003, the Cuban government arrested seventy-five dissidents and journalists, sentencing them to prison terms of up to twenty-eight years on charges of conspiring with the United States to overthrow the state. The Cuban Commission for Human Rights and National Reconciliation, a Havana-based nongovernmental group, reports that the government has in recent years resorted to other tactics besides prison --such as firings from state jobs and intimidation on the street-- to silence opposition figures. A 2005 UN Human Rights Commission vote [condemned Cuba's human rights record](http://hrw.org/english/docs/2006/01/18/cuba12207.htm), but the country was elected to the new UN Human Rights Council in 2006. Guantanamo Bay. Cuba indicated after 9/11 that it would not object if the United States brought prisoners to Guantanamo Bay. However, experts such as Sweig say Cuban officials have since seized on the U.S. prison camp--where hundreds of terror suspects have been detained--as a "symbol of solidarity" with the rest of the world against the United States. Although Obama ordered Guantanamo [to be closed](http://www.cfr.org/publication/18525) by January 22, 2010, the facility remains open as of January 2013, and many analysts say it is likely to stay in operation for an extended period. Cuban exile community. The Cuban-American community in southern Florida traditionally has heavily influenced U.S. policy with Cuba. Both political parties fear alienating a strong voting bloc in an important swing state in presidential elections.

#### Bioattack won’t happen.

Leitenberg ‘5

(Milton Leitenberg, Senior Research Scholar, University of Maryland; Author, “Assessing the Biological Weapons and Bioterrorism Threat,” LA Times 2/17, lexis)

A pandemic flu outbreak of the kind the world witnessed in 1918-19 could kill hundreds of millions of people. The only lethal biological attack in the United States – the anthrax mailings – killed five. But the annual budget for combating bioterror is more than $7 billion, while Congress just passed a $3.8-billion emergency package to prepare for a flu outbreak. The exaggeration of the bioterror threat began more than a decade ago after the Japanese Aum Shinrikyo group released sarin gas in the Tokyo subways in 1995. The scaremongering has grown more acute since 9/11 and the mailing of anthrax-laced letters to Congress and media outlets in the fall of 2001. Now an edifice of institutes, programs and publicists with a vested interest in hyping the bioterror threat has grown, funded by the government and by foundations. Last year, for example, Senate Majority Leader Bill Frist described bioterrorism as "the greatest existential threat we have in the world today." But how could he justify such a claim? Is bioterrorism a greater existential threat than global climate change, global poverty levels, wars and conflicts, nuclear proliferation, ocean-quality deterioration, deforestation, desertification, depletion of freshwater aquifers or the balancing of population growth and food production? Is it likely to kill more people than the more mundane scourges of AIDS, tuberculosis, malaria, measles and cholera, which kill more than 11 million people each year? So what substantiates the alarm and the massive federal spending on bioterrorism? There are two main sources of bioterrorism threats: first, from countries developing bioweapons, and second, from terrorist groups that might buy, steal or manufacture them. The first threat is declining. U.S. intelligence estimates say the number of countries that conduct offensive bioweapons programs has fallen in the last 15 years from 13 to nine, as South Africa, Libya, Iraq and Cuba were dropped. There is no publicly available evidence that even the most hostile of the nine remaining countries -- Syria and Iran -- are ramping up their programs. And, despite the fear that a hostile nation could help terrorists get biological weapons, no country has ever done so – even nations known to have trained terrorists.

#### **No cyber impact**

Healey 13 Jason, Director of the Cyber Statecraft Initiative at the Atlantic Council, "No, Cyberwarfare Isn't as Dangerous as Nuclear War", 2013, [www.usnews.com/opinion/blogs/world-report/2013/03/20/cyber-attacks-not-yet-an-existential-threat-to-the-us](http://www.usnews.com/opinion/blogs/world-report/2013/03/20/cyber-attacks-not-yet-an-existential-threat-to-the-us)

America does not face an existential cyberthreat today, despite recent warnings. Our cybervulnerabilities are undoubtedly grave and the threats we face are severe but far from comparable to nuclear war. The most recent alarms come in a Defense Science Board report on how to make military cybersystems more resilient against advanced threats (in short, Russia or China). It warned that the "cyber threat is serious, with potential consequences similar in some ways to the nuclear threat of the Cold War." Such fears were also expressed by Adm. Mike Mullen, then chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in 2011. He called cyber "The single biggest existential threat that's out there" because "cyber actually more than theoretically, can attack our infrastructure, our financial systems." While it is true that cyber attacks might do these things, it is also true they have not only never happened but are far more difficult to accomplish than mainstream thinking believes. The consequences from cyber threats may be similar in some ways to nuclear, as the Science Board concluded, but mostly, they are incredibly dissimilar. Eighty years ago, the generals of the U.S. Army Air Corps were sure that their bombers would easily topple other countries and cause their populations to panic, claims which did not stand up to reality. A study of the 25-year history of cyber conflict, by the Atlantic Council and Cyber Conflict Studies Association, has shown a similar dynamic where the impact of disruptive cyberattacks has been consistently overestimated. Rather than theorizing about future cyberwars or extrapolating from today's concerns, the history of cyberconflict that have actually been fought, shows that cyber incidents have so far tended to have effects that are either widespread but fleeting or persistent but narrowly focused. No attacks, so far, have been both widespread and persistent. There have been no authenticated cases of anyone dying from a cyber attack. Any widespread disruptions, even the 2007 disruption against Estonia, have been short-lived causing no significant GDP loss. Moreover, as with conflict in other domains, cyberattacks can take down many targets but keeping them down over time in the face of determined defenses has so far been out of the range of all but the most dangerous adversaries such as Russia and China. Of course, if the United States is in a conflict with those nations, cyber will be the least important of the existential threats policymakers should be worrying about. Plutonium trumps bytes in a shooting war. This is not all good news. Policymakers have recognized the problems since at least 1998 with little significant progress. Worse, the threats and vulnerabilities are getting steadily more worrying. Still, experts have been warning of a cyber Pearl Harbor for 20 of the 70 years since the actual Pearl Harbor. The transfer of U.S. trade secrets through Chinese cyber espionage could someday accumulate into an existential threat. But it doesn't seem so seem just yet, with only handwaving estimates of annual losses of 0.1 to 0.5 percent to the total U.S. GDP of around $15 trillion. That's bad, but it doesn't add up to an existential crisis or "economic cyberwar."

#### Multiple barriers check

**Bailey 11 –** [Ronald is Reason's science correspondent. “Cyberwar Is Harder Than It Looks: Internet vulnerability to attacks exaggerated, says new report.” 1/18/2011, <http://reason.com/archives/2011/01/18/cyberwar-is-harder-than-it>]

Brown and Sommer conclude, “It is unlikely that there will ever be a true cyberwar.” By cyberwar, they mean one fought solely over and with information technologies. Why? Because it takes a lot of effort to figure out new vulnerabilities in already protected critical systems and the effects of an attack are difficult to predict, including blowback on the perpetrators. More importantly, they note, “There is no strategic reason why an aggressor would limit themselves to only one class of weaponry.” In a real war, cyberattacks would be an adjunct to conventional efforts to blow up critical infrastructure. Because attacks can be launched from any set of computers, attackers can remain hidden. Consequently, a strategy of deterrence will not work in cyberwarfare because the target for retaliation is unknown. This means that resilience is the main defense against cyberweapons, a combination of preventive measures and contingency plans for a quick post-attack recovery. If cyberwarfare against infrastructure was easy, terrorists like Al Qaeda would have already tried the tactic against us and our NATO allies. Brown and Sommer observe that the Internet and the physical telecommunications infrastructure were designed to be robust and self-healing, so that failures in one part are routed around. “You have to be cautious when hearing from people engaging in fear-mongering about huge blackouts and collapses of critical infrastructures via the Internet,” says University of Toronto cyberwarfare expert Ronald Deibert in the January/February 2011 issue of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists. “There is a lot of redundancy in the networks; it’s not a simple thing to turn off the power grid.” In addition, our experience with current forms of malware is somewhat reassuring. Responses to new malware have generally been found and made available within days and few denial of service attacks have lasted more than a day. In addition, many critical networks such as those carrying financial transactions are not connected to the Internet requiring insider information to make them vulnerable. While not everyone uses up-to-date malware detection, most government agencies, major businesses, and many individuals do, which means that would-be attackers must take the time and effort to find new flaws and develop new techniques. For example, the success of the [Stuxnet worm](http://www.esecurityplanet.com/trends/article.php/3921041/article.htm) that attacked and disabled Iranian nuclear centrifuges required very extensive intelligence gathering and knowledge of specific software flaws as well as someone able to walk into the facilities with an infected USB drive.

### Baseball Diplomacy Advantage

#### Relations high now – business involvement

Wilson 7-24-13 (Tim Wilson- freelance journalist for Near Shore America; “Despite Chavez and Snowden, Pro-U.S. Sentiment Grows in Latin America”; http://www.nearshoreamericas.com/chavez-snowden-latin-america-perceptions-us/)

This is a common phenomenon. The Pew Research Center, in tracking attitudes in Latin America’s two biggest economies, found that in 2012 69% of people in both Brazil and Mexico had a favorable attitude to American music, movies, and television. But when it comes to how Americans “do business”, only 43% of Mexicans and 45% of Brazilians had a favorable view. By contrast, the most recent data indicate that favorable views of the United States have experienced a significant boost: 73% for Brazilians (up from 61% in 2012), and 66% for Mexicans (up from 56% in 2012).¶ “You can see the change in U.S. favorability ratings in Mexico in our 2013 report,” Molly Rohal of the Pew Research Center tells Nearshore Americas. “We also have trend data in the Global Indicators Database.”¶ The trend is your friend¶ Specific to Latin America, the trend data is cause for optimism, given that Latin America is a young continent, and younger people have a more positive view of the U.S. In Brazil, for example, 78% of those between 18 to 29 years of age, and 72% of those between 30 to 49, had a positive view of US popular culture. In Mexico, the percentages were 79% and 70% respectively. And for those over 50 years of age? Only 55% of Brazilians had a positive view, and 57% of Mexicans.¶ But Latin America is more than Mexico and Brazil, and the greater region is experiencing an ideological divide between populist left leaning governments (Argentina, Venezuela, Bolivia, Ecuador, Cuba, and Nicaragua) and neo-liberal regimes embracing market reforms (Colombia, Chile, and most of Central America). The populist governments like to ratchet up the anti-US rhetoric, echoing the Cold War divide when the United States supported many repressive right wing dictatorships.¶ The irony is that the overall perceptions are not that bad, and that the lower the economic engagement with the United States, the less favorable the view. This is interesting in that “business” scores low, suggesting that there is a more general challenge faced by the private sector, and not one that is specific to U.S. businesses. In fact, when U.S. business is involved**, the populace tends to have a positive view.**¶Consequently, **high-contact and business friendly governments** like Chile and El Salvador **have favorable views**, at 68% and 79%, respectively. By comparison, 55% of Bolivians see the U.S. in a favorable light. In Argentina – a country that makes a habit of rounding out the bottom of positive attitudes to the U.S. – only 41% of the population has a positive view of the U.S.¶ Other research has revealed that **Latin America, as a region, has a more positive view of the United States and her people than any other**. The tenth joint report by Americas Quarterly and Efecto Naím, for example, has indicated that popular support for the U.S. exists even in those countries that have populist regimes critical of the United States. And ongoing research from Latinobarómetro has shown that majorities in most Latin American countries have a positive view of the United States.¶ As with other research, Latinobarómetro has found that close economic and cultural ties build a positive experience. Trade, remittances, and investment – including in technology driven areas that involve a skilled workforce, such as Business Process and IT Outsourcing – can build goodwill.

#### No impact to credibility – allies won’t abandon us and adversaries can’t exploit it

Walt 11 (Stephen, Professor of International Relations – Harvard University, “Does the U.S. still need to reassure its allies?” Foreign Policy, 12-5, http://walt.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2011/12/05/us\_credibility\_is\_not\_our\_problem)

A perennial preoccupation of U.S. diplomacy has been the perceived need to reassure allies of our reliability. Throughout the Cold War, U.S. leaders worried that any loss of credibility might cause dominoes to fall, lead key allies to "bandwagon" with the Soviet Union, or result in some form of "Finlandization." Such concerns justified fighting so-called "credibility wars" (including Vietnam), where the main concern was not the direct stakes of the contest but rather the need to retain a reputation for resolve and capability. Similar fears also led the United States to deploy thousands of nuclear weapons in Europe, as a supposed counter to Soviet missiles targeted against our NATO allies. The possibility that key allies would abandon us was almost always exaggerated, but U.S. leaders remain overly sensitive to the possibility. So Vice President Joe Biden has been out on the road this past week, telling various U.S. allies that "the United States isn't going anywhere." (He wasn't suggesting we're stuck in a rut, of course, but saying that the imminent withdrawal from Iraq doesn't mean a retreat to isolationism or anything like that.) There's nothing really wrong with offering up this sort of comforting rhetoric, but I've never really understood why USS.S. leaders were so worried about the credibility of our commitments to others. For starters, given our remarkably secure geopolitical position, whether U.S. pledges are credible is first and foremost a problem for those who are dependent on U.S. help. We should therefore take our allies' occasional hints about realignment or neutrality with some skepticism; they have every incentive to try to make us worry about it, but in most cases little incentive to actually do it.

#### Low soft power key to unified European identity

Soeren ‘8

(Soeren Kern, Senior Writer, “Anti-Americanism: About American Power, Not Policy,” http://www.speroforum.com/site/article.asp?idarticle=13519)

In their quest to transform Europe into a superpower capable of challenging the United States, European elites are using anti-Americanism to forge a new pan-European identity. This artificial post-modern European “citizenship”, which demands allegiance to a faceless bureaucratic superstate based in Brussels instead of to the traditional nation-state, is being set up in opposition to the United States. To be “European” means (nothing more and nothing less than) to not be an American. 6aBecause European anti-Americanism has much more to do with European identity politics than with genuine opposition to American foreign policy, European elites do not really want the United States to change. Without the intellectual crutch of anti-Americanism, the new “Europe” would lose its raison d'être.

#### Solves European war

EUISS ’10

(European Union Institute for Security Studies, official intergovernmental policymaking & expert network dedicated to policy analysis, report co-authored by over twenty experts, <http://www.iss.europa.eu/uploads/media/ESDP_10-web.pdf>)

What is striking is not so much that the main policy conclusions drawn from both exercises should practically be the same. What is rather more striking is that by looking closely at twenty-three EU missions one by one, from the first mission in Bosnia to the naval operation off the coast of Somalia, a larger picture emerges of the future contours and development of ESDP. ESDP is already maturing, and indeed in different ESDP missions elements of its future shape can already be inferred. Building on the last ten years’ best practice, as the present study suggests, will allow for substantially enhanced effectiveness in the ten years to come, and make it easier to reverse the three major deficits both EUISS volumes identify in parallel: the political deficit or the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) gap, insufficient coherence and inadequate capabilities. Examining the EU monitoring mission in Georgia, Sabine Fischer demonstrates that an enormous gain of efficiency is achieved by integrating a mission into a well-defined strategy under ‘strong leadership’ unanimously backed by Member States. EU action to prevent a dangerous escalation of war on its doorstep was decisive also because it was swift, and part of the reason for this timeliness relates to unity of purpose. The need to bridge the political deficit is a main recommendation for the next ten years. The EU mission in Georgia proves that it is quite possible to overcome the political gap that has weakened the impact of other EU missions. Looking at the current mission in Kosovo, Giovanni Grevi concludes that more thinking needs to be devoted ‘to the connection between foreign policy and ESDP’, and expresses the hope the Lisbon Treaty will indeed help bridge the gap. Advantages in terms of coherence that can be gained by unifying EU external action emerge just as clearly from the detailed analysis of the various missions in the Balkans, where many European Commission projects are also being implemented alongside ESDP operations. As Eva Gross states, highlighting the EU’s excellent record as a crisis management actor in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM), the ‘linear application and devolution from a military to a civilian ESDP mission followed by Community programmes’ was crucial to the success of the EU’s intervention there. This is true even though, as has often been observed, strong inter-pillar coordination has in many cases been lacking, including in the Balkans. The double-hatted EU representation to the African Union in Addis Ababa is a foretaste of things to come. Damien Helly points out that it ‘is seen as a very successful experience so far’, and one that must certainly be carefully studied in the process of establishing the European External Action Service. But the need for coherence does not merely refer to the ability to give a common thrust to EU diplomacy, but perhaps more decisively to the necessity to ensure that national policies are part of it as well. Examples of the failures of coordination between EU Members States both among themselves and within the Union are catalogued far too frequently in these pages, Afghanistan being a case in point. The Union needs to overcome the coherence deficit without weakening EU legitimacy for the sake of effectiveness. The benefits of pooling are equally obvious when it comes to the universally recognised capability gap, and bridging this is certainly a major challenge for the future. The sheer size of some operations, like the civilian eulex mission in Kosovo, and the ‘successful’ Althea military mission in Bosnia, show that sufficient usable military resources and capacities exist within the Member States to generate enough forces to meet the commonly established operational goals. However, as the Chad mission has notably made plain, operational capabilities are lacking in a certain number of areas and, from a purely European point of view, there is vast waste in terms of spending and much duplication in other areas owing to the multiplicity of national procurement programmes. This is clearly demonstrated by Daniel Keohane who argues that military resources can be maximised if Member States simply ‘coordinate more of their demand and spend their defence budgets more efficiently.’ In fact bringing capabilities up to speed where they are lacking will require not more but better spending.

#### **Goes nuclear**

Glaser, 93

Assistant Professor, Irving B. Harris Graduate School of Public Policy, University of Chicago

(Charles, International Security, Summer, Vol. 18 // Issue 1, p. 8-9)

However, although the lack of an imminent Soviet threat eliminates the most obvious danger, U.S. security has not been entirely separated from the future of Western Europe. The ending of the Cold War has brought many benefits, but has not eliminated the possibility of major power war, especially since such a war could grow out of a smaller conflict in the East. And, although nuclear weapons have greatly reduced the threat that a European hegemon would pose to U.S. security, a sound case nevertheless remains that a European war could threaten U.S. security. The United States could be drawn into such a war, even if strict security considerations suggested it should stay out. A major power war could escalate to a nuclear war that, especially if the United States joins, could include attacks against the American homeland. Thus, the United States should not be unconcerned about Europe’s future.

#### Baseball diplomacy causes Venezuela oil cutoff from US.

Chris Arsenault, 3-10-2013, “’Baseball Diplomacy’ strikes out in Venezuela,” http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/features/2013/03/201331013310778232.html

Despite the jokes and political trash-talk, baseball – like the oil that brought it to Venezuela – has been sucked into diplomatic tensions between the Bolivarian Republic and Uncle Sam.¶ After the US supported a coup in 2002 that attempted to topple Chavez's elected government, William Brownfield, the former US ambassador to Venezuela, attempted to foster good relations through "baseball diplomacy".¶ The two nations, at odds over Iran's nuclear programme, Israel's occupation of Palestinian lands, and US support for opposition groups in Venezuela, share "good and similar values" because of their mutual love of baseball, Brownfield once said.¶ Famous for touring Venezuela's baseball fields and dispensing aid along the way, Brownfield, known as "the Texan", left Caracas in 2007 after his car was pelted with eggs by Chavez supporters.¶ Nicolas Maduro, Venezuela's foreign minister at the time, slammed the US diplomat alleging that: "William Brownfield came to Venezuela with one mission, to destabilise the government of Hugo Chavez and assist in toppling him."¶ Statements like these probably worry State Department officials in Washington, who likely hope that the death of Chavez could lead to a rapprochement between the US and one of its largest oil suppliers.

#### Nuclear war

Islam Yasin Qasem 2007, a doctoral candidate in the Department of Politics and Social Sciences at the University of Pompeu Fabra (UPF) in Barcelona, MA in International Affairs from Columbia, July 9, 2007, “The Coming Warfare of Oil Shortage,” online: <http://www.opednews.com/articles/opedne_islam_ya_070709_the_coming_warfare_o.htm>

Recognizing the strategic value of oil for their national interests, superpowers will not hesitate to unleash their economic and military power to ensure secure access to oil resources, triggering worldwide tension, if not armed conflict. And while superpowers like the United States maintain superior conventional military power, in addition to their nuclear power, some weaker states are already nuclearly armed, others are seeking nuclear weapons. In an anarchic world with many nuclear-weapon states feeling insecure, and a global economy in downward

#### Specifically kills US-Japan relations—causes competition to erupt.

Financial Times, 9-23-2013, “Baseball reflects Japan’s changing economy,” http://blogs.ft.com/the-a-list/2013/09/#axzz2pwhVSeUO

Baseball, America and Japan’s shared national pastime, is a useful window through which to view the two countries’ contrasting and changing attitudes to foreigners in general – and in the economy in particular.¶ Fans in the US have long embraced Japanese stars such as Ichiro Suzuki, the hit machine long with the Seattle Mariners; Hideki Matsui, the slugger beloved by the New York Yankees (and nicknamed Godzilla by fans); and Daisuke Matsuzaka, formerly of the Boston Red Sox, the thrower of the mythical gyroball pitch.¶ Japan, conversely, has always been ambivalent about foreign-born stars. Robert Whiting wrote eloquently (and often hilariously) in You Gotta Have Wa about the cultural clashes and tensions that erupted in the 1970s, when American players started playing in greater numbers in Japan. A quota was imposed of no more than two on any team, mirroring some of the strategies used by Japanese trade negotiators when pressed from outside to open up their closed and protected markets.¶ Last week, however, the Japanese single-season home-run record, set by Sadaharu Oh in 1964, was surpassed by a journeyman former US Major League player, Wladimir Balentien of Tokyo’s Yakult Swallows.¶ Balentien’s accomplishment says a lot about important ways in which Japan is changing. Twice before, baseball imports – American “Tuffy” Rhodes in 2001 and Venezuelan Alex Cabrera in 2002 – had reached 55 home runs, tying with the sacred number achieved by Oh. But Japanese baseball conspired to avoid pitching to them, in order to avoid the indignity of a gaijin (foreign born) player surpassing their hero. The fact that an obscure overseas slugger has finally managed to hit a pitch out of the park and surpass Oh is a subtle but critical indicator that Japan is coming to see how competition from outside is both an essential and an inevitable feature of progress.

#### Solves multiple nuclear threats.

Gates 11 (Robert Gates, U.S. Secretary of Defense, U.S. Department of Defense, 1/14/11, “U.S.-Japan Alliance a Cornerstone of Asian Security”, http://www.defense.gov/speeches/speech.aspx?speechid=1529)

Over the course of its history, the U.S.-Japan alliance has succeeded at its original core purpose – to deter military aggression and provide an umbrella of security under which Japan – and the region – can prosper. Today, our alliance is growing deeper and broader as we address a range of security challenges in Asia. Some, like North Korea, piracy or natural disasters, have been around for decades, centuries, or since the beginning of time. Others, such as global terrorist networks, cyber attacks, and nuclear proliferation are of a more recent vintage. What these issues have in common is that they all require multiple nations working together – and they also almost always require leadership and involvement by key regional players such as the U.S. and Japan. In turn, we express our shared values by increasing our alliance’s capacity to provide humanitarian aid and disaster relief, take part in peace-keeping operations, protect the global commons, and promote cooperation and build trust through strengthening regional institutions. Everyone gathered here knows the crippling devastation that can be caused by natural disasters – and the U.S. and Japan, along with our partners in the region, recognize that responding to these crises is a security imperative. In recent years, U.S. and Japanese forces delivered aid to remote earthquake-stricken regions on Indonesia, and U.S. aircraft based in Japan helped deliver assistance to typhoon victims in Burma. We worked together in response to the 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami, earthquakes in Java, Sumatra, and Haiti, and most recently following the floods in Pakistan. These efforts have demonstrated the forward deployment of U.S. forces in Japan is of real and life-saving value. They also provide new opportunities for the U.S. and Japanese forces to operate together by conducting joint exercises and missions. Furthermore, U.S. and Japanese troops have been working on the global stage to confront the threat of failed or failing states. Japanese peacekeepers have operated around the world, including the Golan Heights and East Timor and assisted with the reconstruction of Iraq. In Afghanistan, Japan represents the second largest financial donor, making substantive contributions to the international effort by funding the salaries of the Afghan National Police and helping the Afghan government integrate former insurgents. Japan and the United States also continue to cooperate closely to ensure the maritime commons are safe and secure for commercial traffic. Our maritime forces work hand-in-glove in the Western Pacific as well as in other sea passages such as the Strait of Malacca between Malaysia and Indonesia, where more than a third of the world’s oil and trade shipments pass through every year. Around the Horn of Africa, Japan has deployed surface ships and patrol aircraft that operate alongside those from all over the world drawn by the common goal to counter piracy in vital sea lanes. Participating in these activities thrusts Japan’s military into a relatively new, and at times sensitive role, as an exporter of security. This is a far cry from the situation of even two decades ago when, as I remember well as a senior national security official, Japan was criticized for so-called “checkbook diplomacy” – sending money but not troops – to help the anti-Saddam coalition during the First Gulf War. By showing more willingness to send self-defense forces abroad under international auspices – consistent with your constitution – Japan is taking its rightful place alongside the world’s other great democracies. That is part of the rationale for Japan’s becoming a permanent member of a reformed United Nations Security Council. And since these challenges cannot be tackled through bilateral action alone, we must use the strong U.S.-Japanese partnership as a platform to do more to strengthen multilateral institutions – regional arrangements that must be inclusive, transparent, and focused on results. Just a few months ago, I attended the historic first meeting of the ASEAN Plus Eight Defense Ministers Meeting in Hanoi, and am encouraged by Japan’s decision to co-chair the Military Medicine Working Group. And as a proud Pacific nation, the United States will take over the chairmanship of the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation Forum this year, following Japan’s successful tenure. Working through regional and international forums puts our alliance in the best position to confront some of Asia’s toughest security challenges. As we have been reminded once again in recent weeks, none has proved to be more vexing and enduring than North Korea. Despite the hopes and best efforts of the South Korean government, the U.S. and our allies, and the international community, the character and priorities of the North Korean regime sadly have not changed. North Korea’s ability to launch another conventional ground invasion is much degraded from even a decade or so ago, but in other respects it has grown more lethal and destabilizing. Today, it is North Korea’s pursuit of nuclear weapons and proliferation of nuclear know-how and ballistic missile equipment that have focused our attention – developments that threaten not just the peninsula, but the Pacific Rim and international stability as well. In response to a series of provocations – the most recent being the sinking of the Cheonan and North Korea’s lethal shelling of a South Korean island – Japan has stood shoulder to shoulder with the Republic of Korea and the United States. Our three countries continue to deepen our ties through the Defense Trilateral Talks – the kind of multilateral engagement among America’s long-standing allies that the U.S. would like to see strengthened and expanded over time. When and if North Korea’s behavior gives us any reasons to believe that negotiations can be conducted productively and in good faith, we will work with Japan, South Korea, Russia, and China to resume engagement with North Korea through the six party talks. The first step in the process should be a North-South engagement. But, to be clear, the North must also take concrete steps to honor its international obligations and comply with U.N. Security Council Resolutions. Any progress towards diffusing the crisis on the Korean Peninsula must include the active support of the People’s Republic of China – where, as you probably know, I just finished an official visit. China has been another important player whose economic growth has fueled the prosperity of this part of the world, but questions about its intentions and opaque military modernization program have been a source of concern to its neighbors. Questions about China’s growing role in the region manifest themselves in territorial disputes – most recently in the incident in September near the Senkaku Islands, an incident that served as a reminder of the important of America’s and Japan’s treaty obligations to one another. The U.S. position on maritime security remains clear: we have a national interest in freedom of navigation; in unimpeded economic development and commerce; and in respect for international law. We also believe that customary international law, as reflected in the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea, provides clear guidance on the appropriate use of the maritime domain, and rights of access to it. Nonetheless, I disagree with those who portray China as an inevitable strategic adversary of the United States. We welcome a China that plays a constructive role on the world stage. In fact, the goal of my visit was to improve our military-to-military relationship and outline areas of common interest. It is precisely because we have questions about China’s military – just as they might have similar questions about the United States – that I believe a healthy dialogue is needed. Last fall, President Obama and President Hu Jin Tao made a commitment to advance sustained and reliable defense ties, not a relationship repeatedly interrupted by and subject to the vagaries of political weather. On a personal note, one of the things I learned from my experience dealing with the Soviet Union during my earlier time in government was the importance of maintaining a strategic dialogue and open lines of communication. Even if specific agreements did not result – on nuclear weapons or anything else – this dialogue helped us understand each other better and lessen the odds of misunderstanding and miscalculation. The Cold War is mercifully long over and the circumstances with China today are vastly different – but the importance of maintaining dialogue is as important today. For the last few minutes I’ve discussed some of the most pressing security challenges – along with the most fruitful areas of regional cooperation – facing the U.S. and Japan in Asia. This environment – in terms of threats and opportunities – is markedly different than the conditions that led to the forging of the U.S-Japan defense partnership in the context of a rivalry between two global superpowers. But on account of the scope, complexity and lethality of these challenges, I would argue that our alliance is more necessary, more relevant, and more important than ever. And maintaining the vitality and credibility of the alliance requires modernizing our force posture and other defense arrangements to better reflect the threats and military requirements of this century. For example, North Korea’s ballistic missiles – along with the proliferation of these weapons to other countries – require a more effective alliance missile defense capability. The U.S.-Japan partnership in missile defense is already one of the most advanced of its kind in the world. It was American and Japanese AEGIS ships that together monitored the North Korean missile launches of 2006 and 2008. This partnership –which relies on mutual support, cutting edge technology, and information sharing – in many ways reflect our alliance at its best. The U.S. and Japan have nearly completed the joint development of a new advanced interceptor, a system that represents a qualitative improvement in our ability to thwart any North Korean missile attack. The co-location of our air- and missile-defense commands at Yokota – and the associated opportunities for information sharing, joint training, and coordination in this area – provide enormous value to both countries. As I alluded to earlier, advances by the Chinese military in cyber and anti-satellite warfare pose a potential challenge to the ability of our forces to operate and communicate in this part of the Pacific. Cyber attacks can also come from any direction and from a variety of sources – state, non-state, or a combination thereof – in ways that could inflict enormous damage to advanced, networked militaries and societies. Fortunately, the U.S. and Japan maintain a qualitative edge in satellite and computer technology – an advantage we are putting to good use in developing ways to counter threats to the cyber and space domains. Just last month, the Government of Japan took another step forward in the evolution of the alliance by releasing its National Defense Program Guidelines – a document that lays out a vision for Japan’s defense posture. These guidelines envision: A more mobile and deployable force structure; Enhanced Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance capabilities; and A shift in focus to Japan’s southwest islands. These new guidelines provide an opportunity for even deeper cooperation between our two countries – and the emphasis on your southwestern islands underscores the importance of our alliance’s force posture. And this is a key point. Because even as the alliance continues to evolve – in strategy, posture, and military capabilities – to deal with this century’s security challenges, a critical component will remain the forward presence of U.S. military forces in Japan. Without such a presence: North Korea’s military provocations could be even more outrageous -- or worse; China might behave more assertively towards its neighbors; It would take longer to evacuate civilians affected by conflict or natural disasters in the region; It would be more difficult and costly to conduct robust joint exercises – such as the recent Keen Sword exercise – that hone the U.S. and Japanese militaries ability to operate and, if necessary, fight together; and Without the forward presence of U.S. forces in Japan, there would be less information sharing and coordination, and we would know less about regional threats and the military capabilities of our potential adversaries.

# 2NC

## T—QPQ

### 2NC—Interp

#### Interpretation – economic engagement is a subset of conditional engagement and implies a quid pro quo

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

In sum, conditional engagement consists of a set of objectives, a strategy for attaining those objectives, and tactics (specific policies) for implementing that strategy.

* The objectives of conditional engagement are the ten principles, which were selected to preserve American vital interests in Asia while accommodating China’s emergence as a major power.
* The overall strategy of conditional engagement follows two parallel lines: economic engagement, to promote the integration of China into the global trading and financial systems; and security engagement, to encourage compliance with the ten principles by diplomatic and military means when economic incentives do not suffice, in order to hedge against the risk of the emergence of a belligerent China.
* The tactics of economic engagement should promote China’s economic integration through negotiations on trade liberalization, institution building, and educational exchanges. While a carrots-and-sticks approach may be appropriate within the economic arena, the use of trade sanction to achieve short-term political goals is discouraged.
* The tactics of security engagement should reduce the risks posed by China’s rapid military expansion, its lack of transparency, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and transnational problems such as crime and illegal migration, by engaging in arms control negotiations, multilateral efforts, and a loosely-structured defensive military arrangement in Asia.8

[To footnotes]

8. Conditional engagement’s recommended tactics of tit-for-tat responses are equivalent to using carrots and sticks in response to foreign policy actions by China. Economic engagement calls for what is described as symmetric tit-for-tat and security engagement for asymmetric tit-for-tat. A symmetric response is one that counters a move by China in the same place, time, and manner; an asymmetric response might occur in another place at another time, and perhaps in another manner. A symmetric tit-for-tat would be for Washington to counter a Chinese tariff of 10 percent on imports for the United States with a tariff of 10 percent on imports from China. An asymmetric tit-for-tat would be for the United States to counter a Chines shipment of missiles to Iran with an American shipment of F-16s to Vietnam (John Lewis Gaddis, Strategies of Containment: A critical Appraisal of Postwar American National Security Policy. New York: Oxford University Press, (1982). This is also cited in Fareed Zakaria, “The Reagan Strategy of Containment,” Political Science Quarterly 105, no. 3 (1990), pp. 383-88).

### 2NC—Limits

#### Here’s proof – they allow tons of random unilateral measures

#### **CSG 13** [Cuba Study Group, a non-profit, non-partisan organization, comprised of business and community leaders of Cuban descent who share a common interest and vision of a free and democratic Cuba, “Restoring Executive Authority Over U.S. Policy Toward Cuba,” Feb 2013, <http://www.cubastudygroup.org/index.cfm/files/serve?File_id=45d8f827-174c-4d43-aa2f-ef7794831032>]

4. Additional Steps the U.S. President Can Take to Promote Change in Cuba¶ While we wait for Congress to act, the Executive Branch should exercise its licensing authority to further safeguard the flow of contacts and resources into the Island, encourage independent economic and political activity, and further empower the Cuban people. To that end, the Cuba Study Group proposes that the President pursue the following measures:¶ i) Modify Remittance and Export Limitations: Increase the $3,000 limit on remittances that can be carried to Cuba by authorized travelers and expand the types of goods that travelers may legally take to Cuba to support micro entrepreneurs. Fewer limitations in these areas will make it easier for U.S. travelers to provide seed capital and in-kind contributions for start-ups.¶ ii) Authorize Travel by General License for NGOs and Allow Them to Open Cuban Bank Accounts: Regulations enacted on January 28, 2011 allow U.S. full- and part-time university staff to travel to Cuba by general license. These regulations also allow U.S.-based academic institutions to open accounts in Cuban banks with funds to support their educational programs in Cuba. A similar license for foundations and NGOs whose mission involves support for micro and small businesses would also help support this growing segment of civil society.¶ iii) Establish New Licenses for the Provision of Services to Cuban Private Entrepreneurs: The President could build on existing authorizations that allow U.S. persons and institutions to pay individual Cuban scholars musicians and artists for their work. New licenses could extend to additional groups, such as artisans or farmers, and authorize a greater scope of activities such as recording, publication, distribution, etc.¶ iv) Authorize Imports of Certain Goods and Services to Businesses and Individuals Engaged in Certifiably Independent Economic Activity in Cuba: The President could authorize the importation of limited types of Cuban-origin goods and services under general or specific licenses, particularly when such authorizations could be justified as providing support for the Cuban people or democratic change in Cuba. For example, the President could authorize imports from private producers or allow U.S. persons to directly engage and hire Cuban professionals.¶ v) Authorize Export and Sale of Goods and Services to Businesses and Individuals Engaged in Certifiably Independent Economic Activity in Cuba: Amend existing licensing policy to establish a presumption of approval for specific items deemed to support the U.S.-stated policy goal of promoting independent economic activity on the Island. Since 2000, legislation has allowed the export of a broad range of agricultural products and a limited range of medicines and medical devices. This should be expanded to include other inputs in demand by indepen - dent businesses, including—but not limited to—good such as art supplies, food preparation equipment, bookkeeping materials, and basic electronic equipment and software required for retail sales and business administration.¶ vi) Authorize the Sale of Telecommunications Hardware in Cuba : Current U.S. regulations, as amended by the Obama administration in 2009, allow for donations of some telecommunications equipment, thereby recognizing that these goods by themselves do not violate the embargo. The next step should be to allow for the sales of those same goods inside the Island. Along with those provisions, changes should also allow for the provision of general travel licenses for research, marketing and sale of those goods.¶ vii) Authorize the Reestablishment of Ferry Services to Cuba : Current U.S. regulations allow both “aircraft and vessels” to serve Cuba as an exception to the U.S. embargo against the Island. The use of chartered aircrafts to transport Cuban-Americans and other licensed U.S. travelers to and from Cuba has long been authorized by the U.S. Department of Treasury. The next step should be to reestablish safe and secure chartered ferry services to transport the same categories of passengers to and from Cuba. Ferry service offers an affordable alternative to airline travel to Cuba and would allow an increase in the amount of goods that Cuban-Americans and other licensed travelers may legally take to Cuba to support their families and micro entrepreneurs.¶ viii) Simplify the Provision of Controlled Commodities, such as Computers and Laptops Direct the Department of Commerce to provide more detailed guidance for individuals to determine whether or not controlled commodities, such as laptops and printers, qualify under the general export waiver.¶ ix) Allow Licensed U.S. Travelers Access to U.S.-Issued Debit, Credit, and Pre-Paid Cards and Other Financial Services While on Authorized Travel in Cuba: Currently, U.S. travelers to Cuba have no access to U.S. bank accounts, credit cards, debit cards or other basic financial services. With few exceptions, U.S. travelers are forced to carry cash with them to Cuba. Allowing U.S. travelers access to electronic payment systems would help ensure their safety and security while being on the Island. Moreover, authorizing new electronic payment systems would facilitate the Administration’s goal of promoting people-to-people contacts and facilitating private economic activity by safeguarding the transfer of money from U.S. residents to relatives and independent entrepreneurs on the island.¶ x) Review Cuba’s Designation as a State Sponsor of Terrorism: Cuba’s status on the State Department’s list of state sponsors of terrorism has been subject to debate for more than a decade. The President should order a comprehensive, apolitical review to determine whether this designation reflects the reality of Cuba today.¶ xi) Develop an expanded bilateral agenda with a range of specific topics of mutual interest : Agenda should include topics such as the resolution of property claims to help foster an environment of dialogue, problem- solving and trust building— thereby helping to set the stage for an eventual normalization of relations.

## Brazil DA

### AT: Kashmir Add-On

#### No Kashmir war

Mutti 9— Master’s degree in International Studies with a focus on South Asia, U Washington. BA in History, Knox College. over a decade of expertise covering on South Asia geopolitics, Contributing Editor to Demockracy journal (James, 1/5, Mumbai Misperceptions: War is Not Imminent, http://demockracy.com/four-reasons-why-the-mumbai-attacks-wont-result-in-a-nuclear-war/)

Fearful of imminent war, the media has indulged in frantic hand wringing about Indian and Pakistani nuclear arsenals and renewed fears about the Indian subcontinent being “the most dangerous place on earth.” As an observer of the subcontinent for over a decade, I am optimistic that war will not be the end result of this event. As horrifying as the Mumbai attacks were, they are not likely to drive India and Pakistan into an armed international conflict. The media frenzy over an imminent nuclear war seems the result of the media being superficially knowledgeable about the history of Indian-Pakistani relations, of feeling compelled to follow the most sensationalistic story, and being recently brainwashed into thinking that the only way to respond to a major terrorist attack was the American way – a war. Here are four reasons why the Mumbai attacks will not result in a war: 1. For both countries, a war would be a disaster. India has been successfully building stronger relations with the rest of the world over the last decade. It has occasionally engaged in military muscle-flexing (abetted by a Bush administration eager to promote India as a counterweight to China and Pakistan), but it has much more aggressively promoted itself as an emerging economic powerhouse and a moral, democratic alternative to less savory authoritarian regimes. Attacking a fledgling democratic Pakistan would not improve India’s reputation in anybody’s eyes. The restraint Manmohan Singh’s government has exercised following the attacks indicates a desire to avoid rash and potentially regrettable actions. It is also perhaps a recognition that military attacks will never end terrorism. Pakistan, on the other hand, couldn’t possibly win a war against India, and Pakistan’s military defeat would surely lead to the downfall of the new democratic government. The military would regain control, and Islamic militants would surely make a grab for power – an outcome neither India nor Pakistan want. Pakistani president Asif Ali Zardari has shown that this is not the path he wants his country to go down. He has forcefully spoken out against terrorist groups operating in Pakistan and has ordered military attacks against LeT camps. Key members of LeT and other terrorist groups have been arrested. One can hope that this is only the beginning, despite the unenviable military and political difficulties in doing so. 2. Since the last major India-Pakistan clash in 1999, both countries have made concrete efforts to create people-to-people connections and to improve economic relations. Bus and train services between the countries have resumed for the first time in decades along with an easing of the issuing of visas to cross the border. India-Pakistan cricket matches have resumed, and India has granted Pakistan “most favored nation” trading status. The Mumbai attacks will undoubtedly strain relations, yet it is hard to believe that both sides would throw away this recent progress. With the removal of Pervez Musharraf and the election of a democratic government (though a shaky, relatively weak one), both the Indian government and the Pakistani government have political motivations to ease tensions and to proceed with efforts to improve relations. There are also growing efforts to recognize and build upon the many cultural ties between the populations of India and Pakistan and a decreasing sense of animosity between the countries. 3. Both countries also face difficult internal problems that present more of a threat to their stability and security than does the opposite country. If they are wise, the governments of both countries will work more towards addressing these internal threats than the less dangerous external ones. The most significant problems facing Pakistan today do not revolve around the unresolved situation in Kashmir or a military threat posed by India. The more significant threat to Pakistan comes from within. While LeT has focused its firepower on India instead of the Pakistani state, other militant Islamic outfits have not. Groups based in the tribal regions bordering Afghanistan have orchestrated frequent deadly suicide bombings and clashes with the Pakistani military, including the attack that killed ex-Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto in 2007. The battle that the Pakistani government faces now is not against its traditional enemy India, but against militants bent on destroying the Pakistani state and creating a Taliban-style regime in Pakistan. In order to deal with this threat, it must strengthen the structures of a democratic, inclusive political system that can also address domestic problems and inequalities. On the other hand, the threat of Pakistani based terrorists to India is significant. However, suicide bombings and attacks are also carried out by Indian Islamic militants, and vast swaths of rural India are under the de facto control of the Maoist guerrillas known as the Naxalites. Hindu fundamentalists pose a serious threat to the safety of many Muslim and Christian Indians and to the idea of India as a diverse, secular, democratic society. Separatist insurgencies in Kashmir and in parts of the northeast have dragged on for years. And like Pakistan, India faces significant challenges in addressing sharp social and economic inequalities. Additionally, Indian political parties, especially the ruling Congress Party and others that rely on the support of India’s massive Muslim population to win elections, are certainly wary about inflaming public opinion against Pakistan (and Muslims). This fear could lead the investigation into the Mumbai attacks to fizzle out with no resolution, as many other such inquiries have. 4. The international attention to this attack – somewhat difficult to explain in my opinion given the general complacency and utter apathy in much of the western world about previous terrorist attacks in places like India, Pakistan, and Indonesia – is a final obstacle to an armed conflict. Not only does it put both countries under a microscope in terms of how they respond to the terrible events, it also means that they will feel international pressure to resolve the situation without resorting to war. India and Pakistan have been warned by the US, Russia, and others not to let the situation end in war. India has been actively recruiting Pakistan’s closest allies – China and Saudi Arabia – to pressure Pakistan to act against militants, and the US has been in the forefront of pressing Pakistan for action. Iran too has expressed solidarity with India in the face of the attacks and is using its regional influence to bring more diplomatic pressure on Pakistan.

#### War won’t go nuclear

Enders 2 (Jan 30, David, Michigan Daily, “Experts say nuclear war still unlikely,” http://www.michigandaily.com/content/experts-say-nuclear-war-still-unlikely)

\* Ashutosh Varshney – Professor of Political Science and South Asia expert at the University of Michigan

\* Paul Huth – Professor of International Conflict and Security Affairs at the University of Maryland

\* Kenneth Lieberthal – Professor of Political Science at the University of Michigan. Former special assistant to President Clinton at the National Security Council

University political science Prof. Ashutosh Varshney becomes animated when asked about the likelihood of nuclear war between India and Pakistan.¶ "Odds are close to zero," Varshney said forcefully, standing up to pace a little bit in his office. "The assumption that India and Pakistan cannot manage their nuclear arsenals as well as the U.S.S.R. and U.S. or Russia and China concedes less to the intellect of leaders in both India and Pakistan than would be warranted."¶ The worlds two youngest nuclear powers first tested weapons in 1998, sparking fear of subcontinental nuclear war a fear Varshney finds ridiculous.¶ "The decision makers are aware of what nuclear weapons are, even if the masses are not," he said.¶ "Watching the evening news, CNN, I think they have vastly overstated the threat of nuclear war," political science Prof. Paul Huth said.¶ Varshney added that there are numerous factors working against the possibility of nuclear war.¶ "India is committed to a no-first-strike policy," Varshney said. "It is virtually impossible for Pakistan to go for a first strike, because the retaliation would be gravely dangerous."¶ Political science Prof. Kenneth Lieberthal, a former special assistant to President Clinton at the National Security Council, agreed. "Usually a country that is in the position that Pakistan is in would not shift to a level that would ensure their total destruction," Lieberthal said, making note of India"s considerably larger nuclear arsenal.¶ "American intervention is another reason not to expect nuclear war," Varshney said. "If anything has happened since September 11, it is that the command control system has strengthened. The trigger is in very safe hands."

## South Korea Intermediary CP

### AT: P/ CP

#### “Economic engagement” must be bilateral.

Miles Kahler1 and Scott L. Kastner, 11-xx-2004, Graduate School of International Relations and Pacific Studies at the University of California, San Diego1, Department of Government and Politics University of Maryland2, “Strategic Uses of Economic Interdependence: Engagement Policies in South Korea, Singapore, and Taiwan,” <http://www.bsos.umd.edu/gvpt/kastner/KahlerKastner.doc>

Economic engagement—a policy of deliberately expanding economic ties with an adversary in order to change the behavior of the target state and effect an improvement in bilateral political relations—is the subject of growing, but still limited, interest in the international relations literature.

The bulk of the work on economic statecraft continues to focus on coercive policies such as economic sanctions. The emphasis on negative forms of economic statecraft is not without justification: the use of economic sanctions is widespread and well-documented, and several quantitative studies have shown that adversarial relations between countries tend to correspond to reduced, rather than enhanced, levels of trade (Gowa 1994; Pollins 1989). At the same time, however, relatively little is known about how widespread strategies of economic engagement actually are: scholars disagree on this point, in part because no database cataloging instances of positive economic statecraft exists (Mastanduno 2003). Furthermore, beginning with the classic work of Hirschman (1945), most studies in this regard have focused on policies adopted by great powers. But engagement policies adopted by South Korea and the other two states examined in this study, Singapore and Taiwan, demonstrate that engagement is not a strategy limited to the domain of great power politics; instead, it may be more widespread than previously recognized.

#### “Towards” requires linear direction of engagement.

CJ McAlvay 1914, Supreme Court Justice in Michigan, “People v. Kreidler”, 180 Mich. 654; 147 N.W. 559; 1914 Mich. LEXIS 945, 6-1, Lexis

2. CRIMINAL LAW -- "TOWARD" -- CONSTRUCTION OF STATUTE. It is sufficient, in a prosecution for violating the statute, to show that the accused was making use of a rifle pointed in the direction of a passenger on a car and discharged the weapon in that direction, without striking any one. The word "toward" means in a course or line leading in the direction of.

#### “Towards” implies certainty.

Anne Marie Lofaso, 2-24-2010, West Virginia University, College of Law, “Talking is Worthwhile: The Role of Employee Voice in Protecting, Enhancing, and Encouraging Individual Rights to Job Security in a Collective System,” <http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1558563>

The obligations placed on employers are significant in two ways. First and significantly, the Collective Redundancies Directive places on employers a duty to consult "with a view to reaching an agreement." n172 Given the Directive's language choice, this consultation right seems to be at least coextensive with the federal right to bargain under the National Labor Relations Act and perhaps even greater than the right granted under the NLRA. Federal courts interpreting NLRA Section 8(d)'s definition of the bargaining duty n173 have made clear that the duty to bargain does not include the duty to come to agreement. n174 Perhaps this is why Professor [\*86] Summers, in describing the duty to bargain under Section 8(d) always referred to it as obligating the parties to bargain in good faith with "a view toward reaching agreement." The use of the preposition "toward" suggests a duty to come close to agreement but not a duty to close the deal.