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### 1AC—Transition Advantage

**CONTENTION 1 IS THE CUBAN TRANSITION:**

**A *confluence of structural factors* makes Cuban collapse *uniquely likely***

Lopez-Levy 11 – Arturo Lopez Levy is lecturer and PhD Candidate at the Josef Korbel School of International Studies at the University of Denver. He a Research Associate of the Institute for the Study of Israel in the Middle East (ISIME) and teaches Latin American Politics, and Comparative Politics at the University of Denver and the Colorado School of Mines. (“Change In Post-Fidel Cuba: Political Liberalization, Economic Reform and Lessons for U.S. Policy”, May 2011, New America Foundation, <http://newamerica.net/sites/newamerica.net/files/policydocs/naf_all_cuba_reform_final.pdf>)

Cuba's Three Crises The VI Party Congress and the reform processes it is ushering in are induced by three unresolved structural crises. 1. Cuba is experiencing a severe economic crisis. 10 **Cuba is suffering its worst economic crisis since** the collapse of the Soviet Union in **1991**, which eliminated one third of all Cuban foreign trade. Although the country is not experiencing 1991-levels of economic deprivation, the decline in Cuba’s GDP and the country’s isolation from the world economy renders this crisis more politically devastating than that of 1991. In the early 1990’s, the Cuban government relied on a reservoir of domestic goodwill generated by two decades of economic growth, nationalist successes (including the victories in the African Wars) and a sustained expansion of social services. Today, the so-called “Special Period” constitutes more than 40 percent of Cuba’s post-revolutionary history. 11 The Cuban population never expected the Special Period to go on so long. While Cuba did survive this period of extreme austerity, younger generations of Cubans and portions of the government’s political base fault the government for not having implemented the types of structural reforms that have been adopted in other Communist-led nations such as the People’s Republic of China (PRC) and Vietnam. 2. The transition from Fidel Castro’s charismatic leadership to the institutionalized rule of the Communist Party is proceeding, but unfinished. The Cuban Communist Party, as it was created after the revolution, is 46 years-old12 but still led by its first generation of leaders. Raul Castro has ruled the country since July 31, 2006, marking almost five years without any significant upheaval under his leadership, proof that Cuba is not experiencing a crisis of governance. But the shift from one Castro to another was merely an intragenerational succession. First Vice-President, and now Second Secretary of the PCC, Jose Ramon Machado Ventura is one year older than Raul and the majority of the other prominent leaders are in their late seventies. The decision to promote Machado to the second in command, first in the government, and now in the Party, can be explained by two factors: 1) the triumph of the alliance of military leaders and provincial party czars as the dominant force in Cuban elite politics (versus government bureaucrats and Fidel’s appointed ideologues), and Raul Castro’s conviction that Fidel’s policy of promotion of young cadres “by helicopter”, not in a step by step Leninist fashion was a mistake. The Cuban political system has **not** yet **passed the most important of tests**, replacing its original generation of leaders with one of different formative experiences and vision, a successful inter-generational succession. This transition also invokes questions about Cuba’s civil-military relations, since almost half of the Politburo members are generals while the Communist Party, not the Armed Forces, is purported to be the country’s leading institution. 3. There is a crisis of confidence among domestic and foreign economic actors over the current leaderships’ commitment to carrying out the reforms needed to place Cuba on a sustainable path. Most of the changes proposed by Raul Castro have been debated within Cuban politics debate for the last twenty years. But the V Congress of the PCC in 1997 was a victory of conservative and bureaucratic forces opposed to the reforms13. As result of the stagnation that followed, significant segments of the Cuban population questioned the government’s willingness to execute the most needed changes. After twenty years of government announcements and delays; confidence in the leadership’s commitment to real reform is shaky. In light of this history, part of the population views the government as oblivious to the costs of excessive gradualism or simply as trying to buy time to remain in power as long as possible, without a clear vision for the future or the will to take risks. These three crises are embedded in a long revolutionary cycle that effects five generations of Cubans14 who grew up under post-revolutionary rule. For a great number of Cubans on the island and in the Diasporas, the decisive experiences of their lives are not connected to Fidel Castro’s triumph in 1959 but instead to the “special period”. These last twenty years of economic hardship and scarcity have diminished the Cuban population’s capacity for major political mobilization. They have also concluded a transition from the Cuban revolution’s more radical phase to a Thermidor15, in which the post-revolutionary elite doesn’t behave as revolutionary anymore. For them, the business of revolution is now business. The convergence of these three crises makes the current situation in Cuba particularly fragile. While the government has innumerable possibilities as to how it will bring change to Cuba, **the** onecompletely **untenable choice would be to maintain the status quo.**

***Most recent evidence* proves *reforms are failing* to stabilize the economy**

Morales 8/31 – Emilio presented this at a conference of the ASCE; translated by Joseph Scarpaci of the Havana Consulting Group. (“Cuban reforms: the ultimate utopia?” last updated 8/31/13, http://thehavanaconsultinggroups.com/index.php?option=com\_content&view=article&id=348%3Acuban-reforms-the-ultimate-utopia&catid=47%3Aeconomy&lang=en)

\*Tables left out\*

When Cuban President Raúl Castro began the reforms to transform the island’s economic model, Cuban economists and foreign experts alike expected a bright future after more than five days decades of mistaken government policies and a centralized economy. Nevertheless, **three years after the reforms began, the results have disappointed**.

The reforms that began under Raúl Castro's government, despite having the greatest reach since those were carried out in the 1990s by his predecessor, have been rather limited, fairly shallow, slow, and somewhat contradictory.

But there is also something quite unique that the government is carrying out: they are enshrining the historic leadership of the revolution for eternity. This has never been seen before in recent history, not even in the countries of Eastern Europe or the former Soviet Union, where the emerging political forces were capable of carrying out reforms. In the Cuban case, the historical leaders have ultimately become trapped in their own errors.

The reforms are based on obsolete structures that have not been dismantled and serve only to preserve socialism. Therefore, what becomes of the so-called reforms is really a contradiction.

In this context, the economic situation of the island is chaotic, and its errors and failures have been piling up for more than a half century. They are a heavy burden that the crippled government must disentangle if the reforms are to work.

The current economy performs like a bankrupt company, and it survives thanks only to outside help: the Cuban diaspora and aid from Venezuela. Nevertheless there are two important factors that are preventing the total collapse of the system.

The outlook for reforms is not hopeful.

The pattern of Cuban outmigration for the last 10 years reveals that more than a half million Cubans have left the island in order to try their luck in other latitudes.

In 2012, two years after the reforms started, the island reached its peak outmigration level for the entire decade. A total of 56,207 Cubans emigrated to other countries. This high mark can be interpreted as a signal that the reforms have not improved the everyday life of Cubans, or, conversely, it may mean that there is considerable anxiety among the population.

Currently, 2.1 million Cubans live outside of the island, while 11.2 million remain there. That means that for every five residents on the Island, one is living abroad. While 3% of the world’s population has migrated internationally, for Cuba the figure is 15.3%.

However, this high Cuban migration rate is paradoxically derived from one of two legs that sustain the island’s economy: remittances.

Thanks to the removal of restrictions on sending money that President Obama implemented in 2009, approximately $2.6 billion in cash and another $2.5 billion in merchandise, reach the island annually. Goods such as clothing, food, medicine, household appliances, and other products constitute these in-kind remittances. Cubans living abroad send them to their family members back home in order to cope with mounting economic needs.

Annually, then, this amounts to $5.1 billion. This amount exceeds the combined gross revenue derived from the four leading products in the country: tourism ($2.6 billion), nickel ($1.4 billion), exporting medical products ($500 million) and sugar exports in the amount of $393.1 million. Those four productive export categories generate $4.9 billion. However, that amount excludes the costs of production, administrative overhead, marketing, and distribution. If we factor in those expenses, that leaves a net figure of about $1 billion in earnings, which is five times less than the amount that the Cuban diaspora gives to family on the island. Moreover, money and merchandise reaching the island does not take into account the cost of wiring money or sending merchandise. In the last four years, remittances grew by $8 billion, a remarkable rate of growth.

Sending remittances over the next few years should rise. This is because of the growing outmigration of Cubans as well as the increase in charter flights and the number of Cuban-Americans headed to the island.

Miami is now the leading city of origin for sending charter flights to Cuba, having surpassed Montreal and Toronto. An ongoing study being carried out by The Havana Consulting Group over the last seven weeks has monitored flights leaving Miami for Cuba. On average, five charter airlines with 150-seat planes make the trip. This translates into an average of about 11.08 flights daily, or 1,662 passengers, of which 17% are non-Cuban-American U.S. residents or citizens. They travel to to seven destinations in Cuba: Havana (66.25%), Camaguey (9.11%), Cienfuegos (8.49%), Holguín (7.25%), Santa Clara (6.21%), Manzanillo (1.45%), and Santiago de Cuba (1.25%). Those passengers report that they carry an average of $3,500 cash with them. If we adjust for the 17% who are non-Cuban American, the daily totals reach $4.82 million dollars entering the island daily. In other words, roughly $1.76 billion reaches Cuba this way annually.

Venezuela’s support is dangerously decreasing.

Venezuela's estimated $6 billion of annual support constitutes the other leg supporting the Cuban economy.

However, the present crisis that this south American economy is experiencing, coupled with the negative effect that the death of Chavez has had in continuing chavismo, means that this level of aid will be difficult to sustain.

The numbers speak for themselves and it is difficult for the Cuban government to ignore them. They shape how the Cuban government shapes their reforms and how they might save the Cuban economy in light of a possible melt down in Venezuela.

To better understand the warning alarm that the Venezuelan economy is sounding, let us take a look at the following data:

When Chávez came to power in 1999, there were 16 ministries. In 2013, there are 36 (up 125%).

In 1999, the government employed 900,000 public workers. Today, there are 2.3 million state employees, which is an increase of 155%.

In 1999, without foreign currency controls, the exchange rate of Venezuela’s currency (Bolivares no fuertes) was 573.86 to one U.S. dollar. Today, with control rates set by CADIVI (Comisión de Administración de Divisas, or Commission on Hard Currency Administration), that exchange rate is 6300 Bolivares to the dollar. This is a devaluation of 997.83%, without taking in to account the Venezuelan government’s subsidy currency, nor addressing the price of the dollar in the nation’s black market.

In 1999, a barrel of oil fetched $10.57. Today, it sells for $109.45 per barrel. This is an increase of 935.48%.

In 1999, oil production reached 3.48 million barrels daily. Today, it is 2.36 million barrels daily, which represents a reduction of nearly one third (32.27%).

In 1999, oil exports were 3 million barrels daily. In recent years, this figure has fallen by 26.67%, or to 2.2 million barrels daily.

In 1999, the state oil company (PDVSA) employed 40,000 employees. Today, it has approximately 120,000, a three-fold rise.

In 1999, PDVSA $6 billion of outstanding debt. Today, it approaches $40 billion, which is a 567% increase.

In 1999, Venezuela’s debt was $39.911 billion. Today, it approaches $104.481 billion. This translates into an increase of 162%.

The Venezuelan government has taken over some 600 fincas (plantations) ($2.5 million hectares).

The government has spent more than $14 billion in purchasing armaments.

What shape is the labor force in three years after the reforms?

The data are not uplifting regarding the number of workers in the private sector. This contrasts with the hope that the government will gradually downsize the public sector and reduce its bureaucracy.

If we analyze the labor force situation three years after the reforms began, we observe that there are 6.8 million persons of working age, of which, 5.17 million are working, and leaving 1.09 million people without work. This translates into unemployment rate of 16%.

Self-employed workers in 2012 reached a high mark of 429,458 workers, of which 77,302 were retired, and 60,124 persons also worked in the state sector. Accordingly, that means that only 292,031 persons or 4.29% of the entire working force age were employed entirely by the private sector of the island. If we add to that figure the private agricultural workers (about 537,000 persons), both sectors of the labor force amount to 12.18% of the working age population of the island.

Table 2. Workforce situation on the island two years after the onset of the reforms. Cuban Work Force 2012 % Those in economically-active age group who work 5,174,500 76.06 All self-employed 429,458 6.31 Retired self-employed 77,302 1.14 Self-employed with public jobs 60,124 0.88 Exclusively self-employed 292,031 4.29 Private agricultural workers 537,000 7.89 Economically-active Age working in public sector 4,745,042 69.75 Unemployed population 1,091,400 16.04 Economically Active Age 6,802,900

The figures are quite striking and show that the private sector has little weight in the island’s economy.

Why aren't the reforms working?

The main obstacles that the reforms confront are that **there are no parallel structural reforms**. All the reforms are based upon the old scheme of centralizing the economy. The reach of the new regulations and laws, therefore, remains shallow.

Rather, the reforms are more about resurrecting prohibitions and curtailing rights than they are about substantive structural change. Here are a few examples: the migration reform, freeing up of the selling of houses and cars, the authorization of more than 183 types of self-employed work, and more recently, contracting Cuban athletes to play with foreign teams.

With the ideology of the Cuban government still intact, reforms will only move forward slowly, if at all. This is been the situation for more than half a century, which is why it will be very difficult that a change in strategic thinking and philosophy will be able to manage the country’s economy. Absent is any critical thinking about moving the country away from a centralized system to a more open economy without restrictions. For instance, one of the main obstacles is the privatization of public goods that is prohibited by the Constitution and, among other reasons, is one of the brakes that slows down foreign capital to the island, and impedes the development of a strong national private sector.

Entrepreneurship and individual initiative are straightjacketed, and rigid laws trap the productive elements of the economy. That is why the national media characterizes the limited successes of self-employed workers as those achieved by the nouveau riche, which strikes distrust and fear if the private sector becomes an engine of social change. Put another way, there is strong resistance to change despite the fact that the top of the government understands that there really is no other option available.

The dual currency system will also be very difficult to eliminate in light of the low productivity of the labor force and the outlandish state levels of employment whose employees remain very unproductive. Witness, for example, the recent opening of the real-estate market, which has proven to be more speculative than one of sales. Prices ascribed to houses bear no relationship with the purchasing power of the Cuban people. The average price of a house in Cuba at the national level is $31,489 CUCs (convertible currency units, equivalent to $1 USD), while the mean monthly salary is $216 CUCs.

In this new market context, there is a lack of financial mechanisms to stimulate the sale of homes and to finance mortgages. State banks play a very small role in providing loans to finance the construction and repair of homes, therefore making the as a place where cash is the only vehicle for acquiring new homes; this is a tedious process that is not attractive to many Cubans.

Capital investment remains discriminatory because only foreign companies and investors can do so. Cubans are not allowed to invest, regardless of whether they live on or off the island.

The government encourages neither private firms from operating nor individual entrepreneurship. Instead, it insists on pursuing the tried old and unsuccessful path led by cooperatives.

Turning arable land into usufruct has been a failure. Even though the state has leased out 70% of public arable lands (80% of all arable land), Cuba still imports 60% of the food it needs at a cost of $2 billion annually. Those who are using these arable lands do not feel as if they own them, and as a result, crops that are produced are more for subsistence than for massive distribution.

Lastly, the 183 types of self-employment jobs that the government has approved will not allow for major increase of the private sector. In the meantime, the skilled labor force of the Cuban economy – professionals such as architects, engineers and programmers-- are not included in these reforms.

So what needs to be done to make these reforms work?

A first element would be to adapt to the present economic situation of the country, which means bringing into play strategic thought that marks a departure from the old schemes of the past and focuses more on how to run the economy. One would have to eliminate the taboos that are standing in the way all new reforms being carried out. The government and party must internalize these this thinking.

In this new paradigm, therefore, the level of freedom required for the productive elements of the economy have to be completely independent of government action; they **must be self administered** and encourage free association and cooperation. It is essential to do away with laws that stand in the way of these reforms. Now is the time to create new laws that encourage entrepreneurship and private initiative.

In this regard, professionals have a major role to play in the leadership of these reforms. Highly skilled workers have been relegated to the background, and this is a huge error. A trained labor force will be the engine to drive the Cuban economy and prove to be a counter-veiling weight to foreign capital investment in the near future.

As well, unfettered access to new technologies is a mandatory condition that would help modernize the economy and avoid allocating it unnecessary intermediate stages.

Agricultural reforms must be deeper. Land should be turned over in perpetuity and not in usufruct. Farmers need to be the true owners of their harvests and compete in a free market without state intervention. It is vital that the private sector compete in the distribution, warehousing, and marketing of agricultural goods. For that to be carried out, private companies must be creative to import machinery and inputs and the agricultural sector, as well as controlling the export of their products.

In this context, the stagnant sugar industry needs to be privatized slowly, in stair-step fashion so that private and foreign investors can participate.

The real-estate sector requires two fundamental premises. 1). Modify the laws that limit its development. 2). Allow the private sector to take a protagonist role in directing investments and carrying out projects.

Foreign capital in the development of a national private sector will be necessary to break up the state bureaucracy and to allow a national construction industry to develop if these changes in real estate are to take place. Such a scenario would have the advantage of accelerating new housing projects that can be occupied and ready for sale in order to move the market forward. Private financial entities that can provide mortgage credit for the sale of homes will be absolutely essential.

**Failure of economic reform causes civil war**

Lopez-Levy 11 – Arturo Lopez Levy is lecturer and PhD Candidate at the Josef Korbel School of International Studies at the University of Denver. He a Research Associate of the Institute for the Study of Israel in the Middle East (ISIME) and teaches Latin American Politics, and Comparative Politics at the University of Denver and the Colorado School of Mines. (“Change In Post-Fidel Cuba: Political Liberalization, Economic Reform and Lessons for U.S. Policy”, May 2011, New America Foundation, <http://newamerica.net/sites/newamerica.net/files/policydocs/naf_all_cuba_reform_final.pdf>)

Indeed, if Cuba’s economic reform fails and local revolts ensue, the most likely outcome would be more a civil war such as that seen in Libya, with horrific acts of war, resistance and violations of human rights throughout the country. Nationalists who are concerned about the risk of political instability and criticize the lack of a credible proposal by most Cuban opposition groups should not be dismissed as opponents of democracy. The support for the political opposition should not be a litmus test that determines whether Washington will engage in cooperative dialogue with actors in Cuba.¶ By ignoring both the Cuban elite’s potential for governance and the current balance of power in which the opposition is fragmented, dispersed and without a clearly-articulated governance plan, the U.S. is opting for the most unstable and uncertain road to political transition. The immediate goals of U.S. policy towards Cuba must be to promote market growth through economic reform and a stable process of political liberalization that welcomes the growth of nonpartisan Cuban civil society organizations.

**A *total repeal* of the embargo is critical to *provide foreign capital* and incentivize *liberalization and democracy***

CSG 13 – The Cuba Study Group is a non-profit and non-partisan organization studying Cuba. (“Restoring Executive Authority Over U.S. Policy Toward Cuba”, February 2013, <http://www.cubastudygroup.org/index.cfm/files/serve?File_id=45d8f827-174c-4d43-aa2f-ef7794831032>)

Beyond failing to advance its stated objectives, the most counterproductive aspect of Helms-Burton is that it codifies U.S. embargo sanctions toward Cuba, and conditions the suspension of any and all such sanctions on congressional recognition of a transition government in Cuba. This is counterproductive in two ways. First, it hinders the United States’ ability to respond rapidly and strategically to developments on the Island as they occur. For example, if the Executive Branch wishes to increase assistance to the 400,000 private entrepreneurs currently operating small businesses in Cuba, it can only do so in a limited way through its licensing authority. Second, it creates a dynamic of “all-or-nothing” conditionality that effectively places U.S. policy in the hands of the Cuban government, making it easier for Cuban officials to resist political reform and dictate the degree of American influence on the Island. Defenders of the status quo inside the Cuban government have shown that they view greater engagement with the United States as a threat to their hold on power. As Elizardo Sanchez, the head of the Cuban Commission for Human Rights, has recognized: “The more American citizens in the streets of Cuban cities, the better for the cause of a more open society.” The Cuban government has become increasingly adept at manipulating U.S. policy choices. This is why any sign of a thaw from the United States has repeatedly been followed by confrontation or repression, which in turn has been followed by U.S. domestic pressure to tighten economic sanctions. This pattern has become somewhat predictable, as recently exemplified by Cuba’s imprisonment of U.S. contractor Alan Gross after President Obama relaxed family travel and remittance restrictions in 2009 and U.S. policymakers’ refusal to pursue improved bilateral relations in response.xvi It can be reasonably concluded that elements of the Cuban government do not, in fact, seek any substantial liberalization from U.S. sanctions. Indeed, Helms-Burton provides them with an alibi for their own failures and may well be essential to their political survival. Senator Jesse Helms famously said that Helms-Burton “tightened the noose around the neck of the last dictator in the Western Hemisphere, Fidel Castro.”xvii In practice, however, Helms-Burton may have served as an incredibly convenient life raft, giving a struggling and failing system the legitimacy that comes from the appearance of being a “state under siege.” Repealing Helms-Burton and related statutory provisions that limit the Executive Branch’s authority over Cuba policy. Over time, U.S. policies toward Communist countries with poor human rights records and histories of adversarial relations—such as China and Vietnam—have evolved toward diplomatic normalization and economic engagement. Policymakers in both parties have rightly judged that engagement, rather than isolation, better serves U.S. national interests and lends greater credibility to calls for political and economic reform. The Cuba Study Group believes the most effective way to break the deadlock of “all-or-nothing” conditionality and remedy the ineffectiveness of current U.S. policy is by de-codifying the embargo against Cuba through the repeal of Helms-Burton and related statutory provisions that limit the Executive Branch’s authority over Cuban policy.xviii Repealing Helm-Burton and related statutory provisions would shift the primary focus of U.S. Cuba policy away from the regime and toward empowering Cuban people. It would also enhance the leverage of the United States to promote a multilateral approach toward Cuba, as well as embolden reformers, democracy advocates and private entrepreneurs inside the island to press their government for greater change. De-codifying the embargo would allow the Executive Branch the flexibility to use the entire range of foreign policy tools at its disposal—diplomatic, economic, political, legal and cultural—to incentivize change in Cuba. The President would be free to adopt more efficient, targeted policies necessary for pressuring the Cuban leadership to respect human rights and implement political reforms, while simultaneously empowering all other sectors of society to pursue their economic wellbeing and become the authors of their own futures.xix Repealing Helms-Burton would also free civil society development and assistance programs to be implemented outside of a contentious sanctions framework. Repealing the extraterritorial provisions of Helms-Burton would allow the United States greater leverage in persuading the international community, especially key regional partners, to adopt a multilateral and targeted approach toward focusing on the advancement of human rights in Cuba. This would fundamentally transform the international dynamic that has long helped the Cuban government stifle dissent, since its efforts to isolate critics at home would increasingly lead to its own isolation from the international community. While it is difficult to prove a direct causal connection between economic reforms and an open society, modern history has taught us that it is increasingly difficult for dictatorial governments to maintain political control the more prosperity their people enjoy.xx Repealing Helms-Burton and related statutory provisions would allow the U.S. the ability to efficiently promote and provide direct support to Cuba’s private sector. Such support would empower a greater plurality within Cuban society, including government reformers, democracy advocates, Cuban entrepreneurs and society as a whole by increasing their access to the resources and expertise of the world’s most prosperous private sector (and largest Cuban diaspora), located a mere 90 miles from Cuba’s shores. In turn, this would enhance the relative power of Cuban society to that of the state, while stripping the latter of its preferred scapegoat for its oppressive practices and economic blunders. U.S. policy should also seek to incentivize the Cuban government to end state monopolies on economic activities and allow greater private participation in the economy. The Cuba Study Group believes that any forthcoming congressional review of current legislation relating to Cuba, such as a review of the Cuban Adjustment Act, must require a review of the totality of the legislative framework codified in HelmsBurton and related statutory provisions so that the United States may finally develop a coherent policy toward the Island. The U.S. should pursue this course of action independent of actions taken by the Cuban government so as not to place the reigns of U.S. policy in the hands of Cuban proponents of the status quo.

**More moderate approaches *comparatively fail* to stabilize Cuba**

Koenig 10 – Lance is a US Army Colonel. This is a paper submitted for a Masters in Strategic Studies at the US Army War College. (“Time for a New Cuba Policy”, March 11, 2010, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA518130)

The United States requires a policy that will lead to better relations between the United States and Cuba, increase the soft power of the United States in the Latin American world, and pull the Cuban government towards a more representative form of governance. These conditions will contribute to the national security of the United States as well as to the western hemisphere. So with this in mind, what are our likely options? Options

• Path of least resistance, stay the course. The United States can continue with the current policy of trade embargo, travel restrictions, and limited diplomatic relations. The United States will not likely choose this path, but will rather go down it because it is easier politically to not change the status quo. This policy requires a long-term commitment and continuing patience. The Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act of 1996 provides the way ahead that the Cuban government must follow in order to gain normalized relations with the United States. This option follows the path of the last forty nine years and no significant change is required on the part of the United States. Politically, this avoids the problems generated by going against the Cuban voters of Florida that have been strong supporters of the current policy. The risk is that the United States will miss a window of opportunity to make fundamental positive changes to our relationship with Cuba. Additionally, Cuba could attain economic prosperity in spite of the United States’ actions. Cuba would be forced to continue to look towards China and Venezuela for trade and security relationships. Additionally, for both trade and tourism, Cuba will continue to develop relationships with Canada and the European Union, while the United States’ influence will continue to wane.

**• Strengthen the current policy**. Eliminate the billions of dollars per year in remittances from Cuban-Americans to relatives within Cuba. Work multilaterally with other countries to increase the effectiveness of the current embargoes on trade and travel. Fully implement the “Powell Commission Report” recommendations to end the Castro dictatorship and undermine the succession strategy.31 The Powell Commission Report seeks to reverse the recent economic gains to put added pressure on the government of Cuba. 32 Additionally, pressure the European Union to stop trading with Cuba and restrict the ability of EU citizens to travel to Cuba. The EU nations provide a great opportunity to make up for lost trade with the United States and have a large population of potential tourists for Cuban beaches. The United States must deter actions by the Organization of American States to work closer with Cuba. The Organization of American States should also warn its members to limit the scope of bilateral relations with Cuba in order to support the efforts of the United States. The United States must use Radio and TV Marti to inform the Cuban people of the true cause of their economic difficulty, the dysfunctional communist centrally controlled economy vice economic sanctions. And finally, tighten the noose around the economy and government of Cuba to attempt to bring down the government in a shorter period of time. This option assumes that our current policy is the correct policy, but needs to be strengthened. It eliminates half measures and contradicting policies to produce a more powerful embargo with devastating effect on the Cuban dictatorship. The risk is that the United States will become further isolated from the world in regards to its Cuba policy and will create additional sympathy for Cuba. This could result in open disregard for the embargo by the European Union and other countries interested in trade with Cuba, with a **collapse of** the **effectiveness** of the embargo. The soft power of the United States would suffer with possibly no gain. The United States could lose all possible influence over the future direction of the Cuban government as the Castro regime is replaced.

**• Limited easing of** economic and travel **sanctions.** Engage the Cuban government and reward concessions by easing sanctions. Engage the Cuban government and use a carrot and stick program to encourage the Cuban leadership to transition from a dictatorship towards a more representative form of government, with more emphasis on the stick and less on the carrot. Reward concessions on human rights and moves toward democratization with increased levels of trade and travel. Use the enticement of increased revenue to the government through higher levels of trade as well as the income generated when Americans (of both Cuban descent and nonCuban descent) visit the island and spend dollars. This approach should be less threatening to the Cuban government as they have a level of control over the pace of change. The risk is that the government of Cuba would have the opportunity to adjust to the gradual changes and maintain control while conditions for the Cuban people improve, removing the pressure for a change towards market reforms and a more democratic form of government.

• Support the Cuban people, but not the government. This option would completely and unilaterally lift the embargo on trade and travel.33 Reestablish normal diplomatic relations with Cuba. Engage the Cuban government and use a carrot and stick program to encourage the Cuban leadership to transition from a dictatorship towards a more representative form of government, with more emphasis on the carrot and less on the stick. Included in the carrots are: military to military exchanges and exercises; observer status in the Organization of American States (OAS); and provide assistance transitioning the economic and financial aspects of the economy towards a free market system. Use the economic element of power to demonstrate the superior qualities of a free market economy. Encourage Cuba to allow United States businesses to operate in Cuba without the restrictions of government ownership and government collection of wages for labor. Help Cuba develop an economy that takes advantage of their educated workforce (literacy rate of 99.8%) 34 to move away from low value added products to high value added products with the goal of improving the per capita gross domestic product (GDP) and thus the quality of life for the average Cuban citizen. This option has risk politically, as Cuban voters in Florida have traditionally supported isolating the Cuban government and economic sanctions. There are recent indications that Cuban-American opinions are shifting towards more engagement with Cuba. The recent poll conducted by the Brookings Institution, in collaboration with Florida International University and the Cuba Study Group, found that over 55% of Cuban-Americans oppose continuing the embargo and seems to indicate that this risk has lessened recently.35 But, with a viable economy that improves the standard of living for the population of Cuba, their government will feel less pressure to change from a dictatorship into a more representative form of government.

Recommendations

The option with the **greatest possibility of success and reward** for the United States **is to** support the Cuban people, but not the Cuban government. The United States should take the following actions unilaterally • **Lift completely the economic embargo.** Establish banking and financial relationships to facilitate the trading of goods and services between the two countries.

• Lift completely the travel ban to allow not only Cuban-Americans with relatives but also all other Americans to travel to Cuba. This interaction of Americans with Cubans will help raise the awareness of Cubans about their northern neighbor.

• Next, the United States should engage the Cuban government to develop a bilateral trade agreement. The goal of this initiative would be to **achieve normal trade relations** between the two countries.

This leaves the issue of compensation for United States companies and individuals whose property was expropriated by the Cuban government. With the embargo lifted, the United States should enlist the assistance of the European Union and Canada to apply pressure to Cuba as well as to assist in negotiations with the World Trade Organization to address issues with illegally confiscated property.36 The United States will gain leverage with the Cuban government as relations improve, and that will be the time to address human rights in Cuba. The return of the Cuban Five, a group of Cuban spies arrested and convicted in Florida, should be worth some human rights concessions. In Cuba, these men are known as the “Cinco Heroes” and their plight is well known.37 So what leverage do we have now that we have unilaterally given the Cuban government most of what they have wanted? Offer to return back to Cuba the Guantanamo Naval Base after the government of Cuba shifts towards a representative form of government. The foundation for this action has already been laid with the Libertad Act. “The future of the Guantanamo base, a provision in the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act of 1996 states that once a democratically elected Cuban government is in place, United States policy is to be prepared to enter into negotiations either to return the base to Cuba or to renegotiate the present agreement under mutually agreeable terms.” The United States Congress should soften the language referring to a democratically elected government and instead substitute that a representative form of government is required before entering into negotiations for the Guantanamo base. Once Cuba makes changes towards a representative form of government the United States can start working on democratic reforms. The carrot is to offer Cuba, in exchange for changes to a democratic form of government, support for their return to the Organization of American States (OAS). Until Cuba makes changes towards democracy, the United States should block the request of several member states to let Cuba into the organization. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said it well in a recent interview. “Many member countries originally sought to lift the 1962 suspension and allow Cuba to return immediately, without conditions, others agreed with us that the right approach was to replace the suspension — which has outlived its purpose after nearly half a century — with a process of dialogue and a future decision that will turn on Cuba’s commitment to the organization’s values.” These values include promoting democracy and defending human rights. The window of opportunity is open now for this type of change. The Obama administration has taken some steps in this direction with the lifting of remittance limits, unlimited visits to relatives in Cuba, and the ability to provide cell phones to relatives in Cuba. The other recent change is the new majority of Cuban-Americans, in Florida, that support removal of the embargo. Based on votes in the United Nations and the European Union it is clear that world opinion would definitely be supportive of this action. The combination of the above mentioned events now points to an opportunity to make real progress that will benefit both nations. The United States would gain in soft power, gain an additional economic trading partner, and have a chance to influence the type of changes in the Cuban government as the Castro influence wanes. Clearly, support to the Cuban people will indirectly provide support to the Cuban government, but that could work against the regime as well if the people realize that improvements in their living conditions are not the result of communism, but from the interaction with the capitalist world. There is a sound reason for unilaterally lifting the trade and travel embargoes without first seeing positive actions from the Cuban government. From Cuba expert Carlos A. Saladrigas, Co-Chairman, Cuba Study Group, “We can go back in the history -- in the 50-year history of United States-Cuba relations and clearly see that any time we begin to see a little bit of relaxation of tensions in the relationship, whenever we begin to see a little bit of openness on the part of the United States or Cuba, historically the Cuban government has done something to counteract that trend and significantly revert back to their playbook.” 40 The United States needs to take the initiative away from the Castro regime, and have them react to actions they have publicly called for (removal of the embargo), but in reality are unsure of the second and third order effects and their ability to control the outcome. One of the first problems for the Cuban government after the removal of the embargo will be the excuse for the poor performing economy. “… the embargo and the United States policy of confrontation and isolation have been incredibly useful to the Cuban regime as an alibi for the failures of the regime to meet the fundamental needs of the people on the island, but also is a significant source of legitimacy, both internal and external.” 41 Conclusion This situation may present the United States with the opportunity to step in to assist with market reforms if the Cuban economy sputters and the government realizes they don’t have a scapegoat. The efforts expended by the United States to keep the embargo effective, the loss of trade, and the loss of soft power in most of the world are clearly not worth it in comparison to the threat that Cuba poses today. The gains to be achieved by following any path other than the unilateral removal of the economic and travel embargoes are small in comparison to the overall costs of continuing the current failed policy. The United States is losing far too much soft power in its efforts to punish and isolate the government of Cuba. American firms could be left out of any economic gains as Cuba continues to grow its economy. As Cuba emerges from the economic difficulties of the last two decades, the United States has an opportunity to influence the future direction of our southern neighbor. The current United States policy has many passionate defenders, and their criticism of the Castro regime is justified. Nevertheless, we must recognize the ineffectiveness of our current policy and deal with the Cuban regime in a way that enhances United States interests.42 The United States cannot afford to miss out on the window of opportunity to affect a positive change in the relationship with Cuba. If Cuba is able to continue on a path of economic progress and emerge once again as a true regional power, with communism intact, the United States will be the loser in this half century struggle. Cuba is spreading its limited influence to Venezuela, Honduras, Nicaragua, and will be ready to bring in any other countries in the Americas that want to move away from the United States orbit. The United States can’t stand by and watch Cuba regain strength, intact as a communist country, but must take this opportunity to create an inflection point for Cuba that guides her onto a path that will benefit the nations of the Americas.

**Cuban collapse *distracts focus from Asia* and makes *resolving the Taiwan crisis impossible***

Gorrell 05 – Tim is a Lieutenant Colonel in the US Army. This paper is a strategy research project. (“Cuba: The Next Unanticipated Strategic Crisis?” March 18, 2005, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA433074)

Regardless of the succession, under the current U.S. policy, Cuba’s problems of a post Castro transformation only worsen. In addition to Cubans on the island, there will be those in exile who will return claiming authority. And there are remnants of the dissident community within Cuba who will attempt to exercise similar authority. A power vacuum or absence of order will create the conditions for instability and civil war. Whether Raul or another successor from within the current government can hold power is debatable. However, that individual will nonetheless extend the current policies for an indefinite period, which will only compound the Cuban situation. When Cuba finally collapses anarchy is a strong possibility if the U.S. maintains the “wait and see” approach. The U.S. then must deal with an unstable country 90 miles off its coast. In the midst of this chaos, thousands will flee the island. During the Mariel boatlift in 1980 125,000 fled the island.26 Many were criminals; this time the number could be several hundred thousand fleeing to the U.S., creating a refugee crisis. Equally important, by adhering to a negative containment policy, the U.S. may be creating its next series of transnational criminal problems. Cuba is along the axis of the drug-trafficking flow into the U.S. from Columbia. The Castro government as a matter of policy does not support the drug trade. In fact, Cuba’s actions have shown that its stance on drugs is more than hollow rhetoric as indicated by its increasing seizure of drugs – 7.5 tons in 1995, 8.8 tons in 1999, and 13 tons in 2000.27 While there may be individuals within the government and outside who engage in drug trafficking and a percentage of drugs entering the U.S. may pass through Cuba, the Cuban government is not the path of least resistance for the flow of drugs. If there were no Cuban restraints, the flow of drugs to the U.S. could be greatly facilitated by a Cuba base of operation and accelerate considerably. In the midst of an unstable Cuba, the opportunity for radical fundamentalist groups to operate in the region increases. If these groups can export terrorist activity from Cuba to the U.S. or throughout the hemisphere then the war against this extremism gets more complicated. Such activity could increase direct attacks and disrupt the economies, threatening the stability of the fragile democracies that are budding throughout the region. In light of a failed state in the region, the U.S. may be forced to deploy military forces to Cuba, creating the conditions for another insurgency. The ramifications of this action could very well fuel greater anti-American sentiment throughout the Americas. A proactive policy now can mitigate these potential future problems. U.S. domestic political support is also turning against the current negative policy. The Cuban American population in the U.S. totals 1,241,685 or 3.5% of the population.28 Most of these exiles reside in Florida; their influence has been a factor in determining the margin of victory in the past two presidential elections. But this election strategy may be flawed, because recent polls of Cuban Americans reflect a decline for President Bush based on his policy crackdown. There is a clear softening in the Cuban-American community with regard to sanctions. Younger Cuban Americans do not necessarily subscribe to the hard-line approach. These changes signal an opportunity for a new approach to U.S.-Cuban relations. (Table 1) The time has come to look realistically at the Cuban issue. Castro will rule until he dies. The only issue is what happens then? **The U.S. can little afford to be distracted by a failed state 90 miles off its coast**. The administration, given the present state of world affairs, does not have the luxury or the resources to pursue the traditional American model of crisis management. The President and other government and military leaders have warned that the GWOT will be long and protracted. These warnings were sounded when the administration did not anticipate operations in Iraq consuming so many military, diplomatic and economic resources. There is justifiable concern that Africa and the Caucasus region are potential hot spots for terrorist activity, so these areas should be secure. North Korea will continue to be an unpredictable crisis in waiting. We also cannot ignore China. What if China resorts to aggression to resolve the Taiwan situation? Will the U.S. go to war over Taiwan? Additionally, Iran could conceivably be the next target for U.S. pre-emptive action. These are known and potential situations that could easily require **all** or many of the **elements of national power to resolve**. In view of such global issues, can the U.S. afford to sustain the status quo and simply let the Cuban situation play out? The U.S. is at a crossroads: should the policies of the past 40 years remain in effect with vigor? Or should the U.S. pursue a new approach to Cuba in an effort to facilitate a manageable transition to post-Castro Cuba?

**US support for Taiwan is critical to preventing war**

Roy 12 – Dr. Denny Roy is a senior research fellow in Asian security issues with the East-West Center in Honolulu. (“Why the U.S. shouldn't abandon Taiwan”, December 6, 2012, <http://globalpublicsquare.blogs.cnn.com/2012/12/06/why-the-u-s-shouldnt-abandon-taiwan/>)

China is the next superpower, the United States is in decline, and America needs to get on China’s good side. So say many analysts who have recently argued that in order to gain favor with Beijing, Washington should stop supporting Taiwan. The U.S. support at stake here includes two explicit policies and one implied policy. Since Taiwan cannot keep up with China’s massive military expansion, the United States sells arms to Taiwan. Washington also insists that any settlement of the Taiwan sovereignty issue must be agreeable to Taiwan’s people, not forced on them by Beijing. Finally, China understands that U.S. forces might intervene if Taiwan came under military attack. The argument for abandoning Taiwan may be superficially appealing in its cold-blooded logic. But it is terribly wrong. U.S. foreign policy has always been a reflection of American principles along with strategic and economic interests. Taiwan is a legitimate democracy, one with a long history of close friendship with the United States, threatened by a large authoritarian state demanding a political annexation that Taiwan’s people clearly do not want. If Americans will not stand by Taiwan, the principled component of U.S. foreign policy is dead. But abandoning Taiwan would not be merely immoral. Washington has economic, political and strategic interests in promoting democracy worldwide. In general, democratic governments make better international citizens than authoritarian states and are more likely to be partners than adversaries in America’s pursuit of its global agenda. Abandoning Taiwan would not only reduce the democratic world in concrete terms by throwing a community of 23 million people back over the barbed-wire fence. It would also signal that America is no longer serious about promoting democratization elsewhere. Some countries in the region are willing to stand up for their own interests against Chinese encroachment only if they have confidence in a long-term U.S. commitment to be a security partner. Other Asia-Pacific governments friendly to the United States would certainly take note if Washington sacrificed Taiwan to improve relations with China. Not only would the U.S. reputation for reliability suffer, but regional governments would perceive a shift in regional leadership from America to China. Absorption of Taiwan by China would make Taiwan an “unsinkable aircraft carrier” for the Chinese military. Taiwan anchors the “first island chain,” limiting the Chinese Navy’s access to the Pacific Ocean. Conversely, occupation of Taiwan would allow Chinese forces to straddle important sea lanes that are the economic lifelines of Japan and South Korea. Chinese control of Taiwan would greatly increase the pressure on Tokyo and Seoul, critically important U.S. allies, to accommodate Beijing’s strategic wishes. These alliances, and along with them the U.S. leadership role in the western Pacific, might become untenable. Although too small to act as a political “Trojan Horse” to massive China, as a vibrant Chinese democracy Taiwan is an influential model for China. It is easy for Chinese to dismiss the American or Western European democracies as unsuitable or unimaginable in a Chinese context, but Taiwan is a different matter. If the persistence of Taiwan as a political showcase (now viewed in person by almost two million mainland Chinese visitors annually) could constructively affect China’s political evolution toward democracy, this Taiwan contribution would be invaluable. But Taiwan requires help to safeguard its democratic system against Chinese pressure. Advocates of abandoning Taiwan may erroneously believe that halting U.S. military and diplomatic support for Taipei would reduce tensions in East Asia. This is certainly what Beijing would have us believe. According to Chinese officials and commentators, U.S. assistance to Taipei is all that stands in the way of peaceful unification, and without it the people of Taiwan would stop resisting and accept Beijing’s terms for unification. This premise, however, ignores an important reality: the main obstacle to unification is not U.S. arms sales, but rather Taiwanese nationalism and the wish of nearly all Taiwan’s people not to be ruled by the Chinese Communist Party. Thus, withdrawal of U.S. support would not necessarily lead to a peaceful resolution of the cross-Strait imbroglio. The opposite outcome is at least as likely. Deterrence against an attack by the People’s Liberation Army would be weakened, while Taiwan’s people may well choose to fight rather than capitulate. Another dubious assumption is that removing the Taiwan issue from U.S.-China relations would clear the way for a vastly improved bilateral relationship. It is true that Taiwan is the greatest single irritant in U.S.-China relations, that U.S. support for Taiwan reinforces Chinese suspicions of an American “containment” strategy, and that the cross-Strait war scenario is a major rationale for China’s military modernization and buildup. But neither U.S.-China relations nor Chinese regional behavior would improve much, if at all, as a result of a U.S. sellout of Taiwan. The Chinese would still have many other reasons to believe the United States is trying to keep China from rising, such as the U.S. alliances, increased American security cooperation with other governments in the region, and the alleged American “meddling” in the South China Sea dispute. There is no reason to expect that China would do more to further the American agenda on issues such as the North Korean and Iran nuclear weapons crises, since Chinese policy follows Chinese self-interests. Most importantly, Taiwan is not the source of China-U.S. friction. The two main Asia-Pacific powers are engaged in a rivalry for regional leadership and, even more fundamentally, in a struggle between two competing models for conducting international relations: one based on modern international laws and norms, and the other based on a return to the Sinocentric sphere of influence that prevailed for much of history. Rather than satisfying and pacifying Beijing, a U.S. concession regarding Taiwan might embolden Chinese demands for more concessions aimed at further weakening America’s strategic position in the Asia-Pacific region. Many observers see America in permanent decline and China as the anointed regional hegemon, but both of these outcomes are highly uncertain. Although now in the trough of an unemployment and fiscal crisis, the United States will probably recover. Conversely, China faces serious limits to its bid for regional leadership. These include internal vulnerabilities such as an aging population, the potential for large-scale political turmoil caused by groups angry at the Chinese government, and the necessity of making huge and painful adjustments to the Chinese economy. Externally, few states in Asia prefer Chinese to U.S. leadership. Unless China becomes overwhelmingly strong and American capabilities greatly diminish, security cooperation among the Asia-Pacific countries in defense of widely-accepted norms of international behavior will be sufficient to check those Chinese aspirations that are illegitimate in that they forcibly intrude on other people’s vital interests. One of these illegitimate aspirations is the notion that China cannot be a prosperous, secure great power without politically absorbing Taiwan, the last big piece of unfinished business from China’s “century of humiliation.” Abandoning Taiwan would, tragically, acquiesce to this notion. The threat of Taiwan independence is an unfortunate invention of the Chinese Communist Party. It is a fake threat. An autonomous Taiwan is not preventing massive increases in China’s prosperity and security. On the other hand, Beijing’s threat to militarily destroy the political system and political identity chosen by Taiwan’s people is real.

**Taiwan crisis is the *most likely scenario* for nuclear war**

Lowther 3/16 – William is a staff writer for the Taipei Times, citing a CSIS report. (“Taiwan could spark nuclear war: report”, 3/16/2013, http://www.taipeitimes.com/News/taiwan/archives/2013/03/16/2003557211)

**Taiwan is the most likely** potential **crisis that could trigger a nuclear war** betweenChina and the US, a new academic report concludes. “Taiwan remains the single most plausible and dangerous source of tension and conflict between the US and China,” says the 42-page report by the Washington-based Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS). Prepared by the CSIS’ Project on Nuclear Issues and resulting from a year-long study, the report emphasizes that Beijing continues to be set on a policy to prevent Taiwan’s independence, while at the same time the US maintains the capability to come to Taiwan’s defense. “Although tensions across the Taiwan Strait have subsided since both Taipei and Beijing embraced a policy of engagement in 2008, the situation remains combustible, complicated by rapidly diverging cross-strait military capabilities and persistent political disagreements,” the report says. In a footnote, it quotes senior fellow at the US Council on Foreign Relations Richard Betts describing Taiwan as “the main potential flashpoint for the US in East Asia.” The report also quotes Betts as saying that neither Beijing nor Washington can fully control developments that might ignite a Taiwan crisis. “This is a classic recipe for surprise, miscalculation and uncontrolled escalation,” Betts wrote in a separate study of his own. The CSIS study says: “For the foreseeable future Taiwan is the contingency in which nuclear weapons would most likely become a major factor, because the fate of the island is intertwined both with the legitimacy of the Chinese Communist Party and the reliability of US defense commitments in the Asia-Pacific region.” Titled Nuclear Weapons and US-China Relations, the study says disputes in the East and South China seas appear unlikely to lead to major conflict between China and the US, but they do “provide kindling” for potential conflict between the two nations because the disputes implicate a number of important regional interests, including the interests of treaty allies of the US. The danger posed by flashpoints such as Taiwan, the Korean Peninsula and maritime demarcation disputes is magnified by the potential for mistakes, the study says. “Although Beijing and Washington have agreed to a range of crisis management mechanisms, such as the Military Maritime Consultative Agreement and the establishment of a direct hotline between the Pentagon and the Ministry of Defense, the bases for miscommunication and misunderstanding remain and draw on deep historical reservoirs of suspicion,” the report says. For example, it says, it is unclear whether either side understands what kinds of actions would result in a military or even nuclear response by the other party. To make things worse, “neither side seems to believe the other’s declared policies and intentions, suggesting that escalation management, already a very uncertain endeavor, could be especially difficult in any conflict,” it says. Although conflict “mercifully” seems unlikely at this point, the report concludes that “it cannot be ruled out and may become increasingly likely if we are unwise or unlucky.” The report says: “With both sides possessing and looking set to retain formidable nuclear weapons arsenals, such a conflict would be tremendously dangerous and quite possibly devastating.”

### 1AC—Plan Text

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

### 1AC—Agriculture Advantage

**CONTENTION 2 IS SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE:**

**Cuban agriculture sustainability is failing—foreign investment is key**

King 12 – M. Dawn King is a Visiting Assistant Professor at Brown University’s Center for Environmental Studies. She earned her Ph.D. in Environmental Politics at Colorado State University and worked as a policy analyst for the U.S. Geological Survey – conducting research on environmental decision-making models and internal governance of watershed management councils. (“Cuban Sustainability: The Effects of Economic Isolation on Agriculture and Energy”, March 21, 2012, <http://wpsa.research.pdx.edu/meet/2012/kingmdawn.pdf>)

Cuba needed an alternative agricultural model when foreign oil imports were cut off significantly at the end of the 1980s, and the partial opening of the Cuban economy, focused on creating more autonomous agricultural cooperatives, in the 1990s helped diversity food crops and set Cuba along a path of increased food security. The Cuban model was initiated out of necessity, not because of any sort of Cuban environmental consciousness, yet better environmental conditions went hand in hand with the new development strategy. Cuba learned the limits of their agricultural model under their socialist economic system and it is in need of further transformation in both the agriculture and energy sectors. A further opening of the economy to joint ventures could help with updating the power grid and providing more sources of renewable energy – potentially expanding Cuba’s potential for a more sustainable means of energy security. Further, Cuba needs foreign investment to update agriculture facilities and take maximum advantage of cogeneration and biofuel potential with sugarcane waste. The strong state control of farming practices, used to successfully jumpstart the alternative model, has hit its limit. The Cuban government must begin loosening its grips on the domestic economy to allow for more competition in the farming sector. Despite the potential to become more sustainable with a purposive and focused opening of the economy, the recent surge in joint venture investment on expanding domestic oil extraction, petrochemical facilities, and oil refinery infrastructure reveals a trend toward decreasing environmental sustainability. Once heralded as the world’s most sustainable country by coupling environmental performance indicators with their human development scores, Cuba is slipping further away from this goal. Perhaps the most distressing part of this current trend is that it took Cuba decades to create a national identity that embraced sustainable environmental practices in both the energy and agricultural sector, and it seemingly took only a couple of years to derail these efforts. Undoubtedly, conservation efforts and sustainable education programs can only satiate citizen’s energy desires to a certain point. In order to further the quality of life in the country, electric production must increase to rural areas with little energy infrastructure and to Havana in order to spur foreign investment and domestic small business growth. Cuba’s trade agreement with Venezuela is bringing in much-needed petroleum for electricity production, but their dependence on a relatively unstable country for crude is trapping them into the same relationship that crippled their economy in 1990 – impairing their original goal of self-sufficiency. Cuba is at a turning point in their path toward environmental sustainability, and the current need for immediate foreign capital and increased energy production seem to be trumping its desire to achieve development sustainably. Cuba still has enough centralized control to leap-frog dirty electric production for cleaner renewable forms of energy and the potential to guide development strategies that emphasize investments in and research on renewable energy. It can utilize its expertise on organic farming strategies to increase sugar production in a much more ecologically friendly manner than their monoculture approach in the 1970s and 80s. Decisions made in the next five years will demonstrate whether Cuba embraces their newly created national identity as a society striving for sustainable development or rejects the goal of sustainable development to increase short-term capital and energy needs.

**The plan provides foreign capital to Cuba and allows its model to be exported globally**

Shkolnick 12 – JD Candidate, Drake University Law School. (“SIN EMBARGO: THE CUBAN AGRICULTURAL REVOLUTION AND WHAT IT MEANS FOR THE UNITED STATES”, 17 Drake J. Agric. L. 683, Fall, http://students.law.drake.edu/aglawjournal/docs/agVol17No3-Shkolnick.pdf)

Cuba today is experiencing the most rapid shifts towards privatization and reform since the revolution more than sixty years ago. Though truly open trade with Cuba will remain out of reach until the embargo is relaxed or a new trade agreement is reached, it is worth the time of agricultural and business entities in the United States to consider how they may approach doing business in Cuba. Given the extent of pre-embargo trade between the United States and Cuba it is no stretch to imagine the enormous possibilities once that partnership is reestablished. Though reforms over the past decade have made significant progress towards this end, they only scratch the surface on what Cuba has to offer. The two economic areas where Cuba shows perhaps the most promise and have the greatest potential for international trade and investment are tourism and agriculture. Tourism shows great promise simply for the fact that for more than half a century the country has been entirely cut off from open trade and travel by U.S. citizens, citizens who will likely flock to the country once access is restored. Agriculture in Cuba also presents numerous unique opportunities, and since the collapse of the Soviet Union the country has developed novel agricultural production techniques that could help serve a growing demand for natural, organic foods in the United States. While tourism may increase economic opportunity for existing businesses and industries, Cuba’s agricultural model, on the other hand, presents unique opportunities to both existing and entirely new busi-ness opportunities in the United States. A. Cuba as a Tourist Destination Prior to the embargo, Cuba was a travel destination for as many as 300,000 American tourists per year.91 Tourists from various Soviet Bloc nations never came close to making up this loss in travel, reaching no more than 30,000tourists per year.92 Since the demise of the Soviet Union, however, tourism to the island has continued to increase dramatically. As of July 2012, Cuba is the sec-ond most popular tourist destination in the Caribbean region, trailing only the Dominican Republic.93 Slightly more than two million tourists per year now visit the island as of 2011, representing growth of 7.3% over the last year alone.94 Asof 2005, Cuba’s service sector accounted for 67.8% of the nation’s annual gross domestic product, eclipsing traditional Cuban exports such as nickel and sugar.95Tourist infrastructure in Cuba, however, has strained to accommodate the rapid surge in visitors, with hotels, resorts, restaurants, and other accommodations showing their age after decades of relatively little improvement or investment.96Depending on the precise means through which the travel and economic embargos are lifted, estimates of the number of U.S. visitors expected to visit Cuba within the first year range from six hundred thousand to more than one million, with up to five million visitors per year by the fifth year of open travel.97 There is the potential for modest yet not insignificant job growth in response to new travel opportunities, with potentially over twelve thousand new service sector and trav-el jobs in the United States within five years.98B. Agricultural Trade with Cuba It is the agricultural sector, however, that provides some of the most substantial and intriguing opportunities for both trade with Cuba and the creation of entirely new businesses in the United States. In fact, agricultural products were the very first items traded between the United States and Cuba since the embargo in December of 2001, when two ships loaded with chicken and corn arrived inHavana.99 The potential for the U.S. agricultural sector is abundantly clear when the sheer volume of Cuba’s agricultural imports are taken into account. In 2008,Cuba imported approximately $1.8 billion in agricultural goods.100 Only approximately 40% of imported agricultural goods were from the United States, leaving over $1 billion of trade going to other countries.101Cuba itself is very much in favor of increased agricultural trade with the United States simply for the logistical simplicity and cost-savings it would pro-vide.102 Import costs account for as much as 35% of the goods Cuba currently imports from its trading partners.103 Because Cuba is less than one hundred miles from the coast of the United States, the country is naturally eager to enter into trade relationships that lead to lower transportation costs.104 Cuban officials cite rice as just one example of an agricultural product that they would be inter-ested in obtaining from the United States.106 Rice is a staple food for Cuban citizens, and they enjoy it with almost every meal.107 Presently, the bulk of their rice must be imported from Eastern Asia, meaning a long voyage by sea and the expenses that go along with shipping tons of goods across the Pacific Ocean.108Rice exports alone present an enormous opportunity for U.S. producers. The United States is a major exporter of both processed and unprocessed rice, accounting for 10% of all international trade in rice each year.109 Half of annual U.S. rice sales come from the export market, and the United States is considered a reliable supplier of a quality product on the international market.110 The USDA estimates that if the current restrictions on trade were removed, Cuba could potentially exceed Mexico and Japan as the biggest importer of rice grown in the United States.111 As of September 2005, Cuba estimated that they could purchase more than one million metric tons of rice annually, but restrictions make it unlikely that import from the United States will go much beyond current levels of 712,000 metric tons.112 A key obstacle, according to Cuba, is the requirement that all shipments of agricultural products from the United States be paid for in cash before they leave port.113 This resulted in a reduction in rice ex-ports to Cuba by nearly 50% from 2004 to 2005, according to the USA Rice Fed-eration.114 For the foreseeable future, any effort by agricultural groups in the United States to take advantage of trade opportunities with Cuba will have to operate within the guidelines and policy directives of Cuba as well as the United States. One risk that any organization that wishes to trade with Cuba might encounter is that their proposals and business plans will run into red tape not only through regulations in the United States, but through conflict with the Communist Party of Cuba, which still holds tremendous sway over policy and business decisions on the island. Cuban officials are, of course, aware of the tremendous opportunity that trade with the United States might bring to their country, and for the most part remain eager to pursue closer ties with whom they see as their closest, most natu-ral trading partner.115 Roy Ramón Philippón, a leading official with the Cuban Society of Agrarian Law, indicated that the country recognizes that changes are necessary in order to properly compete with and participate in an open globalmarket.116 Long gone are the days when Cuba could count on highly subsidized exports to the Soviet Bloc as a stable source of income.117 For the first forty years of Cuba’s “socialist experiment” following their revolution, the first priority for the Cuban government was to provide the maximum amount of social services and benefit to the population regardless of the cost; something that they could achieve through trade with the Soviet Bloc prior to its collapse.118The process of reform in Cuba is necessarily dependent upon the approv-al of the national Communist Party. All of the reforms that have been put in place must be considered by and ultimately recommended by the Communist Party operating under their internal guidelines.119 By its nature this is intended to be a slow, deliberative process, the intent of which is to allow all interested gov-ernment officials, business representatives, and interested citizens to voice their opinions and for the Party’s guidelines to take each group’s concerns into ac-count.120Cuba has continued to introduce new programs to assist local producers in becoming more productive while also promoting ecological restoration andpreservation.121 In a shift away from the large state-run farms that characterized Cuban agriculture for much of the twentieth century, Cuba is now focused on diversifying agricultural production through a variety of both privately run and some state-controlled enterprises.122Cuban officials responsible for investigating and recommending addi-tional improvements to the Cuban agricultural system echo this call for reform and increased efficiency and productivity.123 Cuban officials point to the two primary goals that Cuba is pursuing in its efforts to improve its agricultural out-put and modernize their agricultural system; eco-restoration and preservation and urban and suburban agriculture.124 In addition, while the country is desirous of increasing its agricultural exports as a source of income, enough of the goods produced must be funneled into an official state-controlled market that can con-trol prices and ensure that food is affordable even to those with low incomes.125The first priority before any additional exports can be considered is to increase production for local consumption to the point where the country could conceiva-bly become self-sustaining for the majority of its food production needs.126 Once they are producing enough food for local consumption, then priorities may shift towards producing additional crops for export; coffee in particular is one locally produced crop that Cuba is particularly interested in increasing production for both local consumption and export.127Government officials recognize that the Cuban economy is in a relatively underdeveloped state, and future policies will need to be responsive to the state’s economic needs as well as their agricultural ones.128 If, for example, the price of corn were to skyrocket on the world market, Cuban officials indicate that if it made economic sense, they **“would cover this island with corn.**”129 Similar to the practices of the former Soviet Bloc, the Cuban economy is still very much orga-nized and planned by the state, and the current agricultural plan in Cuba is de-signed to cover the next five years of anticipated growth.130As for direct investment by foreign investors and producers, current poli-cies in Cuba will make that somewhat difficult for the foreseeable future, as all direct business relationships with foreign entities are currently organized and controlled by a number of governmental bodies.131 Cuban officials indicate that future reforms could conceivably open the door to direct investment and transac-tions between Cuban agricultural producers and foreign buyers.132 Understanding this future opportunity first requires a digression into the organizational structure employed in Cuba to manage and direct the agricultural system in Cuba. V. NEW REFORMS The current agricultural system has gone through a period of significant readjustment since the collapse of the Soviet Union. Beginning in 1993, Cuba started to move away from enormous state-run facilities and fully embraced a model of cooperative ownership that it had first introduced in the 1970s with the cooperativa de producción agropecuaria, or CPA.133 The new model, the basic unit of cooperative production, or UBPC, was introduced in September of 1993,and by 1995 there were 2855 UBPCs in operation.134 The UBPC differs from the CPA in that a UBPC operates on land that continues to be owned by the state but is provided to farmers in the form of a usufruct agreement, while a CPA is made up of lands that groups of farmers already had in their possession.135 By the endof 2007, the UBPC had far exceeded the CPA in the amount of land being farmed, with more than 2.8 million hectares of land organized under the UBPC system, compared to just under 700,000 hectares in CPAs.136 The majority of farmland in Cuba remained under state control as of the end of 2007, with more than 6 million hectares of farmland overseen by the state.137Both the UBPCs and the CPAs operate under an arrangement whereby the state provides assistance in the form of access to credit and a market for the goods produced, and in exchange the production cooperatives provide a certain quota of goods for sale and distribution by the state.138 One of the key objectives in the legislation itself is that the farms shall “be owners of the means of produc-tion and of the crop,” while still retaining ownership of the land in state hands.139Goals of this new organization were to improve efficiency and encourage more productive use of land. The goals of the Cuban Revolution continue to be em-bodied in the legislation that created these entities.140In 2008, Cuba passed what is perhaps the most substantial piece of agri-cultural legislation in decades. Named simply “Law 259,” it provides a means for almost any Cuban citizen, existing farm, or authorized agency to acquire un-used state lands and put them to better use as farmland.141 This is a substantial departure from the earlier CPA and UBCP systems that for the most part only transferred existing agricultural land controlled by the state into quasi-privatecooperatives.142 Law 259 continues the usufruct method of land distribution pio-neered by the UBPC system and allows for any interested, qualified party to ap-ply for an initial tract of a maximum of 13.42 hectares (33.16 acres), with their ownership potentially increasing to up to 40.26 hectares (99.48 acres) in the fu-ture.143 Continued operation of farmland granted under this program is contin-gent upon the land being used in a productive, sustainable manner with appropri-ate environmental conservation measures.144Even with the new reforms, the land is still technically tied to the state, and individuals who take possession of land under this program are not permitted to sell or rent the land to others, though the state will compensate landowners for the improvements they have made to the land during their term of tenancy.145The CPA, UBPC, and now Law 259 reforms Cuba put in place, along with reforms the Cuban government is discussing for the future, mean that opportunities for further U.S. involvement in Cuban agriculture are numerous. Presently, foreign companies that wish to enter into business relation-ships with Cuban counterparts must do so almost entirely via official government channels.146 Government agencies such as the Ministry of Sugar or the Ministry of Agriculture are responsible for managing trade for their respective indus-tries.147 All imports of food and other agricultural products must first enter the country via Alimport, a state-run agency that handles the entire sales process from securing contracts and arranging for payment to managing the distributionprocess.148 For the time being, the sole agency that U.S. companies wishing to engage in agricultural trade in Cuba can work with is Alimport.149 Rarely will there be any contact directly between U.S. companies and end-users in Cuba.150The process in the United States can be similarly convoluted. The U.S. Department of Commerce’s Bureau of Industry and Security oversees all busi-ness negotiations with Cuban companies, and notifications of sales must be sub-mitted through them before a license will be granted.151 Since U.S. policy still prohibits the extension of credit to any Cuban banks, all payments either have tobe paid for in cash prior to shipment or a confirmed letter-of-credit can be com-pleted with a bank located in a third country.152 In an unusual and unfortunate overlap in U.S. policy directives, goods that are paid for in cash prior to shipment are legally Cuban property though still in the United States, and potentially sub-ject to seizure on behalf of Cuban exiles within the United States who have out-standing legal and monetary claims against the Cuban government.153 Ships with goods meant for Cuba, however, may leave port as soon as payment is either received in cash or confirmed deposited in a foreign bank, a clarification made by the Department of Treasury Office of Foreign Asset Control in July 2005 in an attempt to reduce anxiety over this possibility.154José Garea Alonso, an official with the Cuban Ministry of Agriculture, indicated that recent legislation such as Law 259 is the start of what may eventu-ally lead to more direct commercial ties between Cuban organizations and foreign buyers or investors.155 At the moment, Cuba’s agricultural cooperatives are relatively small and continue to rely on the state for the bulk of their marketingopportunities.156 In the future, these cooperatives may be allowed to join together to form larger groups of linked agricultural cooperatives working together to manage their own affairs, and may include the ability to directly negotiate with foreign buyers rather than requiring an intervening hand from Alimport or anoth-er appropriate ministry.157Foreign investment in Cuban businesses has only been possible in a lim-ited form since the early 1980s, when the Cuban government introduced legisla-tion allowing for foreign entities to create a joint venture with the Cuban gov-ernment for investment purposes.158 Ultimately, the goal of this legislation was to provide an easier means for Cuba to acquire additional foreign currency to inject into its economy.159 Even with the new law, regulations prohibited any foreign participant in a joint enterprise from controlling more than 49%, though such a restriction was not in place for a partnership.160VI. NEW OPPORTUNITIES While investment in Cuban businesses and sales or purchases of Cuban products must still move through official channels under the joint venture law or other Cuban programs, the time is ripe for organizations in the United States to begin laying groundwork for closer ties with Cuban agricultural entities. Recent regulatory changes implemented by the U.S. government provide a means for individuals and businesses to begin forming the relationships with their Cuban counterparts that will lead to future trade opportunities.161As previously mentioned, recent changes in U.S. policy now allow for any individual in the United States, not simply relatives, to donate money to Cu-ban citizens, though not to exceed $500 for any three month consecutive period, with the only restriction being that the recipient is not an official in the Cuban government or the Communist Party.162 Specifically written into these new regu-lations is the idea that these remittances may be spent “to support the develop-ment of private businesses.”163 A five hundred dollar infusion of capital to sup-port a fledging business or farm can be enormously beneficial when the average monthly salary is only 448 pesos, or approximately twenty dollars.164Additional capital will enable small Cuban farms to expand operations by hiring additional help or perhaps purchasing additional farm animals. While purchasing a tractor may seem like an obvious choice for a growing farm, Medardo Naranjo Valdes of the Organoponico Vivero Alamar, a UBPC just out-side of Havana, indicated that farm animals such as oxen would remain the pre-ferred choice for the foreseeable future on the small and midsized farms that make up the majority of the newer agricultural cooperatives.165 Not only do farm animals not require gasoline or incur maintenance costs beyond perhaps an occa-sional veterinarian charge, their waste can be used as fertilizer. Apart from additional labor, funds provided to agricultural cooperatives could be put to use in developing innovative pest control techniques that do not require the use of expensive pesticides or other chemicals. The Vivero Alamar is currently experimenting with a variety of natural pest control techniques such as introducing plants that serve as natural repellents to insects and the introduction of other insects that feed on harmful pests without harming the crops.166Investment in agricultural cooperatives done in this manner will likely fail to see much return on the investment for their foreseeable future, until poli-cies in both the United States and Cuba are changed.167 For a relatively small sum, American investors will get not only the benefit of a close relationship with a Cuban farm that will become a new source of both import and export business in the future, but potentially gain access to innovative agricultural techniques that could be used in the United States immediately.168 Because the logistical structure needed to transport goods from large ru-ral farms into city markets remains underdeveloped, urban and suburban agricul-ture makes up a growing portion of the food produced and consumed in Cuba.169 As in other countries, the population trends in Cuba have continued to shift away from rural areas to more concentrated urban and suburban areas, with about three-fourths of Cubans living in cities.170 With this shift in population has also come a shift in the country’s agricultural system. As of 2007, about 15% of all agriculture in Cuba could be classified as urban agriculture.171 Not only have agricultural practices changed, but eating habits have as well. Without the Soviet Union to provide a ready source of income and the machinery needed to engage in large-scale livestock production, vegetable consumption has increased dramat-ically.172 Nearly every urban area has direct access to a wide variety of locally grown, organic produce.173 Many of the urban farms in Cuba, including the Vivero Alamar, make use of organoponics, a system where crops are produced in raised beds of soil on land that would otherwise be incapable of supporting intensive agricultural pro-duction.174 Many of these raised beds can be constructed in a concentrated area to support a wide variety of produce, with the typical organoponic garden covering anywhere from one half to several hectares in size.175 The rise of the organoponic production method was a shift away from the earlier centralized production mod-el employed by the state. It has been supported through intensive research and development by a variety of state agencies, such as the National Institute of Agri-cultural Science, and continued development has been guided through intensive training and educational programs.176 The organoponic system is not limited in its application to Cuban urban farms, but **maintains potential to be applied worldwide**, including in the United States. Urban agriculture in Cuba revitalized and put to use previously aban-doned and unused land. A similar approach could be applied to the United States as a means to restore blighted areas.177 Applying Cuban-derived organoponics in U.S. cities could potentially open up an enormous amount of land that was previ-ously unusable. From a business perspective, investing in an organoponic agri-cultural program in the United States is also a sound decision since the demand for local produce reached $4.8 billion in 2008 and is only expected to grow fur-ther, potentially reaching $7 billion in 2012. In an American city beset with high unemployment such as Detroit, Michigan, for example, investing in urban agriculture could potentially generate as many as five thousand new jobs.179 By utilizing Cuba’s system of organopon-ics, the need to use expensive and complex farm machinery could be significantly reduced. Already companies in the United States, such as Farmscape Gardens in southern California, recognize what Cuba’s organoponic system could achieve and have integrated it into their business practices.180 Rachel Bailin, a partner in the company, indicated that it was Cuba’s organic farming practices that helped inspire them to start a company devoted to urban agriculture.181 They have al-ready used Cuba’s organoponic farming methods to produce more than 50,000 pounds of produce since the spring of 2009.182 **The potential for future growth in this industry is huge**, as Farmscape Gardens’ current levels of production make it the largest urban agriculture company in the state of California.183Cuba not only offers attractive prospects for trading in the future, but methods of agriculture pioneered out of necessity have broad prospects if applied to agriculture in the United States. As the demand for locally grown produce continues to increase, a cost-effective and proven agricultural model like Cuba’s organoponic system may be just what is needed to allow for urban agriculture to flourish. VII. CONCLUSIONS The United States and Cuba have a long, complicated history that years of animosity and finger pointing have certainly done little to improve. For more than fifty years now, the United States has shunned one of its closest neighbors, but recent actions by the Obama administration indicate change is certainly a possibility. In conclusion, the future of trade relations with Cuba can be summed up as follows: First, truly open trade with Cuba is not likely to occur for many years. The political and foreign policy practices that have supported the embargo will not disappear overnight. What is more likely, though, is a continued and gradual relaxation of certain trade policies that will ultimately benefit a number of U.S. industries, agriculture included. While trade in agricultural products is currently possible on a limited scale, agricultural entities in the United States interested in trading with Cuba on a larger scale should begin their preparations now by forg-ing relationships with their Cuban counterparts. Opening the door to further trade will not happen without a concentrated and prolonged push by various in-terest groups in the United States. Second, certain companies that wish to do business in Cuba today are able to do so and should begin familiarizing themselves with the Cuban govern-mental entities such as Alimport. Barring a complete reorganization of the Cu-ban government, agencies such as Alimport will likely continue to oversee for-eign trade for the foreseeable future. Forming business relationships with Cuban companies in the short-term under existing regulations will help support broader trade opportunities in the future. Finally, what Cuba has accomplished in the field of cooperative and ur-ban agricultural products is remarkable, and should serve as an inspiration to farmers and businesses in the United States as well. The Cuban organoponic system of production has great potential for a variety of urban and suburban farming activities in the United States, particularly as demand for local and or-ganic produce continues to rise. As relations between Cuba and the United States continue to thaw in the coming years, organizations that began their preparations today will be best equipped to meet the challenges and opportunities posed by this new and grow-ing market. Political animosities will eventually crumble in the face of the eco-nomic opportunities that closer trade relations could bring to both nations. One of the United States’ closest neighbors has been its enemy for far too long. Cuba presents a unique opportunity American business and agricultural enterprises cannot afford to overlook.

**Access to the US market is critical to *sustainability* and *emulation***

Kost 04 – William is part of the Economic Research Service for the USDA. (“CUBAN AGRICULTURE: TO BE OR NOT TO BE ORGANIC?” 2004, http://www.ascecuba.org/publications/proceedings/volume14/pdfs/kost.pdf)

MARKETS MAY BE CRITICAL FOR AN ORGANIC CUBA In addition to the above European markets, the successful expansion and viability of Cuba’s organic production may also depend on access to geographically close, high-income foreign markets, namely the United States and Canada. Currently, Cuban produce is not certified-organic in either of these markets. Only after Cuban products are certified for these countries could Cuba legally export produce labeled organic to these markets. Given that many technical production practices currently followed by Cuban producers are potentially compatible with U.S. certification standards and given Cuba’s prior experience in becoming Swiss-certified, Cuba could be well positioned to meet U.S. certification standards. For the U.S. organic market, in addition to a lifting of the U.S. embargo, Cuba would have to be certified by a USDA-accredited certification program that assures U.S. markets that Cuban products labeled organic meet all National Organic Program standards and regulations under the U.S. Organic Foods Production Act of 1990. If the U.S. embargo on Cuba were lifted, Cuban exports, once certified, could play a significant role in the U.S. organic market. In this current U.S. niche market, production costs are high. Opening the U.S. market would enable Cuba to exploit its significant **comparative advantage** in this area. This market could become a quick foreign exchange earner for Cuba. The largest barrier Cuba faces in expanding into the U.S. organic market will be meeting U.S. requirements for organic certification. Tapping the U.S. market may create sufficient price incentives for Cuban producers to take the necessary steps to meet the organic standards of other importing countries. Cuba could then expand production of organic produce geared to these specialty export markets. With sufficiently high prices for organic produce, urban labor may remain active in an organic urban gardening sector. Most likely, the viability of a vibrant organic produce production and processing sector in Cuba will depend on Cuba’s gaining access to the large, nearby U.S. market. Without such access, organic-oriented production of horticultural products in Cuba will likely remain a necessity-driven way to produce food for domestic consumption in an environment where other production approaches are just not available. The U.S. market is large and diverse. The demand for organic produce is only one portion of that market. How Cuba’s horticultural industry responds to restored U.S. trade will be a function of the relative price and cost incentives of the organic and non-organic market segments. If the organic price premiums are sufficient, Cuba has the climate, land resources, low-cost labor, and history of organicoriented production to allow it to develop and grow its horticultural sector in that direction. If the market incentives are not sufficiently large to pursue the organic produce market, Cuba will return to a chemical- and technology-driven, yield-maximizing, and labor-minimizing commercial production as rapidly as they can afford to do so. Cuba will have some incentive to increase domestic food production as rapidly as possible to feed the domestic population, rather than importing food for domestic consumption. Cuba could then use a larger share of its scarce foreign exchange to import energy, technology, and other inputs to support growth in other sectors of the Cuban economy.

**Continued reliance on industrial mechanized ag results in *catastrophic warming* and *biodiversity loss***

Cummins 10 – Ronnie is the International Director of the Organic Consumers Association. (“Industrial Agriculture and Human Survival: The Road Beyond 10/10/10”, Organic Consumer’s Association, October 7, 2010, <http://www.organicconsumers.org/articles/article_21747.cfm>)

Although transportation, industry, and energy producers are obviously major fossil fuel users and greenhouse gas polluters, not enough people understand that the worst U.S. and global greenhouse gas emitter is "Food Incorporated," transnational industrial food and farming, of which Monsanto and GMOs constitute a major part. Industrial farming, including 173 million acres of GE soybeans, corn, cotton, canola, and sugar beets, accounts for at least 35% of U.S. greenhouse gas emissions (EPA's ridiculously low estimates range from 7% to 12%, while some climate scientists feel the figure could be as high as 50% or more). Industrial agriculture, biofuels, and non-sustainable cattle grazing - including cutting down the last remaining tropical rainforests in Latin America and Asia for GMO and chemical-intensive animal feed and biofuels - are also the main driving forces in **global deforestation and wetlands destruction**, which generate an additional 20% of all climate destabilizing GHGs. In other words the direct (food, fiber, and biofuels production, food processing, food distribution) and indirect damage (deforestation and destruction of wetlands) of industrial agriculture, GMOs, and the food industry are the major cause of global warming. Unless we take down Monsanto and Food Inc. and make the Great Transition to a relocalized system of organic food and farming, we and our children are doomed to reside in Climate Hell. Overall 78% of climate destabilizing greenhouse gases come from CO2, while the remainder come from methane, nitrous oxide, and black carbon or soot. To stabilize the climate we will need to drastically reduce all of these greenhouse gas emissions, not just CO2, and sequester twice as much carbon matter in the soil (through organic farming and ranching, and forest and wetlands restoration) as we are doing presently. Currently GMO and industrial/factory farms (energy and chemical-intensive) farms emit at least 25% of the carbon dioxide (mostly from tractors, trucks, combines, transportation, cooling, freezing, and heating); 40% of the methane (mostly from massive herds of animals belching and farting, and manure ponds); and 96% of nitrous oxide (mostly from synthetic fertilizer manufacture and use, the millions of tons of animal manure from factory-farmed cattle herds, pig and poultry flocks, and millions of tons of sewage sludge spread on farms). Black carbon or soot comes primarily from older diesel engines, slash and burn agriculture, and wood cook stoves. Per ton, methane is 21 times more damaging, and nitrous oxide 310 times more damaging, as a greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide, when measured over a one hundred year period. Damage is even worse if you look at the impact on global warming over the next crucial 20-year period. Many climate scientists admit that they have previously drastically underestimated the dangers of the non-CO2 GHGs, including methane, soot, and nitrous oxide, which are responsible for at least 22% of global warming.

**Status quo food production is failing—a shift to urban agriculture is key to *sustainable food systems* and *biodiversity preservation***

Peters 10 – LL.M. expected 2011, University of Arkansas School of Law, Graduate Program in Agricultural and Food Law; J.D. 2010, University of Oregon School of Law. (“Creating a Sustainable Urban Agriculture Revolution”, Journal of Environmental Law and Litigation, Vol. 25, 203, http://law.uoregon.edu/org/jell/docs/251/peters.pdf)

URBAN AGRICULTURE Urban agriculture is a system that ensures food security by providing access to land and resources to support urban farming efforts.68 The United Nations Development Programme defines urban agriculture as follows: [A]n industry that produces, processes, and markets food and fuel, largely in response to the daily demand of consumers within a town, city, or metropolis, on land and water dispersed throughout the urban and peri-urban area, applying intensive production methods, using and reusing natural resources and urban wastes, to yield a diversity of crops and livestock.69 In the United States, urban agriculture is perhaps better known as community gardening.70 Community gardens are areas where residents grow food on publicly held or privately held land that they do not own.71 Most often, community gardens are located within neighborhoods, on public housing premises, or on school grounds.72 In the face of an imminent food shortage, especially in light of the economic and energy crises discussed above, it is **imperative that urban residents expand** urban **food production**. Neglected and abandoned vacant lots in blighted urban areas comprise a vast amount of land that could be converted into urban gardens.73 In addition to vacant lots, other urban areas including schoolyards, hospital grounds, parks and other open spaces, utility easements, alleys, rooftops, building walls,75 and even windowsills all provide opportunities for urban agriculture.76 While the many benefits of a sustainable urban agricultural system will be discussed below, additional benefits to urban communities deserve mention here. Urban gardens beautify and green urban neighborhoods while also building a sense of community.77 Urban gardens provide educational and employment opportunities, promote self-respect, and can even reduce crime rates.78 These gardens also offer urban residents an opportunity to connect with nature and can instill environmental ethics.79 Additionally, urban gardens promote entrepreneurship, as urban farmers can sell excess produce at farmers’ markets, through Community Supported Agriculture programs,80 and directly to restaurants.81 Finally, urban gardening provides lowincome urban residents with a supply of fresh and healthy organic food that can combat problems associated with inadequate nutrition, such as illness, fatigue, depression, anxiety, and hunger.82 IV SUSTAINABILITY Sustainability is best described as a concept of making decisions for the courses of action we choose in a way that balances the three “E’s” of sustainability—environment, economy, and social equity83 — as well as the lesser known prong of sustainability, national security.84 Sustainability is a big-picture concept. Our individual actions as well as local, state, and federal policies do not exist in a vacuum; every action has an impact on the world at large and on future generations. To create a truly sustainable world, all of our decisions, from individual choices to federal policies, must consider the impact on the environment, economy, society, and national security. Media coverage, marketing of consumer products,85 and recent documentaries have all contributed to bringing the terms “green” and “sustainability” into our everyday vocabulary,86 yet no clear definitions of these terms exist. While green focuses on protection of the environment, sustainability is much broader. In 1987, the World Commission on Environment and Development, in the Brundtland Report, defined sustainable development as “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.”87 At a more fundamental level, sustainability can be defined as “able to be sustained,”88 where sustain means to “strengthen or support physically or mentally . . . [to] keep (something) going over time or continuously.”89 In this broader context, sustainability requires that we look at our current lifestyles and practices and evaluate their capability of being continued indefinitely. Much of the recent attention concerning sustainability focuses on technologies designed to reduce energy consumption and foster development of renewable energy sources.90 Little discourse has been directed towards the immediate impact individuals can have merely by reducing personal levels of consumption through a simplified lifestyle, yet such a reduction would yield immediate results and require little financial investment. As individuals, we can foster sustainability while increasing our food supply simply by providing more for ourselves through a sustainable urban agricultural system. Government incentives, discussed infra Part VII, provide land and resources that would enable individuals and communities to take action to transform our agricultural system into one that is both sustainable and secure. In the following sections, this Note provides an overview of each of the four elements of sustainability—environment, economy, equity, and national security. This Note also discusses modern industrial agriculture, urban development trends, and urban agriculture in terms of the elements of sustainability. A. Environmental Sustainability In the environmental context, sustainability encourages production and development methods that preserve and protect our natural resources and reduce our impact on the environment.91 This involves “protecting existing environmental resources (both in the natural and ‘built’ world), including the preservation of historical sites and the development of environmental resources and assets for future use.”92 To accomplish this goal, we must find innovative ways to reduce our consumption of resources and replenish the resources we do consume. We must protect biodiversity and ecosystems, as well as our land, air, and water resources by reducing greenhouse gas emissions, carbon footprints, air and water pollution, and soil contamination.93 In the context of land use and food production, environmental sustainability demands that we conserve undeveloped land and employ food production methods that will have a minimal impact on the planet. 1. Environmental Sustainability and Industrial Agriculture Industrial agriculture is a system in which economies of scale and maximization of profits are the ultimate goals.94 Profits are maximized when agribusinesses produce the largest yield of single crops at the lowest possible cost, primarily through mechanization and intensive use of agricultural chemicals.95 As discussed supra Part I, the environmental effects of industrial agricultural methods include soil erosion, depletion of soil nutrients, groundwater contamination from chemical inputs, and consumption of finite fuels.96 Additionally, as crop yields decline due to environmental degradation and demand for agricultural products rises due to population growth and the increased use of plant-derived biofuels, more and more land will be consumed by industrial agriculture. This will result in an agricultural system that depletes and destroys natural resources at an increasing rate, which will negatively impact the planet’s carrying capacity.97 Along with farm subsidies and corporate control of food production in the United States, policies that allow the harms of industrial agriculture to be treated as externalities help perpetuate the current agricultural system.98 Under the current system, agribusinesses may pollute the environment, deplete clean water and soil, and promote social inequity without having to account for these harms when calculating profits. These external costs are significant; contaminated industrial farm runoff alone causes an estimated $9 billion of damage annually to U.S. surface waters.99 Further, the externalization of these costs discourages agribusinesses from conserving water, fertile land, and other natural resources. 2. Environmental Sustainability and Urban Development Trends Current urban development trends impact the environment in several significant ways. The most direct impacts are land consumption and the destruction of natural habitats.100 While interior urban areas are deteriorating and being abandoned at an increasing rate, the constant consumption of land to support new urban development is destroying greenfields, forests, and species.101 These new communities require land not only for building homes and businesses, but also for housing public services, such as schools and hospitals, and for creating an expanded transportation infrastructure.102 Increased commuting associated with urban sprawl and flight from blighted areas relies on oil, a finite resource with decreasing availability, and significantly contributes to greenhouse gas emissions,103 which pollute the air and contribute to climate change.104 Urban sprawl further contributes to the degradation of the environment by polluting water sources with runoff from newly constructed impervious surfaces such as homes and transportation infrastructures.105 During the construction phase, stormwater flows over construction sites, “pick[ing] up debris, chemicals, and sediment that flow into water bodies.”106 Water pollution continues to degrade the environment post-construction as stormwater runoff from paved surfaces, including new roads and highways, is also contaminated.107 3. Environmental Sustainability and Urban Agriculture Transitioning from an industrial agricultural system to a sustainable urban agricultural system would minimize the impacts of food production on the planet. Urban agriculture reduces the consumption of undeveloped land for farming. Food would be produced in areas that are already developed and populated, thereby conserving open space for natural habitat. Due to the proximity of urban gardens to dwellings and other buildings, urban agriculture must be performed without the use of large machinery and without the use of chemical pesticides and fertilizers.108 While lack of such inputs could be perceived as a challenge, urban gardening methods may result in increased crop yields on smaller plots of land than conventional farming practices achieve.109 Rather than maximizing crop yields through extensive use of chemicals, sustainable agriculture relies on crop rotation, composting, biofertilizers, and other organic farming techniques to improve soil fertility.110 Organic farming methods also protect water resources because organic farms do not use chemical inputs so there is no contamination of groundwater and streams.111 Furthermore, organic fertilizers reduce the amount of waste deposited in landfills because they are made from composted and recycled food waste, leaves, and lawn clippings.112 Urban gardening reduces the effects of climate change by decreasing greenhouse gas emissions. Unlike industrial farms, urban gardens are cultivated and harvested with minimal mechanization and do not use oil-based fertilizers.113 Moreover, food that is grown and sold locally eliminates the need for wasteful plastic packaging and fossil-fueled transport to market.114 Additionally, having fresh food available in every neighborhood would reduce carbon-emitting automobile trips to the grocery store.115 Urban agriculture presents an opportunity to reverse the decline of urban areas. A significant benefit of urban gardens is the beautification of urban neighborhoods and strengthening of community spirit.116 Urban gardens also can prompt the cleanup of contaminated vacant lots.117 Furthermore, increasing the amount of vegetation in urban areas would reduce surface temperatures during hot months and improve urban air quality.118 B. Economic Sustainability Sustainability requires that economic growth and development must be integrated with environmental protection and sustainable utilization of resources.119 Economic growth and development must also promote both intergenerational and intragenerational equity.120 While a steadily expanding economy is considered prosperity, a growing world population coupled with increasing overall consumption threatens to strain our planet beyond its carrying capacity.121 When economic stability is equated with increased consumption, we push the limits of the planet’s carrying capacity. Simply put, we are depleting the Earth’s resources at a rate that threatens the Earth’s future ability to support our species. The economic aspect of sustainability also addresses the fact that many of the planet’s resources are treated as externalities in the marketplace.122 For example, the costs of depleting natural resources and polluting the air, water, and ground are not reflected in the price of goods. Through regulations, mandates, and incentives, the U.S. government addresses some of these environmental costs,123 but more must be done to implement policies that will incorporate external costs into pricing structures. 1. Economic Sustainability and Industrial Agriculture **Industrial agriculture is not economically sustainable**. Industrial agriculture seeks to maximize profits without regard for environmental degradation or the long-term effects of heavy reliance on chemical pesticides and fertilizers. Rather than balancing economic growth with environmental protection and equity, industrial agriculture concentrates on maximizing profits at the expense of the environment and society, both in the present and the future. The United States currently has no regulations or policies in place that would impose costs upon agribusinesses for externalities;124 rather, current policies promote harmful industrial agricultural methods.125 A food production system that allows businesses to maximize profits without concern for its impact on society and the environment is not sustainable.

**Ecosystem collapse causes extinction**

**WATSON 2006** (Captain Paul, Founder and President of Sea Shepherd Conservation Society, has a show on Animal Planet, Last Mod 9-17, http://www.eco-action.org/dt/beerswil.html)

The facts are clear. More plant and animal species will go through extinction within our generation than have been lost thorough natural causes over the past two hundred million years. Our single human generation, that is, all people born between 1930 and 2010 will witness the complete obliteration of one third to one half of all the Earth's life forms, each and every one of them the product of more than two billion years of evolution. This is biological meltdown, and what this really means is the end to vertebrate evolution on planet Earth. Nature is under siege on a global scale. Biotopes, i.e., environmentally distinct regions, from tropical and temperate rainforests to coral reefs and coastal estuaries, are disintegrating in the wake of human onslaught. The destruction of forests and the proliferation of human activity will remove more than 20 percent of all terrestrial plant species over the next fifty years. Because plants form the foundation for entire biotic communities, their demise will carry with it the extinction of an exponentially greater number of animal species -- perhaps ten times as many faunal species for each type of plant eliminated. Sixty-five million years ago, a natural cataclysmic event resulted in extinction of the dinosaurs. Even with a plant foundation intact, it took more than 100,000 years for faunal biological diversity to re-establish itself. More importantly, the resurrection of biological diversity assumes an intact zone of tropical forests to provide for new speciation after extinction. Today, the tropical rain forests are disappearing more rapidly than any other bio-region, ensuring that after the age of humans, the Earth will remain a **biological**, if not a literal **desert** for eons to come. The present course of civilization points to ecocide -- the death of nature. Like a run-a-way train, civilization is speeding along tracks of our own manufacture towards the stone wall of extinction. The human passengers sitting comfortably in their seats, laughing, partying, and choosing to not look out the window. Environmentalists are those perceptive few who have their faces pressed against the glass, watching the hurling bodies of plants and animals go screaming by. Environmental activists are those even fewer people who are trying desperately to break into the fortified engine of greed that propels this destructive specicidal juggernaut. Others are desperately throwing out anchors in an attempt to slow the monster down while all the while, the authorities, blind to their own impending destruction, are clubbing, shooting and jailing those who would save us all. SHORT MEMORIES Civilized humans have for ten thousand years been marching across the face of the Earth leaving deserts in their footprints. Because we have such short memories, we forgot the wonder and splendor of a virgin nature. We revise history and make it fit into our present perceptions. For instance, are you aware that only two thousand years ago, the coast of North Africa was a mighty forest? The Phoenicians and the Carthaginians built powerful ships from the strong timbers of the region. Rome was a major exporter of timber to Europe. The temple of Jerusalem was built with titanic cedar logs, one image of which adorns the flag of Lebanon today. Jesus Christ did not live in a desert, he was a man of the forest. The Sumerians were renowned for clearing the forests of Mesopotamia for agriculture. But the destruction of the coastal swath of the North African forest stopped the rain from advancing into the interior. Without the rain, the trees died and thus was born the mighty Sahara, sired by man and continued to grow southward at a rate of ten miles per year, advancing down the length of the continent of Africa. And so will go Brazil. The precipitation off the Atlantic strikes the coastal rain forest and is absorbed and sent skyward again by the trees, falling further into the interior. Twelve times the moisture falls and twelve times it is returned to the sky -- all the way to the Andes mountains. Destroy the coastal swath and desertify Amazonia -- it is as simple as that. Create a swath anywhere between the coast and the mountains and the rains will be stopped. We did it before while relatively primitive. We learned nothing. We forgot. So too, have we forgotten that walrus once mated and bred along the coast of Nova Scotia, that sixty million bison once roamed the North American plains. One hundred years ago, the white bear once roamed the forests of New England and the Canadian Maritime provinces. Now it is called the polar bear because that is where it now makes its last stand. EXTINCTION IS DIFFICULT TO APPRECIATE Gone forever are the European elephant, lion and tiger. The Labrador duck, gint auk, Carolina parakeet will never again grace this planet of ours. Lost for all time are the Atlantic grey whales, the Biscayan right whales and the Stellar sea cow. Our children will never look upon the California condor in the wild or watch the Palos Verde blue butterfly dart from flower to flower. Extinction is a difficult concept to fully appreciate. What has been is no more and never shall be again. It would take another creation and billions of years to recreate the passenger pigeon. It is the loss of billions of years of evolutionary programming. It is the destruction of beauty, the obliteration of truth, the removal of uniqueness, the scarring of the sacred web of life To be responsible for an extinction is to commit blasphemy against the divine. It is the greatest of all possible crimes, more evil than murder, more appalling than genocide, more monstrous than even the apparent unlimited perversities of the human mind. To be responsible for the complete and utter destruction of a unique and sacred life form is arrogance that seethes with evil, for the very opposite of evil is live. It is no accident that these two words spell out each other in reverse. And yet, a reporter in California recently told me that "all the redwoods in California are not worth the life on one human being." What incredible arrogance. The rights a species, any species, must take precedence over the life of an individual or another species. This is a basic ecological law. It is not to be tampered with by primates who have molded themselves into divine legends in their own mind. For each and every one of the thirty million plus species that grace this beautiful planet are essential for the continued well-being of which we are all a part, the planet Earth -- the divine entity which brought us forth from the fertility of her sacred womb. As a sea-captain I like to compare the structural integrity of the biosphere to that of a ship's hull. Each species is a rivet that keeps the hull intact. If I were to go into my engine room and find my engineers busily popping rivets from the hull, I would be upset and naturally I would ask them what they were doing. If they told me that they discovered that they could make a dollar each from the rivets, I could do one of three things. I could ignore them. I could ask them to cut me in for a share of the profits, or I could kick their asses out of the engine room and off my ship. If I was a responsible captain, I would do the latter. If I did not, I would soon find the ocean pouring through the holes left by the stolen rivets and very shortly after, my ship, my crew and myself would disappear beneath the waves. And that is the state of the world today. The political leaders, i.e., the captains at the helms of their nation states, are ignoring the rivet poppers or they are cutting themselves in for the profits. There are very few asses being kicked out of the engine room of spaceship Earth. With the rivet poppers in command, it will not be long until the biospheric integrity of the Earth collapses under the weight of ecological strain and tides of death come pouring in. And that will be the price of progress -- ecological collapse, the death of nature, and with it the horrendous and mind numbing specter of massive human destruction.

**A move towards organic ag *mitigates future emissions* and *prevents warming***

Scialabba 10 – Nadia is from the Natural Resources Management and Environment Department, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). (“Organic agriculture and climate change”, February 2, 2010, Renewable Agriculture and Food Systems 25.2, <http://www.fao.org/docs/eims/upload/275960/al185e.pdf>)

Organic agricultural systems have an inherent potential to both reduce GHG emissions and to enhance carbon sequestration in the soil (Table 1). An important potential contribution of organically managed systems is the careful management of nutrients, and hence the reduction of N2 O emissions from soils, which are the most relevant single source of direct GHG emissions from agriculture. More research is needed to quantify and improve the effects of organic paddy rice production and to develop strategies to reduce methane emissions from enteric fermentation (e.g., by promoting double-use breeds). Indirect GHG emissions are reduced in organic systems by avoidance of mineral fertilizers. With the current organic consumers’ demand, further emission reductions are expected when organic standards include speciﬁc climate standards that consider, inter alia, reduced energy consumption in the organic food chain (e.g., limitations on greenhouse heating/cooling, processing and packaging, food miles combined with life cycle assessment). The advantage of organic systems is that they are driven by aware consumers and that they already carry a guarantee system of veriﬁcation and labeling which is consonant with climate labeling113 . The highest mitigation potential of organic agriculture lies in carbon sequestration in soils and in reduced clearing of primary ecosystems. The total amount of mitigation is difﬁcult to quantify, because it is highly dependent on local environmental conditions and management practices. Should all agricultural systems be managed organically, the omission of mineral fertilizer production and application is estimated to reduce the agricultural GHG emissions by about 20% — 10% caused by reduced N2 O emissions and about 10% by lower energy demand. These avoided emissions are supplemented by an emission compensation potential through carbon sequestration in croplands and grasslands of about 40–72% of the current annual agricultural GHG emissions76. However, further research is needed to conﬁrm these ﬁgures, as long-term scientiﬁc studies are limited and do not apply to different kinds of soils, climates and practices. To date, most of the research on the mitigation potential of agricultural practices has been carried out in developed countries; dedicated investigations are needed to assess and understand the mitigation potential in tropical and subtropical areas and under the predominant management practices of developing countries. More importantly, the adaptation aspects of organic agricultural practices must be the focus of public policies and research. One of the main effects of climate change is an increase of uncertainties, both for weather events and global food markets. Organic agriculture has a strong potential for building resilience in the face of climate variability (Table 2). The total abstention from synthetic inputs in organic agriculture has been a strong incentive to develop agricultural management practices that optimize the natural production potential of speciﬁc agro-ecosystems, based on traditional knowledge and modern research. These strategies can be used to enhance agricultural communities that have no access to purchased inputs, which is the case of the majority of the rural poor. The main organic strategies are diversiﬁcation and an increase of soil organic matter, which both could enhance resilience against extreme weather events and are recommended by the IPCC. These strategies have, in particular, a high potential to enhance the productivity of degraded soils, especially in marginal areas, while enhancing soil carbon sequestration. The adaptive approach inherent to organic agriculture offers simultaneous climate mitigation beneﬁts. Finally, certiﬁed organic products cater for higher income options for producers and hence a market-based incentive for environmental stewardship. The scaling-up of organic agriculture would promote and support climatefriendly farming practices worldwide. However, investments in research and development of organic agriculture are needed to better unlock its potential and application on a large scale.

**Warming causes extinction and the threshold is soon**

**Roberts 13** – citing the World Bank Review’s compilation of climate studies - 4 degree projected warming, can’t adapt - heat wave related deaths, forest fires, crop production, water wars, ocean acidity, sea level rise, climate migrants, biodiversity loss. ("If you aren’t alarmed about climate, you aren’t paying attention", January 10, 2013, [http://grist.org/climate-energy/climate-alarmism-the-idea-is-surreal](http://grist.org/climate-energy/climate-alarmism-the-idea-is-surreal/~~))

We know we’ve raised global average temperatures around 0.8 degrees C so far. We know that 2 degrees C is where most scientists predict catastrophic and irreversible impacts. And we know that we are currently on a trajectory that will push temperatures up 4 degrees or more by the end of the century. What would 4 degrees look like? A recent [World Bank review of the science](http://climatechange.worldbank.org/) reminds us. First, it’ll get hot: Projections for a 4°C world show a dramatic increase in the intensity and frequency of high-temperature extremes. Recent extreme heat waves such as in Russia in 2010 are likely to become the new normal summer in a 4°C world. Tropical South America, central Africa, and all tropical islands in the Pacific are likely to regularly experience heat waves of unprecedented magnitude and duration. In this new high-temperature climate regime, the coolest months are likely to be substantially warmer than the warmest months at the end of the 20th century. In regions such as the Mediterranean, North Africa, the Middle East, and the Tibetan plateau, almost all summer months are likely to be warmer than the most extreme heat waves presently experienced. For example, the warmest July in the Mediterranean region could be 9°C warmer than today’s warmest July. Extreme heat waves in recent years have had severe impacts, causing heat-related deaths, forest fires, and harvest losses. The impacts of the extreme heat waves projected for a 4°C world have not been evaluated, but they could be expected to vastly exceed the consequences experienced to date and potentially **exceed the adaptive capacities of many societies and natural systems**. [my emphasis] Warming to 4 degrees would also lead to “an increase of about 150 percent in acidity of the ocean,” leading to levels of acidity “unparalleled in Earth’s history.” That’s bad news for, say, coral reefs: The combination of thermally induced bleaching events, ocean acidification, and sea-level rise threatens large fractions of coral reefs even at 1.5°C global warming. The regional extinction of entire coral reef ecosystems, which could occur well before 4°C is reached, would have profound consequences for their dependent species and for the people who depend on them for food, income, tourism, and shoreline protection. It will also “likely lead to a sea-level rise of 0.5 to 1 meter, and possibly more, by 2100, with several meters more to be realized in the coming centuries.” That rise won’t be spread evenly, even within regions and countries — regions close to the equator will see even higher seas. There are also indications that it would “significantly exacerbate existing water scarcity in many regions, particularly northern and eastern Africa, the Middle East, and South Asia, while additional countries in Africa would be newly confronted with water scarcity on a national scale due to population growth.” Also, more extreme weather events: Ecosystems will be affected by more frequent extreme weather events, such as forest loss due to droughts and wildfire exacerbated by land use and agricultural expansion. In Amazonia, forest fires could as much as double by 2050 with warming of approximately 1.5°C to 2°C above preindustrial levels. Changes would be expected to be even more severe in a 4°C world. Also loss of biodiversity and ecosystem services: In a 4°C world, climate change seems likely to become the dominant driver of ecosystem shifts, surpassing habitat destruction as the greatest threat to biodiversity. Recent research suggests that large-scale loss of biodiversity is likely to occur in a 4°C world, with climate change and high CO2 concentration driving a transition of the Earth’s ecosystems into a state unknown in human experience. Ecosystem damage would be expected to dramatically reduce the provision of ecosystem services on which society depends (for example, fisheries and protection of coastline afforded by coral reefs and mangroves.) New research also indicates a “rapidly rising risk of crop yield reductions as the world warms.” So food will be tough. All this will add up to “large-scale displacement of populations and have adverse consequences for human security and economic and trade systems.” Given the uncertainties and long-tail risks involved, “there is no certainty that adaptation to a 4°C world is possible.” There’s a small but non-trivial chance of advanced civilization breaking down entirely. Now ponder the fact that some scenarios show us going up to 6degrees by the end of the century, a level of devastation we have not studied and barely know how to conceive. Ponder the fact that somewhere along the line, though we don’t know exactly where, enough self-reinforcing feedback loops will be running to make climate change unstoppable and irreversible for centuries to come. That would mean handing our grandchildren and their grandchildren not only a **burned, chaotic, denuded world**, but a world that is inexorably more inhospitable with every passing decade.

**Warming is *real* and *anthropogenic*—reject skeptics**

Prothero 12 – Donald R. Prothero is a Professor of Geology at Occidental College and Lecturer in Geobiology at the California Institute of Technology. (“How We Know Global Warming is Real and Human Caused”, 3/1/2012, http://www.skeptic.com/eskeptic/12-02-08/)

How do we know that global warming is real and primarily human caused? There are numerous lines of evidence that converge to this conclusion. Carbon Dioxide Increase. Carbon dioxide in our atmosphere has increased at an unprecedented rate in the past 200 years. Not one data set collected over a long enough span of time shows otherwise. Mann et al. (1999) compiled the past 900 years’ worth of temperature data from tree rings, ice cores, corals, and direct measurements of the past few centuries, and the sudden increase of temperature of the past century stands out like a sore thumb. This famous graph (see Figure 1 above) is now known as the “hockey stick” because it is long and straight through most of its length, then bends sharply upward at the end like the blade of a hockey stick. Other graphs show that climate was very stable within a narrow range of variation through the past 1000, 2000, or even 10,000 years since the end of the last Ice Age. There were minor warming events during the Climatic Optimum about 7000 years ago, the Medieval Warm Period, and the slight cooling of the Little Ice Age from the 1700s and 1800s. But the magnitude and rapidity of the warming represented by the last 200 years is simply unmatched in all of human history. More revealing, the timing of this warming coincides with the Industrial Revolution, when humans first began massive deforestation and released carbon dioxide by burning coal, gas, and oil.

Melting Polar Ice Caps. The polar icecaps are thinning and breaking up at an alarming rate. In 2000, my former graduate advisor Malcolm McKenna was one of the first humans to fly over the North Pole in summer time and see no ice, just open water. The Arctic ice cap has been frozen solid for at least the past 3 million years and maybe longer3, but now the entire ice sheet is breaking up so fast that by 2030 (and possibly sooner) less than half of the Arctic will be ice covered in the summer.4 As one can see from watching the news, this is an ecological disaster for everything that lives up there, from the polar bears to the seals and walruses to the animals they feed upon, to the 4 million people whose world is melting beneath their feet. The Antarctic is thawing even faster. In February–March 2002, the Larsen B ice shelf—over 3000 square km (the size of Rhode Island) and 220 m (700 feet) thick—broke up in just a few months, a story typical of nearly all the ice shelves in Antarctica. The Larsen B shelf had survived all the previous ice ages and interglacial warming episodes for the past 3 million years, and even the warmest periods of the last 10,000 years—yet it and nearly all the other thick ice sheets on the Arctic, Greenland, and Antarctic are vanishing at a rate never before seen in geologic history.

Melting Glaciers. Glaciers are all retreating at the highest rates ever documented. Many of those glaciers, especially in the Himalayas, Andes, Alps, and Sierras, provide most of the freshwater that the populations below the mountains depend upon—yet this fresh water supply is vanishing. Just think about the percentage of world’s population in southern Asia (especially India) that depend on Himalayan snowmelt for their fresh water. The implications are staggering. The permafrost that once remained solidly frozen even in the summer has now thawed, damaging the Inuit villages on the Arctic coast and threatening all our pipelines to the North Slope of Alaska. This is catastrophic not only for life on the permafrost, but as it thaws, the permafrost releases huge amounts of greenhouse gases and is one of the major contributors to global warming. Not only is the ice vanishing, but we have seen record heat waves over and over again, killing thousands of people, as each year joins the list of the hottest years on record. (2010 just topped that list as the hottest year, surpassing the previous record in 2009, and we shall know about 2011 soon enough). Natural animal and plant populations are being devastated all over the globe as their environment changes.5 Many animals respond by moving their ranges to formerly cold climates, so now places that once did not have to worry about disease-bearing mosquitoes are infested as the climate warms and allows them to breed further north.

Sea Level Rise. All that melted ice eventually ends up in the ocean, causing sea level to rise, as it has many times in the geologic past. At present, sea level is rising about 3–4 mm per year, more than ten times the rate of 0.1–0.2 mm/year that has occurred over the past 3000 years. Geological data show that sea level was virtually unchanged over the past 10,000 years since the present interglacial began. A few millimeters here or there doesn’t impress people, until you consider that the rate is accelerating and that most scientists predict sea level will rise 80–130 cm in just the next century. A sea level rise of 1.3 m (almost 4 feet) would drown many of the world’s low-elevation cities, such as Venice and New Orleans, and low-lying countries such as the Netherlands or Bangladesh. A number of tiny island nations such as Vanuatu and the Maldives, which barely poke out above the ocean now, are already vanishing beneath the waves. Eventually their entire population will have to move someplace else.6 Even a small sea level rise might not drown all these areas, but they are much more vulnerable to the large waves of a storm surge (as happened with Hurricane Katrina), which could do much more damage than sea level rise alone. If sea level rose by 6 m (20 feet), most of the world’s coastal plains and low-lying areas (such as the Louisiana bayous, Florida, and most of the world’s river deltas) would be drowned.

Most of the world’s population lives in coastal cities such as New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington, D.C., Miami, Shanghai, and London. All of those cities would be partially or completely under water with such a sea level rise. If all the glacial ice caps melted completely (as they have several times before during past greenhouse episodes in the geologic past), sea level would rise by 65 m (215 feet)! The entire Mississippi Valley would flood, so you could dock your boat in Cairo, Illinois. Such a sea level rise would drown nearly every coastal region under hundreds of feet of water, and inundate New York City, London and Paris. All that would remain would be the tall landmarks, such as the Empire State Building, Big Ben, and the Eiffel Tower. You could tie your boats to these pinnacles, but the rest of these drowned cities would be deep under water.

Climate Deniers’ Arguments and Scientists’ Rebuttals

Despite the overwhelming evidence there are many people who remain skeptical. One reason is that they have been fed lies, distortions, and misstatements by the global warming denialists who want to cloud or confuse the issue. Let’s examine some of these claims in detail:

“It’s just natural climatic variability.” No, it is not. As I detailed in my 2009 book, Greenhouse of the Dinosaurs, geologists and paleoclimatologists know a lot about past greenhouse worlds, and the icehouse planet that has existed for the past 33 million years. We have a good understanding of how and why the Antarctic ice sheet first appeared at that time, and how the Arctic froze over about 3.5 million years ago, beginning the 24 glacial and interglacial episodes of the “Ice Ages” that have occurred since then. We know how variations in the earth’s orbit (the Milankovitch cycles) controls the amount of solar radiation the earth receives, triggering the shifts between glacial and interglacial periods. Our current warm interglacial has already lasted 10,000 years, the duration of most previous interglacials, so if it were not for global warming, we would be headed into the next glacial in the next 1000 years or so. Instead, our pumping greenhouse gases into our atmosphere after they were long trapped in the earth’s crust has pushed the planet into a “super-interglacial,” already warmer than any previous warming period. We can see the “big picture” of climate variability most clearly in the EPICA cores from Antarctica (see Figure 2 below), which show the details of the last 650,000 years of glacial-interglacial cycles. At no time during any previous interglacial did the carbon dioxide levels exceed 300 ppm, even at their very warmest. Our atmospheric carbon dioxide levels are already close to 400 ppm today. The atmosphere is headed to 600 ppm within a few decades, even if we stopped releasing greenhouse gases immediately. This is decidedly not within the normal range of “climatic variability,” but clearly unprecedented in human history. Anyone who says this is “normal variability” has never seen the huge amount of paleoclimatic data that show otherwise. “It’s just another warming episode, like the Mediaeval Warm Period, or the Holocene Climatic Optimum” or the end of the Little Ice Age.” Untrue. There were numerous small fluctuations of warming and cooling over the last 10,000 years of the Holocene. But in the case of the Mediaeval Warm Period (about 950–1250 A.D.), the temperatures increased by only 1°C, much less than we have seen in the current episode of global warming (see Figure 1). This episode was also only a local warming in the North Atlantic and northern Europe. Global temperatures over this interval did not warm at all, and actually cooled by more than 1°C. Likewise, the warmest period of the last 10,000 years was the Holocene Climatic Optimum (5000–9000 B.C.) when warmer and wetter conditions in Eurasia caused the rise of the first great civilizations in Egypt, Mesopotamia, the Indus Valley, and China. This was largely a Northern Hemisphere-Eurasian phenomenon, with 2–3°C warming in the Arctic and northern Europe. But there was almost no warming in the tropics, and cooling or no change in the Southern Hemisphere.7 To the Eurocentric world, these warming events seemed important, but on a global scale the effect is negligible. In addition, neither of these warming episodes is related to increasing greenhouse gases. The Holocene Climatic Optimum, in fact, is predicted by the Milankovitch cycles, since at that time the axial tilt of the earth was 24°, its steepest value, meaning the Northern Hemisphere got more solar radiation than normal—but the Southern Hemisphere less, so the two balanced. By contrast, not only is the warming observed in the last 200 years much greater than during these previous episodes, but it is also global and bipolar, so it is not a purely local effect. The warming that ended the Little Ice Age (from the mid-1700s to the late 1800s) was due to increased solar radiation prior to 1940. Since 1940, however, the amount of solar radiation has been dropping, so the only candidate for the post-1940 warming has to be carbon dioxide.8

“It’s just the sun, or cosmic rays, or volcanic activity or methane.” **Nope**, sorry. The amount of heat that the sun provides has been decreasing since 19409, just the opposite of the denialists’ claims. There is no evidence (see Figure 3 below) of increase in cosmic radiation during the past century.10 Nor is there any clear evidence that large-scale volcanic events (such as the 1815 eruption of Tambora in Indonesia, which changed global climate for about a year) have any long-term effect that would explain 200 years of warming and carbon dioxide increase. Volcanoes erupt only 0.3 billion tonnes of carbon dioxide each year, but humans emit over 29 billion tonnes a year11, roughly 100 times as much. Clearly, we have a bigger effect. Methane is a more powerful greenhouse gas, but there is 200 times more carbon dioxide than methane, so carbon dioxide is still the most important agent.12 Every other alternative has been looked at, but the only clear-cut relationship is between human-caused carbon dioxide increase and global warming. “The climate records since 1995 (or 1998) show cooling.” That’s a deliberate deception. People who throw this argument out are cherry-picking the data.13 Over the short term, there was a slight cooling trend from 1998–2000 (see Figure 4 below), because 1998 was a record-breaking El Niño year, so the next few years look cooler by comparison. But since 2002, the overall long-term trend of warming is unequivocal. This statement is a clear-cut case of using out-of-context data in an attempt to deny reality. All of the 16 hottest years ever recorded on a global scale have occurred in the last 20 years. They are (in order of hottest first): 2010, 2009, 1998, 2005, 2003, 2002, 2004, 2006, 2007, 2001, 1997, 2008, 1995, 1999, 1990, and 2000.14 In other words, every year since 2000 has been in the Top Ten hottest years list, and the rest of the list includes 1995, 1997, 1998, 1999, and 2000. Only 1996 failed to make the list (because of the short-term cooling mentioned already).

“We had record snows in the winters of 2009–2010, and in 2010–2011.” So what? This is nothing more than the difference between weather (short-term seasonal changes) and climate (the long-term average of weather over decades and centuries and longer). Our local weather tells us nothing about another continent, or the global average; it is only a local effect, determined by short-term atmospheric and oceanographic conditions.15 In fact, warmer global temperatures mean more moisture in the atmosphere, which increases the intensity of normal winter snowstorms. In this particular case, the climate denialists forget that the early winter of November–December 2009 was actually very mild and warm, and then only later in January and February did it get cold and snow heavily. That warm spell in early winter helped bring more moisture into the system, so that when cold weather occurred, the snows were worse. In addition, the snows were unusually heavy only in North America; the rest of the world had different weather, and the global climate was warmer than average. And the summer of 2010 was the hottest on record, breaking the previous record set in 2009.

“Carbon dioxide is good for plants, so the world will be better off.” Who do they think they’re kidding? The people who promote this idea clearly don’t know much global geochemistry, or are trying to cynically take advantage of the fact that most people are ignorant of science. The Competitive Enterprise Institute (funded by oil and coal companies and conservative foundations16) has run a series of shockingly stupid ads concluding with the tag line “Carbon dioxide: they call it pollution, we call it life.” Anyone who knows the basic science of earth’s atmosphere can spot the deceptions in this ad.17 Sure, plants take in carbon dioxide that animals exhale, as they have for millions of years. But the whole point of the global warming evidence (as shown from ice cores) is that the delicate natural balance of carbon dioxide has been thrown out of whack by our production of too much of it, way in excess of what plants or the oceans can handle. As a consequence, the oceans are warming18 and absorbing excess carbon dioxide making them more acidic. Already we are seeing a shocking decline in coral reefs (“bleaching”) and extinctions in many marine ecosystems that can’t handle too much of a good thing. Meanwhile, humans are busy cutting down huge areas of temperate and tropical forests, which not only means there are fewer plants to absorb the gas, but the slash and burn practices are releasing more carbon dioxide than plants can keep up with. There is much debate as to whether increased carbon dioxide might help agriculture in some parts of the world, but that has to be measured against the fact that other traditional “breadbasket” regions (such as the American Great Plains) are expected to get too hot to be as productive as they are today. The latest research19 actually shows that increased carbon dioxide inhibits the absorption of nitrogen into plants, so plants (at least those that we depend upon today) are not going to flourish in a greenhouse world. Anyone who tells you otherwise is ignorant of basic atmospheric science.

“I agree that climate is changing, but I’m skeptical that humans are the main cause, so we shouldn’t do anything.” This is just fence sitting. A lot of reasonable skeptics deplore the “climate denialism” of the right wing, but still want to be skeptical about the cause. If they want proof, they can examine the huge array of data that directly points to humans causing global warming.20 We can directly measure the amount of carbon dioxide humans are producing, and it tracks exactly with the amount of increase in atmospheric carbon dioxide. Through carbon isotope analysis, we can show that this carbon dioxide in the atmosphere is coming directly from our burning of fossil fuels, not from natural sources. We can also measure oxygen levels that drop as we produce more carbon that then combines with oxygen to produce carbon dioxide. We have satellites in space that are measuring the heat released from the planet and can actually see the atmosphere get warmer. The most crucial proof emerged only in the past few years: climate models of the greenhouse effect predict that there should be cooling in the stratosphere (the upper layer of the atmosphere above 10 km (6 miles) in elevation, but warming in the troposphere (the bottom layer of the atmosphere below 10 km (6 miles), and that’s exactly what our space probes have measured. Finally, we can rule out any other culprits (see above): solar heat is decreasing since 1940, not increasing, and there are no measurable increases in cosmic radiation, methane, volcanic gases, or any other potential cause. Face it—it’s our problem.

Why Do People Deny Climate Change? Thanks to all the noise and confusion over the debate, the general public has only a vague idea of what the debate is really about, and only about half of Americans think global warming is real or that we are to blame.21 As in the debate over evolution and creationism, the scientific community is virtually unanimous on what the data demonstrate about anthropogenic global warming. This has been true for over a decade. When science historian Naomi Oreskes surveyed all peer-reviewed papers on climate change published between 1993 and 2003 in the world’s leading scientific journal, Science, she found that there were 980 supporting the idea of human-induced global warming and none opposing it. In 2009, Doran and Kendall Zimmerman23 surveyed all the climate scientists who were familiar with the data. They found that 95–99% agreed that global warming is real and that humans are the reason. In 2010, the prestigious Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences published a study that showed that 98% of the scientists who actually do research in climate change are in agreement with anthropogenic global warming.24 Every major scientific organization in the world has endorsed the conclusion of anthropogenic climate change as well. This is a rare degree of agreement within such an independent and cantankerous group as the world’s top scientists. This is the same degree of scientific consensus that scientists have achieved over most major ideas, including **gravity, evolution, and relativity.** These and only a few other topics in science can claim this degree of agreement among nearly all the world’s leading scientists, especially among everyone who is close to the scientific data and knows the problem intimately. If it were not such a controversial topic politically, there would be almost no interest in debating it, since the evidence is so clear-cut. If the climate science community speaks with one voice (as in the 2007 IPCC report, and every report since then), why is there still any debate at all? The answer has been revealed by a number of investigations by diligent reporters who got past the PR machinery denying global warming, and uncovered the money trail. Originally, there was no real “dissenters” to the idea of global warming by scientists who are actually involved with climate research. Instead, the forces with vested interests in denying global climate change (the energy companies, and the “free-market” advocates) followed the strategy of tobacco companies: create a smokescreen of confusion and prevent the American public from recognizing scientific consensus. As the famous memo25 from the tobacco lobbyists said “Doubt is our product.” The denialists generated an anti-science movement entirely out of thin air and PR. The evidence for this PR conspiracy has been well documented in numerous sources. For example, Oreskes and Conway revealed from memos leaked to the press that in April 1998 the right-wing Marshall Institute, SEPP (Fred Seitz’s lobby that aids tobacco companies and polluters), and ExxonMobil, met in secret at the American Petroleum Institute’s headquarters in Washington, D.C. There they planned a $20 million campaign to get “respected scientists” to cast doubt on climate change, get major PR efforts going, and lobby Congress that global warming isn’t real and is not a threat.

The right-wing institutes and the energy lobby beat the bushes to find scientists—any scientists—who might disagree with the scientific consensus. As investigative journalists and scientists have documented over and over again,26 the denialist conspiracy essentially paid for the testimony of anyone who could be useful to them. The day that the 2007 IPCC report was released (Feb. 2, 2007), the British newspaper The Guardian reported that the conservative American Enterprise Institute (funded largely by oil companies and conservative think tanks) had offered $10,000 plus travel expenses to scientists who would write negatively about the IPCC report.27

We are accustomed to the hired-gun “experts” paid by lawyers to muddy up the evidence in the case they are fighting, but this is extraordinary—buying scientists outright to act as shills for organizations trying to deny scientific reality. With this kind of money, however, you can always find a fringe scientist or crank or someone with no relevant credentials who will do what they’re paid to do. The NCSE satirized this tactic of composing phony “lists of scientists” with their “Project Steve.”28 They showed that there were more scientists named “Steve” than their entire list of “scientists who dispute evolution.” It may generate lots of PR and a smokescreen to confuse the public, but it doesn’t change the fact that scientists who actually do research in climate change are unanimous in their insistence that anthropogenic global warming is a real threat. Most scientists I know and respect work very hard for little pay, yet they still cannot be paid to endorse some scientific idea they know to be false.

The climate deniers have a lot of other things in common with creationists and other anti-science movements. They too like to quote someone out of context (“quote mining”), finding a short phrase in the work of legitimate scientists that seems to support their position. But when you read the full quote in context, it is obvious that they have used the quote inappropriately. The original author meant something that does not support their goals. The “Climategate scandal” is a classic case of this. It started with a few stolen emails from the Climate Research Unit of the University of East Anglia. If you read the complete text of the actual emails29 and comprehend the scientific shorthand of climate scientists who are talking casually to each other, it is clear that there was no great “conspiracy” or that they were faking data. All six subsequent investigations have cleared Philip Jones and the other scientists of the University of East Anglia of any wrongdoing or conspiracy.30

Even if there had been some conspiracy on the part of these few scientists, there is no reason to believe that the entire climate science community is secretly working together to generate false information and mislead the public. If there’s one thing that is clear about science, it’s about competition and criticism, not conspiracy and collusion. Most labs are competing with each other, not conspiring together. If one lab publishes a result that is not clearly defensible, other labs will quickly correct it. As James Lawrence Powell wrote31:

Scientists….show no evidence of being more interested in politics or ideology than the average American. Does it make sense to believe that tens of thousands of scientists would be so deeply and secretly committed to bringing down capitalism and the American way of life that they would spend years beyond their undergraduate degrees working to receive master’s and Ph.D. degrees, then go to work in a government laboratory or university, plying the deep oceans, forbidding deserts, icy poles, and torrid jungles, all for far less money than they could have made in industry, all the while biding their time like a Russian sleeper agent in an old spy novel? Scientists tend to be independent and resist authority. That is why you are apt to find them in the laboratory or in the field, as far as possible from the prying eyes of a supervisor. Anyone who believes he could organize thousands of scientists into a conspiracy has never attended a single faculty meeting.

There are many more traits that the climate deniers share with the creationists and Holocaust deniers and others who distort the truth. They pick on small disagreements between different labs as if scientists can’t get their story straight, when in reality there is always a fair amount of give and take between competing labs as they try to get the answer right before the other lab can do so. The key point here is that when all these competing labs around the world have reached a consensus and get the same answer, there is no longer any reason to doubt their common conclusion. The anti-scientists of climate denialism will also point to small errors by individuals in an effort to argue that the entire enterprise cannot be trusted. It is true that scientists are human, and do make mistakes, but the great power of the scientific method is that peer review weeds these out, so that when scientists speak with consensus, there is no doubt that their data are checked carefully.

Finally, a powerful line of evidence that this is a purely political controversy, rather than a scientific debate, is that the membership lists of the creationists and the climate deniers are highly overlapping. Both anti-scientific dogmas are fed to their overlapping audiences through right-wing media such as Fox News, Glenn Beck, and Rush Limbaugh. Just take a look at the “intelligent-design” creationism website for the Discovery Institute. Most of the daily news items lately have nothing to do with creationism at all, but are focused on climate denial and other right-wing causes.32

If the data about global climate change are indeed valid and robust, any qualified scientist should be able to look at them and see if the prevailing scientific interpretation holds up. Indeed, such a test took place. Starting in 2010, a group led by U.C. Berkeley physicist Richard Muller re-examined all the temperature data from the NOAA, East Anglia Hadley Climate Research Unit, and the Goddard Institute of Space Science sources (see Figure 5 below). Even though Muller started out as a skeptic of the temperature data, and was funded by the Koch brothers and other oil company sources, he carefully checked and re-checked the research himself. When the GOP leaders called him to testify before the House Science and Technology Committee in spring 2011, they were expecting him to discredit the temperature data. Instead, Muller shocked his GOP sponsors by demonstrating his scientific integrity and telling the truth: the temperature increase is real, and the scientists who have demonstrated that the climate is changing are right. In the fall of 2011, his study was published, and the conclusions were clear: global warming is real, even to a right-wing skeptical scientist. Unlike the hired-gun scientists who play political games, Muller did what a true scientist should do: if the data go against your biases and preconceptions, then do the right thing and admit it—even if you’ve been paid by sponsors who want to discredit global warming. Muller is a shining example of a scientist whose integrity and honesty came first, and did not sell out to the highest bidder. Science and Anti-Science

## 2AC

### Warming

#### Warming is real and human-caused—ice core data and models over the thousands of years are perfectly consistent with rising CO2 emissions and ice caps are receding faster than they ever have before—that’s Prothero

#### Every single one of 900 scientific papers and 99% of climate scientists agree—prefer scientific consensus because it limits out skeptics and has the greatest likelihood of being correct

### 2AC—Must Be Conditional

#### Counterinterpretation—engagement must be unconditional

Smith 5 — Karen E. Smith, Professor of International Relations and Director of the European Foreign Policy Unit at the London School of Economics, 2005 (“Engagement and conditionality: incompatible or mutually reinforcing?,” *Global Europe: New Terms of Engagement*, May, Available Online at http://fpc.org.uk/fsblob/484.pdf, Accessed 07-25-2013, p. 23)

First, a few definitions. ‘Engagement’ is a foreign policy strategy of building close ties with the government and/or civil society and/or business community of another state. The intention of this strategy is to undermine illiberal political and economic practices, and socialise government and other domestic actors into more liberal ways. Most cases of engagement entail primarily building economic links, and encouraging trade and investment in particular. Some observers have variously labelled this strategy one of interdependence, or of ‘oxygen’: economic activity leads to positive political consequences.19 ‘Conditionality’, in contrast, is the linking, by a state or international organisation, of perceived benefits to another state (such as aid or trade concessions) to the fulfilment of economic and/or political conditions. ‘Positive conditionality’ entails promising benefits to a state if it fulfils the conditions; ‘negative conditionality’ involves reducing, suspending, or terminating those benefits if the state violates the conditions (in other words, applying sanctions, or a strategy of ‘asphyxiation’).20 To put it simply, engagement implies ties, but with no strings attached; conditionality attaches the strings. In another way of looking at it, engagement is more of a bottom-up strategy to induce change in another country, conditionality more of a top-down strategy.

#### Our interpretation is key to aff ground—solvency advocates only exist for 2 or 3 QPQ affs and they’re all terrible and solved by the unconditional counterplan—the literature base for unconditional Cuba affs is huge and critical to aff innovation which turns their ground claims

#### Limits are offense for us—their interpretation multiplies the topic by all the possible actions to condition each unconditional aff on

#### Default to reasonability—competing interpretations create a moral hazard that incentivizes going for T to arbitrarily limit out the aff instead of making debates better

### 2AC—Cubanismo

#### The affirmative should win if the results of the imagined plan action are good—that’s specifically true in the context of trade in Latin America

Giordano and Li 12 – \*Paolo, PhD in Economics from the Institut d'Etudes Politiques de Paris, Lead Economist @ the Integratoin and Trade Sector of the IADB, \*\*Kun, Research Fellow @ IADB (“An Updated Assessment of the Trade and Poverty Nexus in Latin America,” p. 375-377)

Despite the move towards more open trade regimes, Latin American economies are still ¶ relatively closed to international trade. Under the pressure of globalisation, it is likely that in the ¶ coming years the region will need to open further and adjust to compete in an increasingly ¶ challenging global environment. Latin America being one of the most unequal regions of the ¶ world, the assessment of the trade and poverty nexus is crucial to devise policies aiming at ¶ better distributing the gains from trade. Latin America-specific research on this topic will ¶ provide policymakers and stakeholders with evidence necessary to underpin a debate which ¶ seems to be nurtured more by anxiety than rigorous knowledge. ¶ In this light, it is useful to refer to a few conclusions with the aim of building up a solid base ¶ for policy debates and future research.¶ There is a gap in the availability of methodologies to explore the link between macro policy ¶ reforms like trade liberalisation and micro-economic determinants of welfare and poverty. It is ¶ therefore crucial to invest in the generation of data and research techniques, to adapt the ¶ research agenda to the specificity of Latin America and to consider qualitative issues that are ¶ difficult to measure. Meanwhile, normative statements referring to the trade policy nexus should ¶ cautiously consider the limitations of current positive knowledge.¶ Trade openness, inequality and poverty are wide multidimensional concepts. Measuring and ¶ attributing causal relations among these variables without carefully qualifying the specific ¶ dimensions explored or the particular transmission mechanisms at play may be misleading. It is ¶ important to disentangle the specific dimension of the trade and poverty nexus from the wider ¶ debate on globalisation and financial integration, the competing concepts of relative and ¶ absolute inequality and the objective and subjective dimension of poverty and deprivation.¶ Despite the impossibility to rigorously and unambiguously assert that trade openness is ¶ conducive to growth and poverty reduction, the preponderance of evidence supports this ¶ conclusion. However, the majority of empirical macro studies also show that the impact of trade ¶ on growth and poverty is also generally small and that the causes of indigence are to be found ¶ elsewhere. But it is in fact extremely arduous to find evidence that supports the notion that trade ¶ protection is good for the poor. The question is therefore how to make trade and growth more ¶ pro-poor and not how to devise improbable alternatives to trade integration aiming at improving ¶ the livelihood of the poor.¶ Specific evidence on Latin America reveals that deductive generalisations of the neoclassical ¶ trade theory and global cross-country empirical studies may be of little help in 0-0-understanding ¶ the trade and poverty nexus in the region. Several factors may explain why the integration of ¶ Latin America into the global economy may not necessarily bring about rising wages of ¶ unskilled workers and poverty reduction. The most compelling arguments are related to the ¶ existence of rigidities in the labour markets, the historical pattern of protection that created rents ¶ in unskilled intensive sectors, the emergence of low wage countries such as China and India that ¶ shifts the comparative advantage of Latin American economies, and institutional factors that ¶ protract the effects of an initial unequal distribution of factor endowments against the poor.¶ Trade liberalisation may in fact be associated with rising inequality. But country case studies ¶ present contrasting indications. Although there is some evidence of rising inequality in the ¶ aftermath of trade opening, such as in the case of Mexico, Colombia, Argentina and Chile, it ¶ seems that the specific effects of trade liberalisation are small or indirect. Skill-biased technical ¶ change, often directly related with the increase of foreign direct investment or with capital ¶ account liberalisation, seems to have a stronger explanatory power than trade liberalisation. ¶ There is also little evidence that trade opening has generated more informality. On the other ¶ hand, the case of Brazil, where trade liberalisation seems to have contributed to the reduction of ¶ wage inequality, is illustrative of the conditions under which trade reforms may have ¶ progressive distributive effects¶ The empirical analysis addressing the direct effect of trade integration on poverty reveals a ¶ similar landscape. Trade integration seems to be good for the poor but the effects are small. ¶ Generalisations should be taken with a great deal of caution because this is a domain where data ¶ may present considerable shortcomings. In any event it seems that foreign trade reforms are ¶ more important for poverty reduction than unilateral ones or than the national component of ¶ reciprocal trade reforms. The countries of the region may therefore expect further contributions ¶ of trade integration to poverty reduction, particularly from the liberalisation of the agriculture ¶ sector where the greatest pockets of residual protectionism are still concentrated. However, ¶ predicting ex ante the pro-poor effects of trade reforms is an extremely sensitive task highly¶ dependent on the quality of the data and the correct specification of the simulation instruments. ¶ It is hard to overstate the importance of strengthening the capacity of policymaking in this area.

#### Perm do both

#### Neoliberalism is inevitable in Cuba

Perez ’12 – Yenisel Rodriguez Perez – lived in Cuba for his entire life until March 30, 2013. Currently a resident in the city of Miami. Writer for the Havana Times and holds a degree in socio-cultural studies –

“The Ideological Success of Neoliberalism in Cuba” – Havana Times – April 29, 2012

http://www.havanatimes.org/?p=68708#sthash.tWIio2fK.dpuf

Despite this, we know that the Cuban government has affected a neoliberal shift in its reform policies.¶ Nonetheless, even today it’s difficult to find a direct connection between the socioeconomic “reforms” implemented by the government and fundamentals of international neoliberalism.¶ The similarities, which clearly exist, fail to form a definite pattern of neoliberal-style economic and social policy.¶ This is why it’s so difficult to follow the economic moves of the political elite in their desperate retreat toward the deregulation of the economy.¶ However at the ideological level, this complicity is apparent. It’s at this level that neoliberalism has become hegemonic in Cuba. The ideological foundations of neoliberalism have achieved a tremendous success in the sphere of the government on the island.¶ The authorities have proclaimed the deregulation of Cuba’s economy as inevitable, as they quietly accept the consolidation of inequality as well as decreased social spending and the renunciation of full employment as a goal.¶ These are basic principles of neoliberalism, ones reflected by measures which they say should guide economic policy over the times to come.¶ The government is convincedthat neoliberalism has won the ideological battle on the field of international relations, despite its economic and social failures.¶ Because of this they are paving the way for a future of the radicalized application of its principles of economic deregulation and social inequality.

#### Their internal link chain is asinine—even if poverty in Latin America is extreme it won’t lead to extinction of the entire planet—only the aff accesses extinction which is a categorically separate impact because its uniquely irreversible

#### The Cuban model is unethical and fails

Sanchez 10 – Yoani Sanchez is a Cuban blogger and activist. (“Freedom and Exchange in Communist Cuba”, June 16, 2010, CATO, http://object.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/pubs/pdf/dbp5.pdf)

Freedom and Socialism in Cuba The real socialism that disappeared in Eastern Europe has been maintained in Cuba, though with severe spending cuts and some variation. Although, in the opinion of some, fresh air was introduced to the suffocating Stalinist model, what is certain is that the same totalitarian way of thinking that existed in faraway allied countries has been replicated on the Caribbean island. The most obvious difference with Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Bulgaria, for example, is that socialism was not imposed on Cuba by an imperialist power; in fact, just the opposite happened. Cuban socialism has always tried to present itself in the garb of sovereignty, and as the only way to achieve independence from the United States.

Despite this veneer of liberation, Cuba is a case study of how the abolition of the aforementioned freedoms is put into practice. In January 1959, a troop of young men—armed and bearded—came down from the mountains. There they had organized the guerilla war, brought about the defeat of the Batista dictatorship (1952–1958), and proclaimed that 1959 would be called, “The Year of the Liberation.” In their first speeches they hoisted the banner of “Bread and Freedom,” and everything indicated that, finally, Cuba would become a democratic nation where the progressive constitution approved in 1940 would be respected. How this group of irreverent revolutionaries ended up founding a gerontocracy, under the last-ditch slogan “Socialism or Death,” would become the subject of detailed historical studies. But it is worthwhile to respond to at least one question: What happened to freedom?

At what point did the liberation process mutate into a process that oppresses? At what point were the civil liberties that had allowed the emergence of the revolutionary groups dynamited? How and when did freedom begin to be an obscene word, mentioned in whispers and longed for in the privacy of one’s home? In exchange for what did Cuban citizens surrender their individual sovereignty and allow themselves to be locked up in the cage of paternalism, control, and authoritarianism? Answering these questions leads to the dismantling of the cage, and prompts further questioning about whether the crumbs offered in exchange for that freedom have been sufficient and extended to all.

Citizenship Sold Off At the beginning of the revolution, the abolition of freedoms found a favorable climate in the unthinking enthusiasm that engulfed almost the whole nation and led it to sign a blank check payable to one person only: Fidel Castro. In the name of that vote of confidence, used ad nauseum by the “Maximum Leader,” within a short time political parties and all the institutions of civil society were swept away. Newspapers, radio, and television ended up under the control of the state. The same fate befell the theaters, art galleries, movie houses, libraries, bookstores, and any entity that might have an opportunity to generate information or opinion. The people offered up—on the altar of a process still not declared to be communist—their civic institutions and the level of freedom they had reached after throwing off the Spanish colonial government.

Along with the disappearance of civil and political rights, economic rights vanished. Two years after it triumphed, the Revolution had completed the confiscation of the most important factories, businesses, and banks. In March of 1968, what sadly became known as the Revolutionary Offensive left not even the smallest kiosk, workshop, or store in private hands. Even the boxes of the shoeshine boys were seized, in what seemed like a desire to remake the nation without any commercial or economic ties inherited from the capitalist past.

It might be said, although it would seem paradoxical, that the Cuban people agreed to repay the debt of gratitude they owed to their liberators with their rights. In exchange for the possessions and rights confiscated by the new government, they received promises of a bright future; payment in advance, however, was required. As it is much easier to redistribute wealth than to create it, the government in the early years of the Revolution aimed to improve the living standards of the poor, not by an increase in production, but by doling out what it expropriated from wealthy property owners. These were the years in which it was calculated that the benefits obtained would be spectacular and immediate. The citizens’ naïveté was the fruit, in part, of an ignorance exceeded only by the enormous irresponsibility with which laws and decrees were dictated to “put the patrimony of the nation into the hands of the people.” The potential beneficiaries did not experience the results with the immediacy or the magnificence they expected, but those whose property had been expropriated or nationalized felt the effects immediately.

The frequent and numerous executions, the failure of several guerilla actions and invasions, and the long prison sentences for conspirators deterred protestors, who later found a bitter exit in exile. Many Cubans opted to remain silent, including some intellectuals who realized, without being negatively affected in the process, that mistakes were being made. To criticize had become inopportune and it was made clear that any gap in the ranks could be used by the enemy. It became common to cite the metaphor of little David against the great Goliath of the north, but the slings of the people were not permitted to launch a single stone at the cyclopean state.

The opponent was real and gigantic, nothing less than the all-powerful North American imperialism, some of whose citizens were among the hardest hit by the nationalizations. The existence of this enemy—some would say the creation of this enemy—fostered a sense of siege where, in the words of St. Ignatius of Loyola, dissent is treason. The history of the dispute is well known and excessively complicated. The Cuban government blamed the Americans for diplomatic pressures, military actions, espionage, a trade embargo, economic warfare, and sabotage. The Cuban government received blame for destabilizing the region through the creation and support of insurgent groups in almost all Latin American countries. The confrontation with the Cuban government also provided the U.S. government with an excuse to strengthen its Cold War policies and to intervene in Latin American societies.

What was least expected to come to fruition could, in the end, be considered the fundamental achievement of the Cuban Revolution: achieving national sovereignty in the face of a neighbor’s voracious appetite. But national security was imposed at the price of renouncing the sovereignty of the people, wherein reside precisely those rights that citizens exercise whenever the state displays authoritarian leanings. To explore whether there was a real or fictitious dilemma between the two versions of sovereignty, it would have been necessary to establish a broad, pluralistic and public debate, but that was not possible.

As was widely said then by party and government officials: “In this historic moment that our country is living through” people need to close ranks and swallow their differences. Officials established priorities that stressed the longed-for national liberation while condemning individual freedoms to last place. To demand such freedoms was to loudly declare one’s selfishness, like a spoilsport who is bothered by loud music while others, to all appearances, are having fun.

The Establishment of State Paternalism Over the course of time, and thanks to a substantial subsidy from the Soviet Union, state paternalism was established. The government provided the population with necessities through a system of rationing for food and industrial products. In a short time this, along with the extension of free education and health care, plus subsidized transportation and communications, turned Cuba into a country where it was not necessary to work to support a family at a minimum level of survival. The crumbs were assured, and with every passing day the bars of the cage were harder to break.

Paternalism stripped citizens of their civic, family, and work responsibilities, as well as the responsibilities each person has to himself. From that point on, the barter trade between freedoms and privileges was institutionalized. Everything you received above and beyond the norm was not due to your own efforts or talent; rather it was a perk, a reward for obedience. A telling example was the emergence of regulations for the distribution of household appliances. These could only be bought through certificates or vouchers given out at mass rallies, after commissions analyzed the work and social merits of each applicant. Workers would earn points depending on their unconditional ideological support, the number of “voluntary” hours they worked, and attendance at political events. The purchasing permits needed to obtain a fan or a refrigerator even took into account participation in the wars in Angola and Ethiopia. Outside this system it was impossible to buy anything. The same method was used to assign housing and the chance to enjoy tourist facilities. Everything had to be paid for twice; once in real money at a subsidized price, and again with freedom, whether offered sincerely or not.

Those who did not jump through the hoops had to continue living with their inlaws and were forbidden to own a refrigerator, television, or washing machine. Even prostitution was practiced by young women willing to give their bodies to ministers and senior military officers in exchange for privileges—never cash. These were the courtesans of socialism who, years later with the arrival of the convertible currency, were transformed into prostitutes in the traditional sense.

The Impact on Personal Freedoms But the infringement of rights did not stop there. Real socialism had an ardor for atheism, and among the questions you had to answer to get a job, enroll in the university, or receive new housing, would be whether you had religious beliefs, which creed you preferred, and how you practiced it. The questions were not a formality, nor a statistical curiosity, because the answers concealed an easy-to-guess password to admission.

While homophobia is not the exclusive patrimony of communists, it is worth remembering that homosexuals could be expelled from any school or workplace. In addition, in the 1970s, many homosexuals were interned in reeducation centers under a regimen of forced labor.

Renouncing the practice of the religion you believed in, or of acting on your sexual preference, was equivalent to giving up gems of freedom. They were the currency of exchange required, and those who agreed to the exchange had the impression that it was a small sacrifice for the sake of the future they were promised. They paid with images of the virgin, rosaries, and scapulars for a hypothetical future that seemed, incredibly, just like the celestial kingdom the sacred books spoke of.

Lowering self-esteem seems to be an essential condition to produce at least a minimum level of acceptance of the loss of freedom. In the peculiar case of Cuba, since the 1970s there has been an attempt to shape a kind of person whose aspirations would not exceed the ceiling that the state had set for him: individuals who would have a self-perception that they could not compete, men and women who should feel satisfied, and even grateful, with what little could be given to everyone equally. Mediocrity began to be called modesty, while self-confidence was branded as arrogance. Amid a widespread lack of material things, the true revolutionary embraced the austerity that labeled the slightest weakness for fashionable clothing as extravagance, while consumerism and any desire for the new was considered as unpardonable. Listening to foreign music, reading literature by authors not in the socialist Parnassus, wearing your hair in a certain way—these manifestations were condemned as ideological deviations which sooner or later would have to be analyzed, and for which one would have to repent through public selfcriticism.

In the midst of this forced austerity and a growing effort to standardize Cuban society, art was given the task of shaping “new ideological values,” thus discrediting its function as a vehicle of expression for the artist. Ernesto Guevara had already had the arrogance to enunciate the original sin of the intellectuals; referring to their poor participation in the fight against Batista, he said they had not been revolutionaries. Earning the revolutionary “diploma” became an obsession for writers and artists who, caught between fear and complacency, accepted the maxim that governed, and still governs, the political culture of the country: “Within the Revolution, everything; against the Revolution, nothing.”

Freedom of expression came to be considered “freedom of the bourgeois press,” and freedom of association an illegal act to overthrow the Revolution. Civil society found itself restricted to revolutionary organizations which were mere transmitters of official views. The unions did not represent the interests of the workers against management, but functioned as extensions of state power to instruct the workers in socialist planning directives to meet production goals. Student associations ceased to be a tool for the young to stand up to school authorities, and evolved into an instrument of the Ministry of Education to enforce disciplinary rules. Nor were women’s organizations a platform to demand women’s rights, but rather a bureaucratic structure to incorporate women into production. The same occurred with the other institutions, including the peasants’ association, the journalists’ union, the writers’ and artists’ union, the college of architects, and even stamp collecting clubs.

Belonging to these organizations, which function in effect as neo-governmental organizations rather than non-governmental organizations, became obligatory. Still today, on any form, whether to register for a language class, ask permission to leave the country, or apply for a new job, the same question always appears: Are you an active member of any of these organizations? On occasion, the organizations are listed and you need only to check the boxes, as if it is illogical that there might be other organizations, or because there are no others. For anything involving the slightest privilege, you must bring a letter, on letterhead with a signature and a stamp, that guarantees, “the bearer is a comrade in the Revolution who participates in all its activities.” But for a higher-level request these trifles are not enough. For something truly important, one must be a member of the Party or its youth organization, and for this, surrendering a small amount of freedom is not sufficient.

The Candid Surrender of the Idealist In all these years, now totaling half a century, many dreamers have believed that the best way to solve the country’s problems, the right path, the appropriate place to correct flaws, was found only within the Communist Party. Of course, becoming a party militant is a voluntary act, but the law establishes that other political organizations cannot be founded, and as a result, it is illegal to belong to any party other than the Cuban Communist Party. All those with political concerns—or simply a sense of civic responsibility—who are interested in promoting initiatives to improve life in their country, will only find a legal space to do so within the party.

To be admitted into the ranks of this select fraternity is accepted as proof, by any examiners, that an applicant is genuine and his intention is not to criticize, but to help. If you express yourself you cannot enter, and if you do not enter you cannot express yourself. This is the conflict that snares those who wish to improve the system through their observations and opinions. Once in the party, they learn that at the entry level they will not be heard, and that in order to climb the ladder, where they supposedly might be able to exercise influence, they have to swallow their criticisms. In the long run they are either domesticated by the machinery or expelled from it as an undesirable excrescence.

The approach of temporarily surrendering freedoms to gain access to a place from where you might reclaim them ends—for those who believe in this dangerous equation—in a well-calculated swindle. During the long silence that supposedly guarantees a platform to eventually speak from, idealists end up confusing faces with masks, the feigned for the felt. No one is going to return the freedoms pawned in this chameleonic act, which leaves idealists trapped between frustration and opportunism.

#### A total shift is impossible—working at the intersection of economics and environmental sustainability is critical

Barry 07 – Dr. John Barry is Director of the Institute of Governance, Public Policy and Social Research and Co-Director of the Centre for Sustainability and Environmental Governance at Queen’s University Belfast. His areas of research include the normative aspects of environmental policy, politics and sustainable development; environmental governance; the governance of science and innovation; the link between academic knowledge and policy making; trust, legitimacy and public policy; citizenship, public policy and governance; theories and practices of reconciliation in Northern Ireland. (“Towards a model of green political economy: from ecological modernisation to economic security”, Int. J. Green Economics, Vol. 1, Nos. 3/4, 2007, http://www.inderscience.com/storage/f614812932511107.pdf)

1 Introduction Economic analysis has been one of the weakest and least developed areas of broadly green/sustainable development thinking. For example, whatever analysis there is within the green political canon is largely utopian – usually based on an argument for the complete transformation of modern society and economy as the only way to deal with ecological catastrophe, an often linked to a critique of the socioeconomic failings of capitalism that echoed a broadly radical Marxist/socialist or anarchist analysis; or underdeveloped – due, in part, to the need to outline and develop other aspects of green political theory. However, this gap within green thinking has recently been filled by a number of scholars, activists, think tanks, and environmental NGOs who have outlined various models of green political economy to underpin sustainable development political aims, principles and objectives. The aim of this article is to offer a draft of a realistic, but critical, version of green political economy to underpin the economic dimensions of radical views about sustainable development. It is written explicitly with a view to encouraging others to think through this aspect of sustainable development in a collaborative manner. Combined realism and radicalism marks this article, which starts with the point that we cannot build or seek to create a sustainable economy ab nihlo, but must begin from where we are, with the structures, institutions, modes of production, laws and regulations that we already have. Of course, this does not mean simply accepting these as immutable or set in stone; after all, some of the current institutions, principles and structures underpinning the dominant economic model are the very causes of unsustainable development. We do need to recognise, however, that we must work with (and ‘through’ – in the terms of the original German Green Party’s slogan of ‘marching through the institutions’) these existing structures, as well as change and reform and in some cases, abandon them as either unnecessary or positively harmful to the creation and maintenance of a sustainable economy and society. Equally, this article also recognises that an alternative economy and society must be based in the reality that most people (in the West) will not democratically vote for a completely different type of society and economy. That reality must also accept that a ‘green economy’ is one that is recognisable to most people and that indeed safeguards and guarantees not just their basic needs but also aspirations(within limits). The realistic character of the thinking behind this article accepts that consumption and materialistic lifestyles are here to stay (so long as they do not transgress any of the critical thresholds of the triple bottom line) and indeed there is little to be gained by proposing alternative economic systems, which start from a complete rejection of consumption and materialism. The appeal to realism is in part an attempt to correct the common misperception (and self-perception) of green politics and economics requiring an excessive degree of self-denial and a puritanical asceticism (Goodin, 1992, p.18; Allison, 1991, p.170–178). While rejecting the claim that green political theory calls for the complete disavowal of materialistic lifestyles, it is true that green politics does require the collective reassessment of such lifestyles, and does require a degree of shared sacrifice. It does not mean, however, that we necessarily require the complete and across-the-board rejection of materialistic lifestyles. There must be room and tolerance in a green economy for people to live ‘ungreen lives’ so long as they do not ‘harm’ others, threaten long-term ecological sustainability or create unjust levels of socioeconomic inequalities. Thus, realism in this context is in part another name for the acceptance of a broadly ‘liberal’ or ‘post-liberal’ (but certainly not anti-liberal) green perspective.1 At the same time, while critical of the ‘abstract’ and ‘unrealistic’ utopianism that peppers green and radical thinking in this area, I do not intend to reject utopianism. Indeed, I agree with Oscar Wilde that a map of the world that does not have utopia on it, is not worth looking at. The spirit in which this article is written is more in keeping with framing green and sustainability concerns within a ‘concrete utopian’ perspective (Hayward, 1995) or what the Marxist geographer Harvey (1996) calls a ‘utopianism of process’, to be distinguished from ‘closed’, blueprint-like and abstract utopian visions. Accordingly, the model of green political economy outlined here is in keeping with Lukes’ (1984, p.158) suggestion that a concrete utopianism depends on the ‘knowledge of a self-transforming present, not an ideal future’. It accepts the current dominance of one particular model of green political economy – namely, ‘Ecological Modernisation’ (EM) – as the preferred ‘political economy’ underpinning contemporary state and market forms of sustainable development, and further accepts the necessity for green politics to positively engage in the debates and policies around EM from a strategic (as well as a normative) point of view. However, it is also conscious of the limits and problems with ecological modernisation, particularly in terms of its technocratic, supply-side and reformist ‘business as usual’ approach, and seeks to explore the potential to radicalise EM or use it as a ‘jumping off’ point for more radical views of greening the economy. The article begins by outlining EM in theory and practice, specifically in relation to the British state’s ‘sustainable development’ policy agenda under New Labour. It maintains that EM, as currently practised by the British state, is ‘weak’ and largely turns on the centrality of ‘innovation’ and ‘eco-efficiency’; it then goes on to investigate in more detail the role of the market within current conceptualisations of EM and other models of green political economy. In particular, a potentially powerful distinction (both in conceptual and in policy debates) between ‘the market’ and ‘capitalism’ has yet to be sufficiently explored and exploited as a starting point for the development of radical, viable and attractive conceptions of green political economy as alternatives to both EM and the orthodox economic paradigm. In particular, the role of the market in innovation and as part of the ‘governance’ for sustainable development in which eco-efficiency and EM of the economy is linked to non-ecological demands of green politics and sustainable development, such as social and global justice, egalitarianism, democratic regulation of the market and the conceptual (and policy) expansion of the ‘economy’ to include social, informal and non-cash economic activity and a progressive role for the state (especially at the local/municipal level). Here, the argument is that the ‘environmental’ argument or basis of green political economy in terms of the need for the economy to become more resource efficient, minimise pollution and waste and so on, has largely been won. What that means is that no one is disputing the need for greater resource productivity, energy and eco-efficiency. Both state and corporate/business actors have accepted the environmental ‘bottom line’ (often rhetorically, but nonetheless important) as a conditioning factor in the pursuit of the economic ‘bottom line’. However, what has been less remarked upon is the social ‘bottom line’ and the centrality of this non-environmental set of principles and policy objectives to green political economy. In particular, the argument for lessening socioeconomic inequality and re-distributive policies to do this have not been as prominent within the green political economy and models of sustainable development as they perhaps should be. One of the reasons for focusing on the ‘social bottom line’ is to suggest that the distinctiveness and critical relevance of a distinctly ‘green’ (as opposed to ‘environmental’ or ‘ecological’) political economy will increasingly depend on developing a political agenda around these non-environmental/resource policy areas as states, businesses and other political parties converge around the EM agenda of reconciling the environmental and economic bottom lines, through an almost exclusive focus on the environmental bottom line. It is in developing a radical political and economic agenda around the social and economic bottom lines that the green political economy needs to focus on. It is for this reason that the final part of the paper looks at the long-standing green commitment to re-orientate the economy towards enhancing and being judged by ‘quality of life’ and ‘well-being’. The more recent discourse around ‘economic security’ is then discussed as building upon and related to the quality of life perspective, and is viewed as a potentially important driver and policy objective for green political economy in practice, in succinctly presenting the green economic case for a new type of economy, in which redistribution and reducing socioeconomic inequality are central. The model of green political economy presented here is defined in part by its commitment to ‘economic security’, which has the strategic political advantage of presenting a positive and attractive discourse for sustainable development arguments, unlike the (still prevalent) negative and often disempowering discourse of ‘limits to growth’, which does not of course mean denying the reality of limits (which are not just ecological, but also include social, cultural and psychological and biological dimensions). The point is that using the language and analysis of economic security is a more attractive and compelling way of arguing and presenting the case for a less growth-orientated economy and consumption-orientated society and one that aims for putting quality of life at the heart of economic thinking and policy. 2 Ecological modernisation in theory and practice in Britain The New Labour government is clearly committed to an EM approach to sustainable development. In a speech on sustainable development Blair (2003) stated that, “tackling climate change or other environmental challenges need not limit greater economic opportunity…economic development, social justice and environmental modernisation must go hand in hand”. This ‘win-win’ logic has also been echoed by the deputy Prime Minister Prescott (2003), who, in a speech to the Fabian Society held that: “There is a widespread view that environmental damage is the price we have to pay for economic progress…Modern environmentalism recognises that…an efficient, clean economy will mean more, not less economic growth and prosperity…Treating the environment with respect will not impede economic progress, it will help identify areas of inefficiency and waste and so unleash whole new forces of innovation.” Like the EM discourse, New Labour sustainable development policy rhetoric adopts the language of business and orthodox economic growth, emphasising the business case for sustainability by linking environmental management with greater resource efficiency, cost reduction and enhanced competitiveness. Typical of this is the Department for Trade and Industry, which notes that, “The environment is a business opportunity...there are economic benefits in reducing waste, avoiding pollution and using resources more efficiently…Reducing pollution through better technology will almost always lower costs or raise product value/differentiation” (DTI, 2000, p.7). This business case for rendering orthodox neo-classical economic growth compatible with environmental considerations can also be found outside Westminster in the devolved administrations. In Scotland, the Scottish Executive’s Enterprise Minister Jim Wallace has recently announce a ‘Green Jobs Strategy’, stating that: “Economic growth and job creation can and should go hand in hand with promoting Scotland's natural environment and, through exports, sustaining good environmental practice overseas. A Green Jobs Strategy will focus our efforts on delivering sustainable growth, which will generate employment while improving our environment and raising living standards across the country. As well as creating new business opportunities, better waste management and more efficient use of resources benefits the bottom line – raising productivity and making a big contribution to environmental targets.” (Scottish Executive, 2005) The notion that orthodox economic growth, employment and investment patterns and the cross-sectoral goals of sustainable development might be in serious tension is excluded from the government’s rhetoric on the environment and the ‘greening of the economy’; it is certainly not presented as a possibly problematic issue for industrial production processes or for global capitalism or the new orthodoxy of export-led growth. Instead, environmental protection and economic growth are portrayed as a positive-sum game, a ‘business opportunity’, suggesting that EM is the basis upon which current debates on environmental and sustainable development policy in the UK are founded (Barry and Paterson, 2004).

#### The embargo is way worse than the method we employ to remove it

Nichols 5 (Dick, The Cuban Revolution in the Epoch of Neoliberal Globalisation, http://readingfromtheleft.com/PDF/CubaNeoLiberalEpoch.pdf)

10. Washington’s policy towards the Cuban Revolution remains what it has always been — to eliminate the Castro leadership and to show that any revolution in its “backyard” is doomed to fail, as “proven” by the examples of Grenada, Nicaragua, El Salvador and Guatemala. The determination of the Cuban people to defend their revolution and the refusal of the Cuban leadership to compromise on their support for popular struggles means that there can be no question of any type of peaceful coexistence between Washington and Havana. The principle factor is not the weight of the counter-revolutionary Miami lobby in US domestic politics (overridden in the Elián González case to avoid exposing Washington’s anti-Cuba policy even more than occurred) but Cuba’s role as example, as a social alternative that has put an end to capitalist rule. Thus, even though certain sections of US business (the farm lobby, computing) would gain from an end to the economic war against the island, the overall interests of US imperialism dictate maintenance of the blockade, which all objective accounts show to have inflicted massive damage on the Cuban economy and people (US$181 billion according to the damages claim of the National Assembly of People’s Power). ¶ 11. The blockade is not, as some liberal opponents claim, a “mistake” by a US government that doesn’t understand its own interests and whose removal would supposedly free the Cuban people to overthrow the “dictator” Castro. It is a vital weapon in a US counter-revolutionary strategy that is composed of five interrelated elements: (1) terrorist acts, economic sabotage, biological war and even military attacks; (2) an intensified economic war, which includes the Torricelli Act (1992), the Helms-Burton Act (1996) and a campaign to dissuade investors from doing business with the island or buying Cuban exports; (3) incitement of Cubans to leave Cuba illegally through the provisions of the Cuban Adjustment Act, which grants automatic residency rights to Cubans reaching US territory; (4) a campaign of financing domestic dissidence in the name of “building civil society”; and, (5) a propaganda and disinformation war implemented in violation of international law through 24 radio transmitters and Television Martí.

### 2AC—OFAC

#### Condo

#### Only allows exports—doesn’t allow two way trade—that’s key—kost

#### Perm do both

#### OFAC links to politics and doesn’t solve

John McAuliff 1/22/2012 (Director of the Fund for Reconciliation and Development, "One Year On: the Semi-opening of Cuba Travel" thehavananote.com/2012/01/one\_year\_semi\_opening\_cuba\_travel)

A major error by the White House was to leave too much discretion in the hands of OFAC, **the understaffed inherently distrustful embargo** enforcement arm of the Treasury Department. OFAC is proving to be a **choke point rather than a facilitator,** perhaps made ever more cautious by **rising complaints from hard line opponents** of travel in Congress.

Based just on our organization's sequential numbering, OFAC received between our first attempt of February 24 (CT-17448) and our sixth revision of January 11 (CT-18987) a total of 1539 applications in less than eleven months. We don't know how many have been rejected, or are in the limbo of “pending”.

As one attorney wrote: **it's a bureaucratic black hole**. it requires persistence. For instance, the regs state clearly one can apply "by letter", and I did, following carefully the instructions. When, months after submitting it, OFAC said it was waiting for my application form, I pointed out that the regs state the application can be by letter. No response yet. With another applicant they said the sample itinerary did not show enough "intimate people contact", which is a mystery because there was clearly all sorts of people contact daily.

#### Perm do the counterplan—plantext says “allow”

### 2AC—Energy Indep DA

#### Canada, mexico, etc

#### Energy independence now

**Donilon 13** – National Security Advisor 2010-2013 in the Obama administration, worked as Executive Vice President for Law and Policy at Fannie Mae (Tom Donilon, “Energy and American Power”, June 15, 2013, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/139509/tom-donilon/energy-and-american-power)

Energy is a profoundly important aspect of U.S. national security and foreign policy: the availability of reliable, affordable energy is essential to economic strength at home, which is the foundation of U.S. leadership in the world. Scarce resources have driven both commerce and conflict since time immemorial -- and still do today. Energy supplies present strategic leverage and disposable income for countries that have them. The challenge of accessing affordable energy is shared by people and businesses in every country -- young democracies, emerging powers, and developing nations -- allies and adversaries alike. Disruptions in supply in one location can have global economic impacts.

Energy shapes national interests and international relations. It influences politics, development, governance, and the security and stability of the environment. For all these reasons and more, increasing global access to secure, affordable, and clean energy is a national interest of the United States and a top priority for those of us entrusted with U.S. national security. Two recent developments have changed Washington’s approach toward energy: first, the substantial increase of affordable energy resources within the United States affects the country’s economic growth, energy security, and geopolitical position. Second, climate change, driven by the world’s use of energy, presents not just a transcendent challenge for the world but a present-day national security threat to the United States. Both forces should push the United States and other countries toward cleaner, more sustainable energy solutions.

The current optimism about the U.S. energy picture is a relatively new development. Even as recently as 2008, when President Barack Obama took office, energy experts predicted that the United States would need to double its imports of liquefied natural gas (LNG) over the next five years. However, thanks to U.S. innovation and technology, nearly all of those estimates have been turned on their head. U.S. oil consumption peaked in 2005 and has been declining since and alternative energy sources are being developed. Domestic oil and natural gas production has increased every year Obama has been in office -- now at seven million barrels of oil per day, the highest level in over two decades. The International Energy Agency projects that the United States could be the world’s largest oil producer by the end of the decade. And the United States is already the top natural gas producer in the world.

Meanwhile, natural gas imports are down almost 60 percent since 2005, and the U.S. now exports more natural gas than ever to Mexico and Canada. In addition, for the first time in over 60 years, the United States is exporting more refined petroleum products than it is importing. And U.S. energy-related greenhouse gas emissions have also fallen to 1994 levels due in large part to Obama’s success over the past four years in **doubling electricity from renewables**, **switching from coal to natural gas** in power generation, and **improving energy efficiency**.

The new U.S. energy posture and outlook will **directly** strengthen the nation’s economy. As Obama has said, a country’s political and **military primacy** depends on its **economic vitality**. Strength at home is critical to strength in the world, and the **U.S. energy boom** has proven to be an important driver for the country’s economic recovery -- boosting jobs, economic activity, and government revenues. In North Dakota, for example, unemployment has dropped to near three percent, the lowest in the country, and the state has a $3.8 billion budget surplus, largely due to increased unconventional gas and oil production. IHS Cambridge Energy Research Associates estimates that the shale gas industry directly or indirectly employed 600,000 Americans in 2010, a number that could double by 2020.

Natural gas production has also sparked a **domestic manufacturing revival**. Manufacturers in energy-intensive sectors, including chemical, steel, plastics, and glass companies, have announced up to $95 billion investments across the United States to take advantage of low-cost natural gas. Furthermore, as a result of U.S. investments in clean energy, tens of thousands of Americans have jobs and the United States is now home to some of the largest wind and solar farms in the world. Domestic economic developments like these improve the country’s world standing and send a **powerful message** that the United States has the resources, as well as the **resolve**, to remain a **preeminent power** for years to come.

The United States’ new energy posture allows Washington to engage in international affairs from a **position of strength**. Increasing U.S. energy supplies acts as a **cushion** that helps **reduce the country’s vulnerability** to global supply disruptions and price shocks. It also affords Washington a stronger hand in pursuing and implementing its international security goals. For example, the United States is engaged in a dual-track strategy that marshals pressure on Iran in pursuit of constructive engagement that addresses global concerns about Iran’s nuclear program. As part of the pressure track, the United States has engaged in tireless diplomacy to persuade relevant nations to end or significantly reduce their consumption of Iranian oil while emphasizing to suppliers the importance of keeping the world oil market stable and well supplied. The substantial increase in oil production in the United States and elsewhere means that international sanctions and U.S. and allied efforts could remove one million barrels per day of Iranian oil from the market while minimizing the burden on the rest of the world. The same approach is being used in Syria today and was used in Libya in 2011.

#### No perception link—current us increases in production are expected which means the plan would just be perceived as part of that expected move toward domestic production—especially when the reserves near Cuba have been discovered and made known, they just haven’t been extracted

#### Cuban oil is statistically insignificant

Benjamin-Alvadaro 10 (Jonathan, Report for the Cuban Research Institute, Florida International University, PhD, Professor of Political Science at University of Nebraska at Omaha, Director of the Intelligence Community Centers of Academic Excellence Program at UNO, Treasurer of the American Political Science Association, “Cuba’s Energy Future: Strategic Approaches to Cooperation”)

At present Cuba possesses an estimated 4.6 million barrels of oil and 9.3 TFC (total final consumption) of natural gas in North Cuba Basin.4 This is approximately half of the estimated 10.4 billion barrels of recoverable crude oil in the Alaska Natural Wildlife Reserve. If viewed in strictly instrumental terms—namely, increasing the pool of potential imports to the U.S. market by accessing Cuban oil and ethanol holdings—Cuba’s oil represents little in the way of absolute material gain to the U.S. energy supply. But the possibility of energy cooperation between the United States and Cuba offers significant relative gains connected to the potential for developing production-sharing agreements, promoting the transfer of state-of-the art technology and foreign direct investment, and increasing opportunities for the development of joint-venture partnerships, and scientific-technical exchanges.

#### No Saudi prolif

* No capabilities
* Too controversial and destabilizing
* Committed to economic reforms
* Official opposition

Lippman ’11 [Thomas, senior adjunct scholar at the Council on Foreign Relations in Washington. His career in journalism at the Washington Post included four years as the Washington Post’s Middle East bureau chief, three years as the Post’s oil and energy reporter and a decade as the newspaper’s national security and diplomatic correspondent, he traveled extensively to Saudi Arabia, 8-5-11, “Saudi Arabia’s Nuclear Policy,” http://www.susris.com/2011/08/05/saudi-arabia%E2%80%99s-nuclear-policy-lippman/]

It is highly unlikely, however, that Saudi Arabia would wish to acquire its own nuclear arsenal or that it is capable of doing so. King Abdullah’s comments should not be taken as a dispositive statement of considered policy. There are compelling reasons why Saudi Arabia would not undertake an effort to develop or acquire nuclear weapons, even in the unlikely event that Iran achieves a stockpile and uses this arsenal to threaten the Kingdom.

Money is not an issue — if destitute North Korea can develop nuclear weapons, Saudi Arabia surely has the resources to pursue such a program. With oil prices above $90 a barrel, Riyadh is flush with cash. But the acquisition or development of nuclear weapons would be provocative, destabilizing, controversial and extremely difficult for Saudi Arabia, and ultimately would be more likely to weaken the kingdom than strengthen it. The kingdom has committed itself to an industrialization and economic development program that depends on open access to global markets and materials; becoming a nuclear outlaw would be fatal to those plans.

Pursuing nuclear weapons would be a flagrant violation of Saudi Arabia’s commitments under the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT), and would surely cause a serious breach with the United States. Saudi Arabia lacks the industrial and technological base to develop such weapons on its own. An attempt to acquire nuclear weapons by purchasing them, perhaps from Pakistan, would launch Saudi Arabia on a dangerously inflammatory trajectory that could destabilize the entire region, which Saudi Arabia’s leaders know would not be in their country’s best interests. The Saudis always prefer stability to turmoil. Their often-stated official position is that the entire Middle East should become an internationally supervised region free of all weapons of mass destruction.

### 2AC—CIR DA

#### PC bad for immigration and XO solves

Altman and Miller 13 – Zeke Miller is a political reporter for TIME. He previously was the first White House correspondent at BuzzFeed and extensively covered the 2012 Presidential campaign. Prior to that, he covered politics for Business Insider. Alex Altman is a Washington correspondent for TIME. (“Sidelined Obama Faces Impossible Task on Immigration”, July 11, 2013, <http://swampland.time.com/2013/07/11/sidelined-obama-faces-impossible-task-on-immigration/>)

Here’s a simple litmus test to gauge the odds of passing immigration reform: **the more President Obama is talking about the issue, the better the chance the bill dies**. As the Senate haggled over a sweeping bill to rewrite U.S. immigration policy, Obama lurked in the shadows, eschewing public negotiations and leaving his aides to work Capitol back channels. But now, with a **radioactive image** among House Republicans, and **few tools to tame congressional gridlock**, the President is preparing to take a more vocal role. It is, allies concede, a telling sign that the bill’s fortunes are foundering in the fractious Republican-controlled House — and a symbol of Obama’s vanishing clout just six months into his second term. Democratic officials expect that over the coming weeks Obama will travel across the U.S., likely to strategically important states like Nevada, North Carolina and Texas, to highlight the economic benefits of the law. Obama summoned Democratic Senator Chuck Schumer and Republican Senator John McCain to the White House on Thursday to discuss ways to advance the bill in the House. The West Wing is waiting on House Republicans to choose a path on immigration reform before finalizing its strategy, but aides plan a markedly different role for the President over the coming months. From the beginning of the Senate’s negotiations, Obama slipped into the background at the behest of Democratic leaders. On a Sunday night in January, days before the President was scheduled to deliver a speech on immigration at an event in Las Vegas, members of the Gang of Eight urged him to withhold specifics. Any principles the President set forth, they feared, would force Republicans to drag the bill to the right to avoid aligning with Obama. “I basically said to the President, give us some space,” Schumer, the lead Democratic negotiator, told TIME last month. “You can give us deadlines, but don’t get involved in the details here, because to get a bipartisan bill, you can’t be all that helpful. And he agreed. He has been perfect on this issue. If it passes, he’ll deserve a lot of credit, because he’s handled it exactly right.” But the challenge in the House is different. **The mere mention of Obama’s name makes the “hell no” caucus shudder**. His toxicity with House Republicans makes his presence in legislative negotiations a liability. One reason the GOP is pushing for border security before legalization is they suspect that once the bill is passed, Obama will enforce only the parts that he likes. “Enforcement can’t be conditioned on the President’s goodwill and honesty,” says Republican activist Grover Norquist, “because there isn’t a belief that it exists.” For his part, Obama is looking for cues from House Democrats on how to proceed. During a summit at the White House on Wednesday, Obama asked members of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus how he could be helpful, according to a Democratic aide briefed on the meeting. For now, the plan is to highlight the economic benefits of comprehensive immigration reform without assigning blame to House Republicans, who aren’t in the mood to be lectured. “If he thinks barnstorming the country, or attacking Republicans or saying what he thinks is in the Republicans’ best interest, he’s wrong,” says a House GOP leadership aide. “You don’t need to raise the temperature here any higher than it is.” The White House is planning to step up its efforts with business leaders and stakeholders, and will deploy members of the Cabinet to hold events in support of immigration reform. Meanwhile senior staff will be spending more time on the phones with CEOs, faith leaders and community groups that can help the cause. The push is expected to gear up once the direction of the House Republican conference becomes clear. The GOP emerged from a two-hour closed meeting in the basement of the Capitol with no consensus — except perhaps that “this Administration cannot be trusted,” as House Republicans leaders declared in a joint statement. (MORE: Explainer: Why It Costs Immigrants $680 to Apply for Naturalization) If reform fails, Administration officials are plotting how to keep Obama on the right side of public opinion. They won’t rule out the possibility of further executive actions to circumvent Congress in the event the House fails to act. Congressional gridlock has driven Obama down this path before. He issued a series of executive orders on gun control, and toughened emissions standards on vehicles and power plants when climate legislation faltered. He also used executive authority to halt deportations of so-called DREAMers at the height of last year’s presidential campaign. But Representative Albio Sires, a New Jersey Democrat, told reporters after a meeting with Obama that the President was wary of taking executive action to further curb deportations now. “He’s afraid that it’s going to harm the overall process of trying to get immigration done,” Sires said, according to Politico. A key difficulty for the Administration is the lack of leverage over House Republicans, who after redistricting have a wealth of safe seats. In a tacit admission that retaking the House anytime soon is a long shot, Administration officials say their chances of accomplishing immigration reform in two years would be lower than they are now, with the momentum of the Senate bill and the 2012 elections. But the politics would be in their favor, with Republicans bearing the brunt of the blame for sinking the bill. As Obama aides know, immigration will be a potent issue in the 2016 presidential race, even if it can’t help them reclaim the House next year. Obama isn’t the only President to find himself beguiled by immigration reform. George W. Bush’s push to overhaul immigration policy was stymied by his own party during his second term as well. But Obama’s vanishing swat on Capitol Hill is a sign that he began losing traction in his second term from the start. “It’s a sad indictment of the way politics operates these days, but House and Senate Republicans have made it very clear they don’t want anything to do with President Obama,” says Jim Manley, a veteran Democratic strategist and longtime aide to Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, who, like many Capitol Hill observers, thinks Obama has taken a shrewd approach to immigration. And yet, Obama’s relegation to a supporting role on one of the signature legislative fights of his second term marks the limits of his powers. “He’s a lightning rod — unfairly so,” Manley says. “If he starts trying to get involved legislatively, that’s a Drudge warning siren that the bill’s dying a slow, painful death.”

#### Menendez wouldn’t target CIR—he loves it—their card sucks

#### No chance of passage

Gomez 10-17 [Alan. “Shutdown over, Democrats say immigration is next” *USA Today*, 10/17/13 ln//GBS-JV]

Before the bill to end the budget impasse even hit President Obama's desk Wednesday, he and congressional Democrats had pivoted to what they hope is the next big legislative battle: an overhaul of the nation's immigration laws including citizenship for the nation's 12 million undocumented immigrants.¶ "I look forward to the next venture, which is making sure we do immigration reform," Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, D-Nev., said late Wednesday.¶ "Good luck," said Rep. Trey Gowdy, R-S.C., who chairs the House immigration committee.¶ House Republicans emerged from the 16-day shutdown fight angered at the White House and Reid for refusing to negotiate over the terms to end the shutdown and lift the nation's debt ceiling, and emboldened to wage more strategic legislative strikes in the future.¶ Gowdy has been moderately supportive of immigration changes and says he maintains good relationships with House Democrats. "But it's a little disingenuous to treat the House as an irrelevant branch of government and then say, 'By the way, tomorrow you'll need to go ahead and push (immigration reform),'" Gowdy said. "It doesn't work that way."¶ Democrats are hopeful that Republicans, mindful of the party's poor standing nationally with Hispanics, will support a comprehensive approach. Obama said Thursday that immigration is one of the three agenda items he wants Congress to pass this year. Sen. Charles Schumer, D-N.Y., told MSNBC Thursday that an immigration overhaul is "the thing (Obama) wants to get more than anything else" in his second term.¶ House Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, remains publicly and privately committed to advancing immigration legislation in this Congress, but there is virtually no interest among GOP lawmakers to advance the kind of sweeping bill that Democrats are seeking. Instead, Republicans are more likely to pursue a piecemeal approach to address issues individually, such as border security and visas for high-skilled workers.¶ Rep. Raul Labrador, R-Idaho, a Tea Party conservative who was once a member of a bipartisan House group that tried to draft a broad immigration bill, said the prospects for even smaller bills are slim in the House.¶ "It's not going to happen this year," Labrador said. "After the way the president acted over the last two or three weeks where he would refuse to talk to the speaker of the House ... they're not going to get immigration reform. That's done."¶ Getting immigration changes through the House was always going to be a difficult task. The majority of House Republicans have consistently opposed the bill passed by the Senate in July that allows the nation's undocumented immigrants to apply for U.S. citizenship after 13 years, something many in the conference refer to as "amnesty."¶ That means Boehner, who struggled to unify his members throughout the shutdown, would have to "divide the conference" to pass an immigration bill, said Rep. Tim Huelskamp, R-Kan.¶ "That would really melt down the conference," said Huelskamp, a Tea Party conservative.¶ That faction of the House wielded considerable influence over the chamber throughout the 16-day shutdown, pushing Boehner to demand cuts or delays to the president's signature health care law. Those conservatives were supported by Sen. Ted Cruz, R-Texas, a presidential contender for 2016 whose saw his notoriety grow as he railed against Obamacare and the national debt.¶ And while Cruz was marginalized earlier this year during Senate hearings on the immigration law, his opposition to the bill may get new life through the more conservative wing of the House.¶ "As we've recently seen, he has the ear of a number of people in the House and I think he's going to be a factor," said Rep. Mario Diaz-Balart, R-Fla., another member of the bipartisan House immigration group who remains confident something can pass.

#### Passing immigration reform isn’t an opportunity cost to the plan since the judge has agential ambit to do both—you should only consider real-world opportunity costs because that’s critical training for real-world decisionmaking

#### No impact—their authors construct and inflate threats

Brito and Watkins 11 – Jerry is a Senior Research Fellow at the Mercatus Center at George Mason University. Tate is a Research Associate at the Mercatus Center at George Mason University. (“Loving the Cyber Bomb? The Dangers of Threat Inflation in Cybersecurity Policy”, April 26, 2011, <http://mercatus.org/sites/default/files/publication/110421-cybersecurity.pdf>)

Over the past two years there has been a steady drumbeat of alarmist rhetoric coming out of Washington about potential catastrophic cyber threats. For example, at a Senate Armed Services Committee hearing last year, Chairman Carl Levin said that “cyberweapons and cyberattacks potentially can be devastating, approaching weapons of mass destruction in their effects.”1 Proposed responses include increased federal spending on cybersecurity and the regulation of private network security practices. The rhetoric of “cyber doom”2 employed by proponents of increased federal intervention, however, lacks clear evidence of a serious threat that can be verified by the public. As a result, the United States may be witnessing a bout of threat inflation similar to that seen in the run-up to the Iraq War. Additionally, a cyber-industrial complex is emerging, much like the military-industrial complex of the Cold War. This complex may serve to not only supply cybersecurity solutions to the federal government, but to drum up demand for them as well. Part I of this article draws a parallel between today’s cybersecurity debate and the run-up to the Iraq War and looks at how an inflated public conception of the threat we face may lead to unnecessary regulation of the Internet. Part II draws a parallel between the emerging cybersecurity establishment and the military-industrial complex of the Cold War and looks at how unwarranted external influence can lead to unnecessary federal spending. Finally, Part III surveys several federal cybersecurity proposals and presents a framework for analyzing the cybersecurity threat. I.THREAT INFLATION, THE IRAQ WAR, AND PARALLELS TO THE CYBER DEBATE Threat inflation is a concept in political science that refers to “the attempt by elites to create concern for a threat that goes beyond the scope and urgency that a disinterested analysis would justify.”3 Different actors— including members of Congress; defense contractors; journalists; policy experts; academics; and civilian, military, and intelligence officials—will each have their own motives for contributing to threat inflation. When a threat is inflated, the marketplace of ideas on which a democracy relies to make sound judgments—in particular, the media and popular debate—can become overwhelmed by fallacious information.4 The result can be unwarranted public support for misguided policies. A. Run-Up to the Iraq War The run-up to the Iraq War illustrates the dynamic of threat inflation. After 9/11, the Bush Administration decided to invade Iraq to oust Saddam Hussein.5 Lacking any clear casus belli, the administration sought popular and congressional support for war by promoting several rationales that ultimately proved baseless.6 First, the administration implied that the Iraqi regime was connected to the terrorist attacks of 9/11.7 In a major speech outlining the Iraqi threat in October of 2002, President Bush stated that Iraq and al Qaeda had longstanding links, and that Iraq had provided training and medical treatment to members of al Qaeda.8 Vice President Cheney on various occasions made the claim that 9/11 hijacker Mohamed Atta had met with an Iraqi official in Prague in 2001.9 Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld called evidence of the link “bulletproof,” and Condoleezza Rice echoed those claims.10 We now know that there was no solid evidence for those statements.11 For one thing, al Qaeda, under the direction of Osama Bin Laden, was a fundamentalist Muslim organization that despised the secular government of Saddam Hussein.12 More specifically, investigations by the FBI, CIA, and the U.N. concluded that these links did not exist.13 Mohamed Atta, for example, was in Florida at the time the alleged Prague meeting took place.14 President Bush ultimately admitted that he “had no evidence that Saddam Hussein was involved with September 11th,” but he did so only after the war had commenced. 15 As late as 2006, however, over 40 percent of Americans still said they believed Saddam Hussein was “personally” involved in the 9/11 attacks.16 Second, the administration also sought to make the case that Iraq threatened its neighbors and the United States with weapons of mass destruction (WMD). By framing the issue in terms of WMD, the administration was conflating the threat from nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons.17 While no doubt terrible, the destructive power of biological and chemical weapons is tiny next to that of a nuclear detonation.18 Conflating these threats, however, allowed the administration to link the unlikely but serious threat of nuclear weapons to the more likely but less serious threat posed by biological and chemical weapons.19 The president, vice president, and senior members of the administration made the claim that Iraq was close to acquiring nuclear weapons.20 They made these claims without providing any verifiable evidence. The evidence they did provide—Iraq’s alleged pursuit of uranium “yellowcake” from Niger and its purchase of aluminum tubes allegedly meant for uranium enrichment centrifuges—were ultimately determined to be unfounded.21 The administration was also aware at the time that the evidence it was presenting was problematic. The CIA had investigated the claim that Iraq had attempted to buy yellowcake in Niger and had concluded that it was false.22 Weeks before the invasion, it was revealed that the documents on which the claim had been predicated were forgeries.23 Similarly, technical experts at the Department of Energy had concluded that the aluminum tubes that had been purchased by Iraq were not suitable for uranium enrichment and were likely meant to build artillery rockets.24 Despite the lack of verifiable evidence to support the administration’s claims, the news media tended to report them unquestioned.25 The initial reporting on the aluminum tubes claim, for example, came in the form of a front page New York Times article by Judith Miller and Michael Gordon that relied entirely on anonymous administration sources.26 The article gave the impression that there was consensus that the tubes were meant for uranium enrichment.27 Later reporting by Miller and Gordon noted that, in fact, there were dissenting opinions on the purpose of the tubes among government experts.28 However, they were quick to dismiss those views, citing “other, more senior, officials” who insisted that the skeptics represented a minority view.29 One reason why the New York Times reports have been criticized so strongly is that they were later cited by the administration in making its case for war.30 Appearing on Meet the Press, Vice President Cheney answered a question about evidence of a reconstituted Iraqi nuclear program by stating: There’s a story in The New York Times this morning—this is—I don’t— and I want to attribute The Times. I don’t want to talk about, obviously, specific intelligence sources, but it’s now public that, in fact, [Saddam Hussein] has been seeking to acquire, and we have been able to intercept and prevent him from acquiring through this particular channel, the kinds of tubes that are necessary to build a centrifuge.31 This meant that the administration was able to cite its own leak—with the added imprimatur of the Times—as a rationale for war. Miller, who was criticized after the invasion for her credulous reporting, has defended herself by stating that as a reporter, “my job isn’t to assess the government’s information and be an independent intelligence analyst myself. My job is to tell readers of The New York Times what the government thought about Iraq’s arsenal.”32 This view of reporting as mere conduit for anonymous administration officials is dangerous because it can serve to give the endorsement of an independent media on controlled leaks by government insiders.33 Most members of Congress similarly took the administration at its word and were uncritical of the evidence underpinning the rationales for war. As Ronald R. Krebs and Jennifer Lobasz write, A large and critical group of Democrats, whose national profiles might have bolstered the opposition to war, shied away from criticizing the popular president leading the War on Terror: while a handful jumped enthusiastically on the Iraq bandwagon, many others quietly favored invasion or at most criticized unilateral action.34 While there are competing theories why it may have been the case,35 the fact is that our system of checks and balances failed to test the evidence of a serious threat from Iraq. B. Cyber Threat Inflation Over the past two years, there has been a drive for increased federal involvement in cybersecurity. This drive is evidenced by the introduction of several comprehensive cybersecurity bills in Congress,36 the initiation of several regulatory proceedings related to cybersecurity by the Federal Communications Commission and Commerce Department,37 and increased coverage of the issue in the media.38 The official consensus seems to be that the United States is facing a grave and immediate threat that only quick federal intervention can address.39 This narrative has gone largely unchallenged by members of Congress or the press, and it has inflated the threat. There is very little verifiable evidence to substantiate the threats claimed, and the most vocal proponents of a threat engage in rhetoric that can only be characterized as alarmist. Cyber threat inflation parallels what we saw in the run-up to the Iraq War. 1. The CSIS Commission Report One of the most widely cited arguments for increased federal involvement in cybersecurity can be found in the report of the Commission on Cybersecurity for the 44th Presidency.40 The Commission was convened by the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), a Washington think tank focused on foreign policy and defense. It was chaired by two members of Congress and composed of representatives of the IT industry, security consultants, academics, and former government officials.41 Beginning in February 2008, the Commission acted as a self-appointed transition team for whoever the next president would be. It held a series of open and closed-door meetings, received classified briefings from government officials,42 and in December issued its report warning that “cybersecurity is now a major national security problem for the United States,”43 and recommending that the federal government “regulate cyberspace.”44 In its report, the Commission makes assertions about the nature of the threat, such as, “America’s failure to protect cyberspace is one of the most urgent national security problems facing the new administration that will take office in January 2009. It is . . . a battle fought mainly in the shadows. It is a battle we are losing.”45 Unfortunately, the report provides little evidence to support such assertions. There is a brief recitation of various instances of cyber-espionage conducted against government computer systems.46 However, it does not put these cases in context, nor does it explain how these particular breaches demonstrate a national security crisis, or that “we are losing.” The report notes that Department of Defense computers are “probed hundreds of thousands of times each day.”47 This is a fact that proponents of increased federal involvement in cybersecurity often cite as evidence for a looming threat.48 However, probing and scanning networks are the digital equivalent of trying doorknobs to see if they are unlocked—a maneuver available to even the most unsophisticated would-be hackers.49 The number of times a computer network is probed is not evidence of an attack or a breach, or a even of a problem.50 More ominously, the report states that Porous information systems have allowed opponents to map our vulnerabilities and plan their attacks. Depriving Americans of electricity, communications, and financial services may not be enough to provide the margin of victory in a conflict, but it could damage our ability to respond and our will to resist. We should expect that exploiting vulnerabilities in cyber infrastructure will be part of any future conflict.”51 An enemy able to take down our electric, communications, and financial networks at will could be a serious national security threat. And it may well be the case that the state of security in government and private networks is deplorable. But the CSIS report advances no reviewable evidence to substantiate this supposed threat. There is no evidence in the report that opponents have “mapped vulnerabilities” and “planned attacks.” The probing of DoD computers and the specific cases of cyber espionage that the report cites do not bear on the probability of a successful attack on the electrical grid. Nevertheless, the Commission report and the cybersecurity bills it inspired prescribe regulation of the Internet. The report asserts plainly: “It is undeniable that an appropriate level of cybersecurity cannot be achieved without regulation, as market forces alone will never provide the level of security necessary to achieve national security objectives.”52 But without any verifiable evidence of a threat, how is one to know what exactly is the “appropriate level of cybersecurity” and whether market forces are providing it? How is one to judge whether the recommendations that make up the bulk of the Commission’s report are necessary or appropriate? Although never clearly stated, the implication seems to be that the report’s authors are working from classified sources, which might explain the dearth of verifiable evidence.53 To its credit, the Commission laments what it considers the “overclassification” of information related to cybersecurity.54 But this should not serve as an excuse. If our past experience with threat inflation teaches us anything, it is that we cannot accept the word of government officials with access to classified information as the sole source of evidence for the existence or scope of a threat. The watchword is “trust but verify.” Until those who seek regulation can produce clear reviewable evidence of a threat, we should discount assertions such as “The evidence is both compelling and overwhelming,”55 and, “This is a strategic issue on par with weapons of mass destruction and global jihad.”56 2. Cyber War While the CSIS Commission report may be one of the most cited documents suggesting that we face a grave cyber threat requiring an immediate federal response, the most popular brief for this view is the 2010 bestselling book Cyber War. 57 In it, former presidential cybersecurity advisor Richard A. Clarke and Council on Foreign Relations fellow Richard K. Knake make the case that the United States and its infrastructure is extremely vulnerable to military cyber attack by enemy states. They offer a set of recommendations that includes increased regulation of Internet service providers (ISPs) and electrical utilities.58 Clarke and Knake are clear about the threat they foresee. “Obviously, we have not had a full-scale cyber war yet,” they write, “but we have a good idea what it would look like if we were on the receiving end.”59 The picture they paint includes the collapse of the government’s classified and unclassified networks, refinery fires and explosions in cities across the country, the release of “lethal clouds of chlorine gas” from chemical plants, the midair collision of 737s, train derailments, the destruction of major financial computer networks, suburban gas pipeline explosions, a nationwide power blackout, and satellites in space spinning out of control.60 They explain somberly about the scene: Several thousand Americans have already died, multiples of that number are injured and trying to get to hospitals. . . . In the days ahead, cities will run out of food because of the train-system failures and the jumbling of data at trucking and distribution centers. Power will not come back up because nuclear plants have gone into secure lockdown and many conventional plants have had their generators permanently damaged. High-tension transmission lines on several key routes have caught fire and melted. Unable to get cash from ATMs or bank branches, some Americans will begin to loot stores. . . . In all the wars America has fought, no nation has ever done this kind of damage to our cities. A sophisticated cyber war attack by one of several nation-states could do that today, in fifteen minutes, without a single terrorist or soldier appearing in this country.61 According to Clarke and Knake, that is the threat we face unless the federal government takes immediate action. Readers of their bestselling book would no doubt be as frightened at the prospect of a cyber attack as they might have been at the prospect of Iraq passing nuclear weapons to al Qaeda. Yet Clarke and Knake assure us, “These are not hypotheticals.”62 Unfortunately, they present little, if any, evidence.63 The only verifiable evidence they present to support the possibility of a cyber doomsday relates to several well-known distributed denial of service (DDOS) attacks. A DDOS attack works by flooding a server on the Internet with more requests that it can handle, thereby causing it to malfunction. For example, the web server that hosts www.gmu.edu has a certain limited bandwidth and processing capacity with which to serve George Mason University’s home page to visitors.64 If several dozen persons were browsing university web pages and simultaneously requested GMU’s homepage, the server would likely perform perfectly well. However, if the server encountered a hundred thousand requests for the home page every second, it would be overwhelmed and would likely shut down. A person carrying out a DDOS attack will almost certainly employ a botnet to cause the massive flood of requests on the attacked server. A botnet is a network of computers that have been compromised without their users’ knowledge, usually through a computer virus.65 The attacker remotely controls these computers and commands them to carry out the attack.66 Experts have estimated that over 25 percent of personal computers are compromised and form part of a botnet.67 Clarke and Knake point to several well-known DDOS attacks as evidence of a threat. Specifically, they cite attacks on Estonia in 2007 and Georgia in 2008, both suspected by many to have been coordinated by Russia.68 They also mention an attack on U.S. and NATO websites after the 1999 accidental bombing of the Chinese embassy in Belgrade,69 and a July 4, 2009 attack on U.S. and South Korean websites widely attributed to North Korea.70 These reputedly state-sponsored attacks, along with the hundreds of thousands of other DDOS attacks by criminals and vandals seen each year,71 are evidence of the sorry state of consumer computer security and of how vulnerable publicly accessible servers can be. They are not, however, evidence of the type of capability necessary to derail trains, release chlorine gas, or bring down the power grid. The authors admit that a DDOS attack is often little more than a nuisance.72 The 1999 attack saw websites temporarily taken down or defaced, but “did little damage to U.S. military or government operations.”73 Similarly, the 2009 attacks against the United States and South Korea caused several government agency websites, as well as the websites of NASDAQ, NYSE, and the Washington Post to be intermittently inaccessible for a few hours, but did not threaten the integrity of those institutions.74 In fact, Clarke points out that the White House’s servers were able to easily deflect the attack thanks to the simple technique of “edge caching,” which he had arranged as cybersecurity coordinator.75 Without any formal regulation mandating that it be done, the affected agencies and businesses worked with Internet service providers to filter out the attacks.76 Once the attackers realized they were no longer having an effect, the attacks stopped.77 Georgia similarly addressed attacks on its websites by moving them to more resilient servers hosted outside of the country.78 Clarke and Knake recognize that DDOS is an unsophisticated and “primitive” form of attack that would not pose a major threat to national security.79 Nevertheless, reference to DDOS attacks make up the bulk of the verifiable evidence they present. They assert, however, that the reason we have no verifiable evidence of a greater threat is that “attackers did not want to reveal their more sophisticated capabilities, yet.”80 Specifically referring to the Georgian and Estonian episodes, they write that “[t]he Russians are probably saving their best cyber weapons for when they really need them, in a conflict in which NATO and the United States are involved.”81 The implication is eerily reminiscent of the suggestion before the invasion of Iraq that although we lacked the type of evidence of WMD that might lead us to action, we would not want “the smoking gun to be a mushroom cloud.”82 Clarke and Knake have no proof to corroborate the type of vulnerabilities that could pose a serious national security risk. For example, one of the threats they identify as most serious is a sustained nationwide power outage.83 The evidence they offer is either not reviewable or easily debunked. To show that the electrical grid is vulnerable, they suggest that the Northeast power blackout of 2003 was caused in part by the “Slammer” worm, which had been spreading across the Internet around that time.84 However, the final report of the joint U.S.–Canadian task force that investigated the blackout explained clearly in 2004 that no virus, worm, or other malicious software contributed to the power failure.85 Clarke and Knake also point to a 2007 blackout in Brazil, which they believe was the result of criminal hacking of the power system.86 However, separate investigations by the utility company involved, Brazil’s independent systems operator, and the energy regulator all concluded that the power failure was the result of soot and dust deposits on high voltage insulators on transmission lines.87 Given the weakness of the public evidence they offer, it is difficult to trust the evidence Clarke and Knake present based on anonymous sources. Specifically, they write that countries such as China have “laced U.S. infrastructure with logic bombs.”88 That is, that hackers have penetrated into the control systems of utilities, including the electrical grid, and left behind computer programs that can later be triggered remotely to cause damage.89 Depending on the scope of the intrusions and which systems are compromised, this could pose a serious threat. However, Clarke and Knake present only suppositions, not evidence. We are told that “America’s national security agencies are now getting worried about logic bombs, since they seem to have found them all over our electric grid,”90 and that “[enemies] have probably done everything short of a few keystrokes of what they would do in real cyber war.”91 This is speculation. The notion that our power grid, air traffic control system, and financial networks are rigged to blow at the press of a button would be terrifying if it were true. But fear should not be a basis for public policy making. We learned after the invasion of Iraq to be wary of conflated threats and flimsy evidence. If we are to pursue the type of regulation of Internet service providers and utilities that Clarke and Knake advocate, we should demand more precise evidence of the threat against which we intend to guard, and of the probability that such a threat can be realized. Clarke and Knake lament their position when they write, “How do you convince someone that they have a problem when there is no evidence you can give them?”92 Like the CSIS Commission, they recognize that there is insufficient public debate because much of the information about the state of cybersecurity is classified.93 Citizens should trust but verify, and that will require declassification and a more candid, on-the-record discussion of the threat by government officials. 3. The Media and Other Experts Much as in the run-up to the Iraq War, some in the media may be contributing to threat inflation by reporting the alarmist view of a possible threat in a generally uncritical fashion. For example, while Clarke and Knake’s Cyber War has been widely criticized in the security trade press,94 the popular media took the book at its word. Writing in the Wall Street Journal, Mort Zuckerman warned that enemy hackers could easily “spill oil, vent gas, blow up generators, derail trains, crash airplanes, cause missiles to detonate, and wipe out reams of financial and supply-chain data.”95 The sole source for his column, and for his recommendation that the federal government establish a federal cybersecurity agency to regulate private networks, was Clarke’s “revealing” book.96 The New York Times’s review was also approving, sweeping aside skepticism of the book’s doomsday scenarios by noting that Clarke, who had previously warned the Bush and Clinton administrations about the threat from al Qaeda before 9/11, had been right in the past.97 The review also noted that the Wall Street Journal had recently reported that the power grid had been penetrated by Chinese and Russian hackers and laced with logic bombs, as Clarke and Knake had contended.98 That front page Wall Street Journal article from April 2009 is often cited as evidence for the proposition that the power grid is rigged to blow, but it could just as easily be cited as an example of “mere conduit” reporting.99 Similar to Judith Miller’s Iraq WMD articles, the only sources for the article’s claim that key infrastructure has been compromised are anonymous U.S. intelligence officials.100 With little specificity about the alleged infiltrations, readers are left with no way to verify the claims. The article does cite a public pronouncement by senior CIA official Tom Donahue that a cyber attack had caused a power blackout overseas.101 But Donahue’s pronouncement is what Clarke and Knake cite for their claim that cyber attacks caused a blackout in Brazil, which we now know is untrue.102 The author of the article, Siobhan Gorman, also contributed to another front-page Wall Street Journal cybersecurity scoop reporting that spies had infiltrated Pentagon computers and had stolen terabytes of data related to the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter.103 The only sources for that report were “current and former government officials familiar with the attacks.”104 Later reporting by the Associated Press, also citing anonymous officials, found that no classified information was compromised in the breach.105 Unfortunately, without any official statement on the matter, the result of these reports can well be to raise public alarm without offering a clear sense of the scope or magnitude of the threat. The now-debunked Brazil blackout was also the subject of a CBS 60 Minutes exposé on cyber war.106 For its claim that the blackouts were the result of cyber attacks, the newsmagazine cited only anonymous “prominent intelligence sources.”107 The 60 Minutes report, however, did feature an interview with former NSA chief, now Booz Allen Hamilton vice president, Mike McConnell, who said a blackout was within reach of foreign hackers and that the United States was not prepared for such an attack.108 In February of 2010, the Washington Post granted McConnel a rare 1,400 word essay in its Sunday opinion section in which he made the cyber war case. He told readers, “If an enemy disrupted our financial and accounting transactions, our equities and bond markets or our retail commerce—or created confusion about the legitimacy of those transactions—chaos would result. Our power grids, air and ground transportation, telecommunications, and water-filtration systems are in jeopardy as well.”109 While he did not provide any specific evidence to corroborate this fear, McConnell did point to corporate espionage generally, and specifically the then-recent incident in which Google’s Gmail service had been compromised—another instance of espionage attributed to China—as evidence of a cyber threat.110 The result is more conflation of possible cyber threats. In July 2010, the cover of the Economist magazine featured a city consumed by a pixelated mushroom cloud overlaid with the words, “Cyberwar: The threat from the internet.”111 The popular conception of cyber threats fostered by the media, often relying on anonymous government sources and the pronouncements of defense contractors and consultants, can be said to be more alarming than the verifiable evidence available would suggest. And as we will see, anonymously sourced threats and expert assertions reported in the media are later cited by officials as rationales for regulation. 4. Congress Congress has also been quick to adopt the alarmist rhetoric of cyber doom espoused by the proponents of government intervention.112 For example, writing in the Wall Street Journal in support of their co-sponsored cybersecurity bill, Sens. Jay Rockefeller and Olympia Snowe warned citizens about the potential of “catastrophic economic loss and social havoc” from cyber attack.113 However, they provided no specifics of the threat and instead argued from authority that “[a]s members of both the Senate Commerce and Intelligence committees, we know our national security and our economic security is at risk.” 114 Another argument from authority is in the very first sentence of their op-ed, which quotes Mike McConnell’s oft-repeated warning, “If the nation went to war today in a cyberwar, we would lose.”115 Members of Congress have used the same rhetoric at hearings on cybersecurity. In one such hearing, Sen. Rockefeller stated, It would be very easy to make train switches so that two trains collide, affect or disrupt water and electricity, or release water from dams, where the computers are involved. How our money moves, they could stop that. Any part of the country, all of the country is vulnerable. How the Internet and telephone communication systems work, attackers could handle that rather easily.116 At another hearing, Sen. Rockefeller noted that “a major cyber attack could shut down our Nation’s most critical infrastructure: our power grid, telecommunications, financial services; you just think of it, and they can do it.”117 Sen. Snowe agreed, adding that “if we fail to take swift action, we risk a cybercalamity of epic proportions, with devastating implications for our Nation.” 118 Other members of Congress have adopted similarly alarmist rhetoric.119 Speaking at a hearing, Senate Armed Services Committee Chairman Carl Levin stated that “cyber weapons and cyber attacks potentially can be devastating, approaching weapons of mass destruction in their effects.”120 Rep. Yvette Clarke, chairwoman of the House committee focused on cybersecurity, has said, “There is no more significant threat to our national and economic security than that which we face in cyberspace.” 121 In each of these instances, members of Congress have not offered any reviewable evidence to support their claims.
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#### Diaz-Canel doesn’t solve

Abrams 13 – Elliott Abrams is a Senior Fellow for Middle Eastern Studies at CFR (he also focuses on democracy and human rights issues). (“Who Speaks for the People of Cuba?” March 1, 2013, <http://blogs.cfr.org/abrams/2013/03/01/who-speaks-for-the-people-of-cuba/>)

Last week the Castro brothers announced the name of the man who, they said, will succeed Raul Castro when–or if–he retires at the end of the new five-year term as president to which he has just appointed himself. The name is Miguel Diaz-Canel. He’s an apparatchik in the best Soviet style: thirty years in the Communist Party, starting with its youth groups. He’s not particularly well-known on or off the island, which may have recommended him to the Castros: previous heirs apparent sometimes got too big for their britches and had to be dumped. Of course, Canel may be dumped too, at any moment. He has no power base, and no apparent close ties with the Army and security services–who will be critical once the Castros are dead. The day Raul or Fidel is tired of him will be the day his “elevation” is undone. It will be interesting to see whether, in his new post as vice president, Canel is handed any real responsibilities by the Castros. This much is clear: nothing this man has ever done in his life suggests he believes in freedom, democracy, or human rights–or the Castros would never have selected him.

#### Lack of foreign investment makes economic and societal collapse inevitable—normalizing relations is key

Ashby 13 – Timothy is a Senior Research Fellow at the Council on Hemispheric Affairs. (“Preserving Stability in Cuba After Normalizing Relations with the United States—The Importance of Trading with State-Owned Enterprises”, March 29, 2013, [http://www.coha.org/preserving-stability-in-cuba-timothy-ashby](http://www.coha.org/preserving-stability-in-cuba-timothy-ashby/)/)

Cuba under Raúl Castro has entered a new period of economic, social, and political transformation. Reforms instituted within the past few years have brought the expansion of private sector entrepreneurial activity, including lifting restrictions on the sales of residential real estate, automobiles, and electronic goods. Additional reforms included, more than a million hectares of idle land has been leased to private farmers, where citizens have been granted permission to stay in hotels previously reserved for tourists, and freedom being granted for most Cubans to travel abroad. Stating that it was time for the “gradual transfer” of “key roles to new generations,” President Raúl Castro announced that he will retire by 2018, and named as his possible successor a man who was not even born at the time of the Cuban Revolution. [1] The twilight of the Castro era presents challenges and opportunities for U.S. policy makers. Normalization of relations is inevitable, regardless of timing, yet external and internal factors may accelerate or ~~retard~~ the process. The death of Venezuelan President Hugo Chávez is likely to undermine the already dysfunctional Cuban economy, if it leads to reductions in oil imports and other forms of aid. **This could bring social chaos**, especially among the island’s disaffected youth. Such an outcome would generate adverse consequences for U.S. national and regional security. To maintain Cuba’s social and economic stability while reforms are maturing, **the U**nited **S**tates **must throw itself open to unrestricted bilateral trade** with all Cuban enterprises, both private and state-owned. The collapse of Cuba’s tottering economy could seismically impact the United States and neighboring countries. It certainly did during the Mariel Boatlift of 1980, precipitated by a downturn in the Cuban economy which led to tensions on the island. Over 125,000 Cuban refugees landed in the Miami area, including 31,000 criminals and mental patients. Today, the United States defines its national security interests regarding Cuba as follows: • Avoid one or more mass migrations; • Prevent Cuba from becoming another porous border that allows continuous large-scale migration to the hemisphere; • Prevent Cuba from becoming a major source or transshipment point for the illegal drug trade; • Avoid Cuba becoming a state with ungoverned spaces that could provide a platform for terrorists and others wishing to harm the United States. [2] All of these national security threats are directly related to economic and social conditions within Cuba. U.S. policy specifically supports “a market-oriented economic system” [3] toward Cuba, yet regulations prohibit the importation of any goods of Cuban origin, whether from the island’s potentially booming private sector–including 300,000 agricultural producers–or State-Owned Enterprises (“SOEs”). [4] Such a policy is **counterproductive to U.S. interests.** Regardless of over 400,000 entrepreneurs, including agricultural cultivators, it could be many years, if ever, when Cuba’s private sector would be ready to serve as the engine of economic growth. SOEs employ 72 percent of Cuban workers. [5] A rational commercial rapprochement towards Cuba would therefore require a change in current laws and in the system of regulations prohibiting the importation of Cuban goods and products. Normalized bilateral trade will benefit the Cuban people by helping to provide economic stability and fostering the growth of a middle class–both of which are essential for the foundation of democratic institutions. Two-way trade must include both Cuba’s private sector as well as SOEs. Cuban SOEs are in a state of gradual transition like other parts of the economy. In December 2012, the Cuban government authorized a wide range of co-ops that will allow workers to collectively open new businesses or take over existing SOEs in construction, transportation, and other industries. Considered a pilot program that is a prime candidate for an expansion, the co-ops “will not be administratively subordinated to any state entity.” [6] Many Cuban officials, well aware of the limits to small-scale entrepreneurism, appear to harbor hope that co-ops could shift a large portion of the island’s economy to free-market competition from government-managed socialism. In other transitional states, particularly in post-socialist economies, co-ops have served as commercial bridges between state-owned and privatized business. Of the 300 largest co-ops in the world, more than half are in United States, Italy, or France. [7] Ironically, the outputs of such co-ops, including agricultural products which could find strong demand in the American market, are barred by short-sighted federal regulations, thus hampering, if not defeating, what could be a major U.S. policy goal.

#### **Reforms are failing—plan key**

Goforth 12 – Sean H. Goforth is a graduate of the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill and the School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University. His research focuses on Latin American political economy and international trade. (“Cuba’s Economic Depression”, July 31, 2012, http://nationalinterest.org/commentary/cuba%27s-economic-desperation-7269)

Earlier this month, Cuba’s parliament rubber-stamped several reforms tied to Raul Castro’s program, announced almost two years ago, to grow the country’s private sector. If all goes according to plan, Cuban officials expect roughly half of the economy will be reborn in the private sector over the next five years. In theory, steep taxes on small businesses and privatized co-ops will bolster state coffers, and regulation will keep state-owned enterprises insulated from competition. In practice, **the government is losing control of the privatization program**. For the most part, the hundreds of thousands of small-business licenses handed out so far by the government pertain to low-skilled services and nonessential industries, including restaurants, car-repair shops and the like. Entrepreneurial Cubans have improvised solutions to prohibitions against most forms of advertising by painting the side doors of their cars and leafleting window shields. Another major hitch to the expansion of private enterprise, access to wholesalers, is being resolved in part by the Obama administration’s 2009 decision to allow greater freedom of travel to the island by Cuban Americans. According to some estimates, roughly $1 billion a year in goods enters Cuba in this fashion. Despite the kinks, the nascent private sector is outcompeting the state. Last week, the Miami Herald reported that the Castro government is raising fees on goods imported by Cuban Americans, “apparently trying to force émigrés to send badly needed cash instead, to control the trade in imported items and counter the drop in sales of those types of goods at state-owned stores.” If the specter of better private-sector goods at lower prices seems bad for the government, the alternative may be more troubling. What if people try to keep state jobs while peddling their services and wares in the informal economy? Cubans have decades of experience—often expressed in terms of “resolve”—in getting by this way. This may explain an apparent lull in interest to join the private sector. According to a recent New York Times article, Havana planned to move 170,000 people off the government payroll in 2012, but from January through May it issued only 24,000 licenses for self-employment. Then there’s Cuba’s relatively large class of skilled professionals, people highly trained at government expense, who need to be kept in state employ. Yet at $20-a-month salary, many Cuban doctors are leaving the profession to work as taxi drivers or waiters, while others have taken to prioritizing patients willing to pay extra for care. Consequently, health care, the one indisputable achievement of the Cuban Revolution, is faltering. To these and other problems, the government still could reassert its control, as it did under Fidel in the mid-2000s. In the aftermath of the Soviet Union’s collapse, Cuba’s economy contracted, then stagnated. Fidel kept the Cuban economy afloat in the officially sanctioned “special period” by allowing use of the dollar, rationing hundreds of additional foodstuffs, permitting some small businesses to operate and encouraging tourism to the island. Relief eventually came when Hugo Chavez, having solidified his control over Venezuela’s oil industry, began pumping billions of dollars of aid into Cuba, thereby allowing Fidel to reverse many of the compromises he’d been forced into making in the 1990s. Now facing a serious challenger in the presidential election later this year and an unknown cancer status, Chavez’s future looks more uncertain than that of the geriatric Castros. Communist Cuba’s salvation this time around was expected to come in the form of massive offshore oil and gas deposits. The Economist last year called the Scarabeo 9, a rig built and shipped from China by the Spanish oil firm Repsol in order to skirt the U.S. embargo, “Cuba’s main hope of economic independence.” China, Russia and other countries eagerly courted Raul as the rig moved into place, each vying for a sizeable concession or servicing contract, and each probably rather pleased by the potential side effect of sticking in Washington’s craw. Then, after spending over $100 million in the endeavor, Repsol decided in late May to stop exploring off Cuba’s coast. Four of the five wells it drilled didn’t turn up any oil. In turn, Raul’s visit to China, Vietnam and Russia earlier this month—almost certainly scheduled before the Repsol announcement—didn’t result in any breakthrough commitments for investment in Cuba. Of course, Cuba still may become an oil-rich nation in time; already a Malaysian outfit plans to explore a separate offshore bloc. But that’s scant consolation for the communist government, which desperately needs the influx of international credit that would accompany a significant oil strike. In more stark terms, **Cuba needs a new sponsor**, and just who that might be is now in doubt given the recent reticence of the Chinese, Brazilians and others to having greater sway over the island’s future. The bad news about oil also makes it harder to envision the Cuban economy transitioning to a state capitalist system. Meanwhile, those in the privatized economy are thrashing out wholesale markets via the informal sector, largely at state expense. For the first time since Raul ushered in his seemingly methodical economic reforms, the aging autocrat faces a pressing “from, to” dilemma.

#### Lifting the embargo won’t speed reform – instability is more likely without the plan

**Whiting ’13** (Ashley, LEEHG Institute for Foreign Policy, Policy Recommendation to Lift the Cuban Embargo, 1/30/13,

http://www.leehg.org/?p=467)

The United States’ embargo against Cuba has failed to fulfill its purpose even half a century after its implementation. Although the Cold War ended over twenty years ago, the United States still utilizes this outdated mindset in their relations towards Cuba. The Cuban embargo is one of the last relics of the Cold War era, and it is time to move forward in terms of foreign policy. During a time when containment was the overruling policy of foreign affairs, imposing an embargo against Cuba was rational diplomacy. In today’s times though, using failed and outdated tactics against Cuba will not yield the results that the United States desires. The time has come to reform relations with Cuba. The Cuban embargo should be lifted due to the sanctions’ ineffectiveness, the correlation between wealth and democracy, the benefits of free trade, and the disapproval by the international community. Before entering into the core arguments against the embargo, it is important to understand the history of U.S.-Cuban relations. The embargo was implemented in 1960, during the height of the Cold War, when the Cuban government nationalized U.S. businesses on their land. The Castro regime has still not paid their reparations, and most likely will not do so anytime soon. With the rising communist government, the support from the Soviet Union, and the looming danger of the Cuban Missile Crisis, the embargo was a highly reasonable decision at that time. Although U.S.S.R.-Cuban relations troubled the U.S. fifty years ago, this relationship is no longer an issue. The Helms-Burton act, implemented during the Clinton Administration, strengthened the sanctions but allowed for humanitarian aid. Although critics of the embargo hoped that President Obama would ease these trade restrictions in 2009, the President has openly stated that he shall continue the embargo until Cuba shows signs of democratization. One of the core arguments against the embargo is that the sanctions have failed to spread democracy to Cuba. Although economic sanctions provide an attractive alternative to full-scale military intervention against an antagonistic nation, they often prove to be ineffective. According to research by Abel Escriba-Folch and Joseph Wright in their publication, Dealing with Tyranny: International Sanctions and the Survival of Authoritarian Rulers, a sanction will fail if it is unsuccessful at affecting the citizens in a leader’s support coalition. This concept correlates perfectly with the core arguments of the rational political ambition theory. A leader’s support coalition is the percentage of people which a leader must satisfy in order to remain in office. If a leader wants to maintain power, then domestic policies must be focused on satisfying the winning coalition. Considering this hypothesis, dictators will value private goods due to the small size of their winning coalition, whereas democratic leaders will distribute more public goods due to the large size of their winning coalition.[5] Although research shows that sanctions are more effective against other democracies, the United States generally imposes sanctions against authoritarian governments. These sanctions may be used to destabilize a totalitarian state, or to simply demonstrate disapproval. Unintentionally, sanctions against dictatorships generally harm those citizens outside of the electorate. These citizens cannot choose their leaders, but they still face the extreme consequences of their government’s policies. If a sanction fails to negatively alter the support coalition’s loyalty, then the leader shall remain in office. Some studies suggest that imposed sanctions strengthen a dictatorship since the leader must reinforce oppression in response to rising foreign pressure. If this is true, then one could argue that the embargo strengthens the Castro regime more than Cuba’s chances of democratization.[5] Considering the correlation between wealth and democracy, lifting the embargo can serve as a beneficial strategy in democratizing Cuba. Research from Freedom House and GDP measurements have demonstrated a strong correlation between a state’s economic growth and level of democracy. Considering the gruesome fate that generally awaits a dictator after leaving office, it is predictable for totalitarian leaders to avoid implementing democratic reforms. Since the United States cannot force Castro to reform, the U.S. must take a different approach. By strengthening the Cuban middle class, the U.S. can indirectly push Cuba further down the path of democratization. One well-known hypothesis, created by political sociologist Seymour Martin Lipset, states that, “The more well-to-do a nation, the greater the chances that it will sustain a democracy“.[3] Various examples in history have supported this hypothesis, such as with the prosperity of South Korea. A once autocratic nation, South Korea has flourished after decades of industrialization and urbanization. A strong middle class is the core of a democracy, since economic stability allows for more political participation. Increased economic inequality may not directly decrease democratic stability, but an impoverished population certainty will. If the majority of a population lacks the necessary resources to fulfill their basic needs, then the probability of them participating in politics is quite low. Without such opportunities, these oppressed people can only change their government in the form of a revolution. Even so, revolutions are rare, unpredictable, chaotic, and catastrophic to those directly involved. When considering basic macroeconomic ideas, free trade is theoretically preferable over pure self-reliance. In this age of globalization, the increased rise of economic interdependency must not be ignored. If each country produces that which they have a comparative advantage in, then all states can capitalize on their own prosperity. A tariff on trade generally helps those companies that cannot compete, but such restrictions defeat the purpose of comparative advantage. Even the concept of free trade between international markets injures communism at its core. Lifting the trade embargo shall not only stimulate the United States’ economy, but shall also improve the living conditions of the Cuban population. By opening up the markets in Cuba, the country may slowly move towards capitalist ideals. [4] The Cuban embargo has become increasingly unpopular through the eyes of the public. The international community overwhelmingly condemns the Cuban embargo, with the U.N. General Assembly member states voting 186-2 against the embargo in 2011.[2] Critics of the embargo argue that the United States uses a double standard towards foreign policy with Cuba. The U.S. does not always trade with other capitalist democracies. China is a communist country, and is also one of the United States’ most important trading partners. Saudi Arabia is commonly defined as a dictatorship, yet the U.S. receives oil and other valued resources from this state. In the long run, Castro’s communism shall eventually crumble. However, the Cuban embargo has not helped this process of democratization. The embargo has failed at destabilizing the Castro regime, and succeeded in unintentionally harming the civilian population. These sanctions are ineffective since they have failed at directly harming Castro’s support coalition. The lack of a strong middle class decreases Cuba’s chances of democratizing, and enables Castro to continue his oppression. Instead of coercing Castro into making top-down democratic reforms, the United States can stimulate the Cuban economy and encourage reform from the bottom-up. From a more liberal viewpoint, free trade shall benefit the United States economy since it may allow a new source of income and a wider access of resources. All things considered, the United States should lift this failed embargo and take a new approach in influencing the domestic politics of Cuba.