### Plan

#### The United States federal government should create a policy for constructive engagement toward the Republic of Cuba by lifting all economic sanctions placed on The Republic of Cuba.

### SOFT POWER

#### First, the Cuban embargo undermines U.S.-Latin American relations.

Hakim 13 — Peter Hakim, President Emeritus and Senior Fellow of the Inter-American Dialogue—a Washington-based think tank on Western Hemisphere affairs, Member of the Council on Foreign Relations, has served on boards and advisory committees for the World Bank, Council on Competitiveness, Inter-American Development Bank, Canadian Foundation for Latin America, Partners for Democratic Change, and Human Rights Watch, holds a Master of Public and International Affairs degree from Princeton University’s Woodrow Wilson School, 2013 (“Post Chavez: Can U.S. rebuild Latin American ties?,” *The Great Debate*—a *Reuters* blog, March 27th, Available Online at http://blogs.reuters.com/great-debate/2013/03/27/post-chavez-can-u-s-rebuild-latin-american-ties/, Accessed 05-20-2013)

Recent developments suggest, however, that for Washington to regain clout in regional affairs, it must it end its standoff with Cuba. U.S. policy toward Cuba sets Washington against the views of every Latin American and Caribbean government. Long-standing U.S. efforts to isolate and sanction Cuba, have, counterproductively, brought every country in Latin America to Cuba’s defense with a general admiration of Havana’s resistance to U.S. pressures.

Because this U.S. policy is viewed as so extreme, no Latin America country is willing to criticize Cuba — almost regardless of its words or actions. Chavez, with his close association with Cuba, possessed some of that immunity — with his neighbors leaving him unaccountable for his violations of democracy, human rights and decency.

His funeral made it clear that the United States has a lot of work to do to prevent that immunity from spreading.

#### Cuba policy is the lynchpin of weak relations — policy change *on this issue* is key.

Thale and Boggs 13 — Geoff Thale, Program Director of the Washington Office on Latin America, has studied Cuba issues since the mid-1990s and traveled to Cuba more than a dozen times, including organizing delegations of academics and members of Congress, and Clay Boggs, Program Officer for Cuba and for Rights and Development at the Washington Office on Latin America, 2013 (“Cuba and the Terrorist List,” Washington Office on Latin America, March 5th, Available Online at http://www.wola.org/commentary/cuba\_and\_the\_terrorist\_list, Accessed 07-21-2013)

More broadly, the U.S. approach toward Cuba, which is exemplified by Cuba’s designation as a State Sponsor of Terrorism, hurts the U.S. image in Latin America. In recent years, Latin American leaders have publicly questioned U.S. policy toward Cuba. At the most recent Summit of the Americas in Cartagena, Colombia, Latin American presidents across the political spectrum challenged President Obama on a number of issues, including Cuba’s participation **in the Summit of the Americas and drug policy**. It is also striking that Cuba is the pro tempore president of CELAC (Comunidad de Estados Latinoamericanos y Caribeños), the new regional forum that includes all of the countries of the hemisphere, except Canada and the United States. The changed geopolitical landscape—and the symbolic importance that U.S. policy toward Cuba continues to hold for the Latin American public and elite opinion—makes it clear that policy change toward Cuba would improve the U.S. image in the hemisphere.

**The embargo decimates U.S. soft power — it is universally opposed.**

Wilkinson 9 — Stephen Wilkinson, Chairman of the International Institute for the Study of Cuba—an initiative by a team of UK academics, specialists and consultants, holds a Ph.D. in Cuban Literature, 2009 (“Cruel Cuban embargo must end,” *Comment is Free*—a *Guardian* blog, October 28th, Available Online at http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2009/oct/28/cuba-embargo-un-united-nations, Accessed 05-20-2013)

The United Nations general assembly has just voted on a Cuban resolution condemning the US's trade and economic embargo against the island.

For the 18th year in succession the assembly has crushingly rejected the US policy, this time by a margin of 187-3. Only Israel (which trades with Cuba anyway) and the tiny Pacific statelet of Palau voted with the US. The vote was just as embarrassing for the superpower last year but back then it was a condemnation of an embargo enforced by George Bush. This time it is on Obama's watch, and so has a greater significance.

Prior to the vote, the secretary-general prepared a public report that explains what UN members and UN organisations say about the embargo. The document could not be more dismissive of a policy that is near-universally viewed as a hypocritical failure.

The US's closest allies oppose the policy, including the UK, Australia, France, Germany, Colombia, Japan, Mexico and Brazil. The embargo is especially unpopular in the western hemisphere, where Washington stands alone as the only government without diplomatic relations with Havana, and where organisation after organisation – the Rio Group, the Ibero-American Summit, the heads of state of Latin America and the Caribbean, and Caricom – have called for its repeal.

#### *Specifically*, strong Latin American relations are vital to U.S. global influence

Sabatini and Berger 12 — Christopher Sabatini, Adjunct Professor at the School of International and Public Affairs at Columbia University, Editor-in-Chief of *Americas Quarterly* and Senior Director of Policy at Americas Society/Council of the Americas, former Director for Latin America and the Caribbean at the National Endowment for Democracy, holds Ph.D. in Government from the University of Virginia, and Ryan Berger, Policy Associate at the Americas Society/Council of the Americas, 2012 (“Why the U.S. can't afford to ignore Latin America,” *Fareed Zakaria’s GPS* blog, June 13th, Available Online at http://globalpublicsquare.blogs.cnn.com/2012/06/13/why-the-u-s-cant-afford-to-ignore-latin-america/, Accessed 05-27-2013)

Speaking in Santiago, Chile, in March of last year, President Obama called Latin America “a region on the move,” one that is “more important to the prosperity and security of the United States than ever before.”

Somebody forgot to tell the Washington brain trust.

The Center for a New American Security, a respected national security think tank a half-mile from the White House, recently released a new series of policy recommendations for the next presidential administration. The 70-page “grand strategy” report only contained a short paragraph on Brazil and made only one passing reference to Latin America.

Yes, we get it. The relative calm south of the United States seems to pale in comparison to other developments in the world: China on a seemingly inevitable path to becoming a global economic powerhouse, the potential of political change in the Middle East, the feared dismemberment of the eurozone, and rogue states like Iran and North Korea flaunting international norms and regional stability.

But the need to shore up our allies and recognize legitimate threats south of the Rio Grande goes to the heart of the U.S.’ changing role in the world and its strategic interests within it.

Here are three reasons why the U.S. must include Latin America in its strategic calculations:

1. Today, pursuing a global foreign policy requires regional allies.

Recently, countries with emerging economies have appeared to be taking positions diametrically opposed to the U.S. when it comes to matters of global governance and human rights. Take, for example, Russia and China’s stance on Syria, rejecting calls for intervention.

Another one of the BRICS, Brazil, tried to stave off the tightening of U.N. sanctions on Iran two years ago. And last year, Brazil also voiced its official opposition to intervention in Libya, leading political scientist Randall Schweller to refer to Brazil as “a rising spoiler.”

At a time of (perceived) declining U.S. influence, it’s important that America deepens its ties with regional allies that might have been once taken for granted. As emerging nations such as Brazil clamor for permanent seats on the U.N. Security Council and more representatives in the higher reaches of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, the U.S. will need to integrate them into global decision-making rather than isolate them.

If not, they could be a thorn in the side of the U.S. as it tries to implement its foreign policy agenda. Worse, they could threaten to undermine efforts to defend international norms and human rights.

2. Latin America is becoming more international.

It’s time to understand that the U.S. isn’t the only country that has clout in Latin America.

For far too long, U.S. officials and Latin America experts have tended to treat the region as separate, politically and strategically, from the rest of the world. But as they’ve fought battles over small countries such as Cuba and Honduras and narrow bore issues such as the U.S.-Colombia free-trade agreement, other countries like China and India have increased their economic presence and political influence in the region.

It’s also clear that countries such as Brazil and Venezuela present their own challenges to U.S. influence in the region and even on the world forum.

The U.S. must embed its Latin America relations in the conceptual framework and strategy that it has for the rest of the world, rather than just focus on human rights and development as it often does toward southern neighbors such as Cuba.

3. There are security and strategic risks in the region.

Hugo Chavez’s systematic deconstruction of the Venezuelan state and alleged ties between FARC rebels and some of Chavez’s senior officials have created a volatile cocktail that could explode south of the U.S. border.

FARC, a left-wing guerrilla group based in Colombia, has been designated as a “significant foreign narcotics trafficker” by the U.S. government.

At the same time, gangs, narcotics traffickers and transnational criminal syndicates are overrunning Central America.

In 2006, Mexican President Felipe Calderón launched a controversial “war on drugs” that has since resulted in the loss of over 50,000 lives and increased the levels of violence and corruption south of the Mexican border in Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras and even once-peaceful Costa Rica. Increasingly, these already-weak states are finding themselves overwhelmed by the corruption and violence that has come with the use of their territory as a transit point for drugs heading north.

Given their proximity and close historical and political connections with Washington, the U.S. will find it increasingly difficult not to be drawn in. Only this case, it won’t be with or against governments — as it was in the 1980s — but in the far more complex, sticky situation of failed states.

There are many other reasons why Latin America is important to U.S. interests.

#### Policies are key to soft power.

Nye 9 — Joseph S. Nye, Jr., University Distinguished Service Professor and Former Dean of the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University, served as Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, Chair of the National Intelligence Council, and Deputy Under Secretary of State for Security Assistance, Science and Technology, holds a Ph.D. in Political Science from Harvard University, 2009 (“The U.S. can reclaim 'smart power',” *Los Angeles Times*, January 21st, Available Online at http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/commentary/la-oe-nye21-2009jan21,0,3381521.story, Accessed 07-20-2013)

Smart power is the combination of hard and soft power. Soft power is the ability to get what you want through attraction rather than coercion or payments. Opinion polls show a serious decline in American attractiveness in Europe, Latin America and, most dramatically, the Muslim world.

The resources that produce soft power for a country include its culture (when it is attractive to others), its values (when they are attractive and not undercut by inconsistent practices) and policies (when they are seen as inclusive and legitimate).

When poll respondents are asked why they report a decline in American soft power, they cite American policies more than American culture or values. Because it is easier for a country to change its policies than its culture, this implies that Obama will be able to choose policies that could help to recover some of America's soft power.

#### Soft power is vital to address global challenges — hard power *alone* is not enough.

Nye 9 — Joseph S. Nye, Jr., University Distinguished Service Professor and Former Dean of the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University, served as Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, Chair of the National Intelligence Council, and Deputy Under Secretary of State for Security Assistance, Science and Technology, holds a Ph.D. in Political Science from Harvard University, 2009 (“The U.S. can reclaim 'smart power',” *Los Angeles Times*, January 21st, Available Online at http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/commentary/la-oe-nye21-2009jan21,0,3381521.story, Accessed 07-20-2013)

Of course, soft power is not the solution to all problems. North Korean dictator Kim Jong Il likes to watch Hollywood movies, but that is unlikely to affect his nuclear weapons program. And soft power got nowhere in attracting the Taliban government away from its support for Al Qaeda in the 1990s. That took hard military power in 2001. But other goals, such as the promotion of democracy and human rights, are better achieved by soft power.

A little more than a year ago, the bipartisan Center for Strategic and International Studies' Commission on Smart Power concluded that America's image and influence had declined in recent years, and that the U.S. had to move from exporting fear to inspiring optimism and hope.

The commission was not alone in this conclusion. Defense Secretary Robert M. Gates has called for the U.S. to commit more money and effort to soft-power tools, including diplomacy, economic assistance and communications, because the military alone cannot defend U.S. interests. He pointed out that military spending totals nearly half a trillion dollars annually -- excluding Iraq and Afghanistan -- compared with a State Department budget of $36 billion. In his words: "I am here to make the case for strengthening our capacity to use soft power and for better integrating it with hard power."

The Pentagon is the best resourced arm of the government, but there are limits to what hard power can achieve on its own. Promoting democracy, human rights and the development of civil society are not best handled with the barrel of a gun. The effects of the 9/11 terrorist attacks threw America off course. Terrorism is a real threat, but over-responding to the provocations of extremists does us more damage than the terrorists ever could. Success in the struggle against terrorism means finding a new central premise for U.S. foreign policy to replace the "war on terror." A commitment to providing for the global good can provide that premise.

America can become a smart America -- a smart power -- by again investing in global public goods, providing things people and governments of the world want but have not been able to get in the absence of leadership by the strongest country. Development, public health and coping with climate change are good examples. By complementing U.S. military and economic might with greater investments in soft power, and focusing on global public goods, the U.S. can rebuild the framework that it needs to tackle tough global challenges.

#### Strong U.S.-Latin American relations are vital to address a wide range of impacts including economic growth, climate change, proliferation, democracy, and human rights.

Bachelet et al. 12 — Michelle Bachelet, former President of Chile, head of UN Women, and Carla A. Hills, Co-chair of the Council on Foreign Relations, Chair of the National Committee on United States-China Relations, served as United States Secretary of Housing and Urban Development under President Ford and as a U.S. Trade Representative under President Bush, co-chairs of the Sol M. Linowitz Forum of the Inter-American Dialogue—a non-partisan, 100-member group of politicians, academics, business leaders, and others from the United States and Latin America, et al., 2012 (“Remaking the Relationship: The United States and Latin America,” Report of the Sol M. Linowitz Forum of the Inter-American Dialogue, April, Available Online at http://www.thedialogue.org/PublicationFiles/IAD2012PolicyReportFINAL.pdf, Accessed 05-20-2013, p. 3-4)

There are compelling reasons for the United States and Latin America to pursue more robust ties.

Every country in the Americas would benefit from strengthened and expanded economic relations, with improved access to each other’s markets, investment capital, and energy resources. Even with its current economic problems, the United States’ $16-trillion economy is a vital market and source of capital (including remittances) and technology for Latin America, and it could contribute more to the region’s economic performance. For its part, Latin America’s rising economies will inevitably become more and more crucial to the United States’ economic future. The United States and many nations of Latin America and the Caribbean would also gain a great deal by more cooperation on such global matters as climate change, nuclear non-proliferation, and democracy and human rights. With a rapidly expanding US Hispanic population of more than 50 million, the cultural and demographic integration of the United States and Latin America is proceeding at an accelerating pace, setting a firmer basis for hemispheric partnership. [end page 3]

Despite the multiple opportunities and potential benefits, relations between the United States and Latin America remain disappointing. If new opportunities are not seized, relations will likely continue to drift apart. The longer the current situation persists, the harder it will be to reverse course and rebuild vigorous cooperation. Hemispheric affairs require urgent attention—both from the United States and from Latin America and the Caribbean.

#### soft power is key to prevent every major impact including drugs and disease— power diffusion makes U.S. influence vital.

Nye 9 — Joseph S. Nye, Jr., University Distinguished Service Professor and Former Dean of the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University, served as Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, Chair of the National Intelligence Council, and Deputy Under Secretary of State for Security Assistance, Science and Technology, holds a Ph.D. in Political Science from Harvard University, 2009 (“American Power in the Twenty-First Century,” *Project Syndicate*, September 10th, Available Online at http://www.project-syndicate.org/print/american-power-in-the-twenty-first-century, Accessed 05-27-2013)

The United States government’s National Intelligence Council projects that American dominance will be “much diminished” by 2025, and that the one key area of continued American superiority – military power – will be less significant in the increasingly competitive world of the future. Russian President Dmitri Medvedev has called the 2008 financial crisis a sign that America’s global leadership is coming to an end. The leader of Canada’s opposition Liberal Party, Michael Ignatieff, suggests that US power has passed its mid-day. How can we know if these predictions are correct?

One should beware of misleading metaphors of organic decline. Countries are not like humans with predictable life spans. For example, after Britain lost its American colonies at the end of the eighteenth century, Horace Walpole lamented Britain’s reduction to “as insignificant a country as Denmark or Sardinia.” He failed to foresee that the industrial revolution would give Britain a second century of even greater ascendency.

Rome remained dominant for more than three centuries after the apogee of Roman power. Even then, Rome did not succumb to another state, but suffered a death of a thousand cuts inflicted by various barbarian tribes. Indeed, for all the fashionable predictions of China, India, or Brazil surpassing the US in the coming decades, the classical transition of power among great states may be less of a problem than the rise of modern barbarians – non-state actors. In an information-based world of cyber-insecurity, power diffusion may be a greater threat than power transition.

So, what will it mean to wield power in the global information age of the twenty-first century? What resources will produce power? In the sixteenth century, control of colonies and gold bullion gave Spain the edge; seventeenth-century Holland profited from trade and finance; eighteenth-century France gained from its larger population and armies; and nineteenth-century British power rested on its industrial primacy and its navy.

Conventional wisdom has always held that the state with the largest military prevails, but in an information age it may be the state (or non-state) with the best story that wins. Today, it is far from clear how the balance of power is measured, much less how to develop successful survival strategies.

In his inaugural address in 2009, President Barack Obama stated that “our power grows through its prudent use; our security emanates from the justness of our cause, the force of our example, the tempering qualities of humility and restraint.” Shortly thereafter, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said, “America cannot solve the most pressing problems on our own, and the world cannot solve them without America. We must use what has been called ‘smart power,’ the full range of tools at our disposal.” Smart power means the combination of the hard power of command and the soft power of attraction.

Power always depends on context. The child who dominates on the playground may become a laggard when the context changes to a disciplined classroom. In the middle of the twentieth century, Josef Stalin scornfully asked how many divisions the Pope had, but four decades later, the Papacy was still intact while Stalin’s empire had collapsed.

In today’s world, the distribution of power varies with the context. It is distributed in a pattern that resembles a three-dimensional chess game. On the top chessboard, military power is largely unipolar, and the US is likely to remain the only superpower for some time. But on the middle chessboard, economic power has already been multi-polar for more than a decade, with the US, Europe, Japan, and China as the major players, and others gaining in importance.

The bottom chessboard is the realm of cross-border transactions that occur outside of government control. It includes diverse non-state actors, such as bankers electronically transferring sums larger than most national budgets, and, at the other extreme, terrorists transferring weapons or hackers threatening cyber-security. It also includes new challenges like pandemics and climate change.

On this bottom board, power is widely dispersed, and it makes no sense to speak of unipolarity, multipolarity, hegemony, or any other cliché. Even in the aftermath of the financial crisis, the giddy pace of technological change is likely to continue to drive globalization and transnational challenges.

The problem for American power in the twenty-first century is that there are more and more things outside the control of even the most powerful state. Although the US does well on military measures, there is much going on that those measures fail to capture.

Under the influence of the information revolution and globalization, world politics is changing in a way that prevents America from achieving all its international goals acting alone. For example, international financial stability is vital to Americans’ prosperity, but the US needs the cooperation of others to ensure it. Global climate change, too, will affect Americans’ quality of life, but the US cannot manage the problem alone.

In a world where borders are more porous than ever to everything from drugs to infectious diseases to terrorism, America must help build international coalitions and institutions to address shared threats and challenges. In this sense, power becomes a positive sum game.It is not enough to think in terms of power over others. One must also think in terms of power to accomplish goals. On many transnational issues, empowering others can help to accomplish one’s own goals. In this world, networks and connectedness become an important source of relevant power. The problem of American power in the twenty-first century is not one of decline, but of recognizing that even the most powerful country cannot achieve its aims without the help of others.

#### **Soft Power key to food security, piracy, global pandemics, cyber war, and natural disasters. Hard power won’t solve.**

Tufts Quoting Stavridis 13 <http://now.tufts.edu/articles/power-soft-power>

Stavradis is the former supreme commander of NATO

- See more at: <http://now.tufts.edu/articles/power-soft-power#sthash.qBAX53nN.dpuf>

He has developed those ideas into a concept he calls “open-source security,” arguing that we can protect ourselves better from today’s threats—terrorism, piracy, cyber warfare, natural disasters, global pandemics—by collaborating and sharing information than we can through secrecy and force. “We will not deliver security solely from the barrel of a gun,” he said in a recent TED talk. “My thesis of open-source security is about international, interagency, private-public connection, pulled together by this idea of strategic communication on the Internet.”

That view is far from orthodox in the U.S. military-industrial complex, which has spent trillions to build the most formidable strategic power the world has ever known. When the military has partnered with other countries or outside contractors, it has been mainly to enhance that might, all tightly controlled by a disciplined command structure.

Directly at odds with this approach, Stavridis’ concept of open-source security is more like the model of open-source software—loosening and decentralizing control to allow health organizations, business leaders, teachers and others to join in building security. And yet, through a combination of charm, conviction and military credentials, Stavridis’ unconventional worldview propelled him to the highest ranks of the armed forces. This past summer it also began to inform his latest post as the new dean of the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy—the school from which he received both a master’s in 1983 and a Ph.D. in 1984.

Arriving on the fourth floor of Cabot Hall for a late-afternoon appointment with Stavridis, I find an office that’s run with military precision—I’m told the new dean started the day with an eight a.m. breakfast presentation to a women’s leadership group, and has been in meetings ever since. My time with him is rationed to the minute.

I enter his office, prepared to be overwhelmed by the larger-than-life figure his friends and associates have described. Instead, I find someone trim and compact, and surprisingly relaxed for a man who’s been going all day. His office is decorated with nautical memorabilia, interspersed with photos of his wife and his two daughters—one a newly minted U.S. Navy nurse—as well as his basset hound, Lilly.

Despite the time pressure, he starts the interview by asking me questions, taking a leisurely 10 minutes out of his own time to inquire about my education and upbringing. We ease into a discussion about our mutual love of old maps—Stavridis collects 17th- and 18th-century sea charts of the Atlantic—then smoothly segue into history and the role of the military in world power. The minutes seem to lengthen as Stavridis delivers his tightly packaged answers in invisible bullet points, some with invisible subpoints, before deftly wrapping up our conversation by returning the focus to me with questions about my children.

Stavridis’ gift for engaging with people from all walks of life is well known to friends and colleagues, I learn later. “He has a supreme ability to meet people where they are,” says Pete Daly, a retired vice admiral who served alongside him and has known him for 30 years. “Whether he is talking to a junior sailor or a head of state, they come away feeling like he uniquely understands their perspective.”

Mel Immergut, retired chairman of the New York law firm Milbank, Tweed, Hadley & McCloy and a senior defense advisor, toured operations in Afghanistan with Stavridis and remembers watching him speak with everyone from brigadier generals to a soldier in a forward operating base on the Pakistan border that was under heavy fire. “Not everybody can interact with a 17-year-old from Council Bluffs, Iowa, in a mess hall and get him to open up,” Immergut says. “He spoke to him about the quarters he lived in, the food he ate, as well as the dangers they faced.”

But his ability to connect is only one of many strengths. Immergut, who is a trustee of the Intrepid Sea, Air & Space Museum, in New York City, presented Stavridis with the Intrepid Freedom Award in 2011. During the ceremony, he called Stavridis a “Renaissance admiral,” a name that has stuck with him after it was taken up by the New York Times to describe him.

“I’ve had a chance to see him in so many capacities—as a warrior, author, speaker, leader, family man, the whole gamut of what you would want for someone in the positions Jim has filled,” Immergut says. “He is the embodiment of all of those qualities. It’s the rare person who can truly be said to fit that description.”

Born in south Florida, Stavridis went to the U.S. Naval Academy to follow in the footsteps of his Greek-American father, a Marine. While on training cruises, he fell in love with the sea and decided to enlist in the Navy instead. Even at Annapolis, he showed a broad intellectualism, majoring in English literature before graduating in 1976.

But the first time Stavridis began to consider ideas of “soft power” was when he entered the Fletcher School in 1981 as a graduate student. “Up to that point, I had been entirely focused on learning my profession, going to sea, driving ships, becoming a good Navy officer,” he says. “When I came to the Fletcher School, I began to learn about the world”—through classes in developmental economics, international business and diplomatic history. He came to understand not just how wars are fought, but how they start and how to avoid them.

More than the class work, though, he says it was his fellow students who opened his eyes to the complexities of the world and the privileged place the United States held in it. He listened to the stories his Latin American and Caribbean classmates told about the clumsy way the United States sometimes threw its weight around in the region. “I began to see that military force in and of itself—hard power—seldom yields the results you are seeking,” he says.

Unlike most of the students from the Navy, who gravitated towards the national security program, Stavridis sought out Jerry Cohen, a professor of political economy, to guide his dissertation on treaty negotiations over the law of the sea. “He has a natural interest in just about everything,” says Cohen, now chair of the political science department at the University of California, Santa Barbara. “He doesn’t exclude anything.”

Cohen remembers mentioning offhandedly that he was reading The Natural, Bernard Malamud’s mystical baseball novel, and Stavridis pointing out the many ways in which the book was based on the Arthurian quest for the Holy Grail. While at Fletcher, Stavridis took time to teach a course on the literature of the sea at the Tufts Experimental College and to spar with Cohen on the tennis court. “He was far better than me—he insisted on giving me a few lessons,” Cohen laughs.

After graduating from Fletcher in 1984, Stavridis soared through the naval ranks, excelling at ship handling in a way that earned the attention of his superiors. “It’s unusual to get widely known as a junior officer—unless you’d done something bad,” says Daly, the retired admiral who served with Stavridis. “Jim was widely known even as a lieutenant.” Besides driving ships himself, he wrote articles on tactics and maneuvers, eventually serving on the board of the U.S. Naval Institute, which publishes a monthly journal of musing, opinions and criticisms of the service.

From 1993 to 1995 he commanded a destroyer, the USS Barry, which he captained in the Persian Gulf following the Gulf War and in the Adriatic supporting UN peacekeepers in the Bosnian War.

It was during that time that he first realized how much good the military could do. The United States was trying to help return Jean-Bertrand Aristide to power in Haiti when his ship took part in humanitarian operations there. “I saw firsthand the grinding poverty of Haiti, and how well received the shipment of U.S. aid, loaded on the pier by Navy sailors, was—far more so than weapons and security,” he says.

It was a lesson he remembered as he rose to command his own destroyer squadron—six warships—in 1998, and then the Enterprise Carrier Strike Group, with its dozen vessels, in 2002 during the Iraq War. By the time he was appointed head of U.S. Southern Command in 2006, he was ready to put his ideas into practice on a wider scale.

Evelyn Farkas, F95, F99, met Stavridis when she was a staff member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, which oversaw his command (she’s now deputy assistant secretary of defense). She watched as he created more positions that served as liaison with the State Department and other agencies and as he channeled military resources toward things like medical aid and clean water development. He wanted his senior officers to study native languages, and led the way by learning French, Spanish and Portuguese.

“His philosophy when he met with State Department officials was that his military officials were there to support diplomatic efforts,” says Farkas. “Most military commanders have very little understanding of that. He is the first one I saw articulating that message.”

One of Stavridis’ prime goals was to encourage companies and nonprofits to work with the military in areas beyond supporting combat operations. For a project called Continuing Promise, he helped set up a partnership between the U.S. Navy and such nonprofits as Operation Smile, Project HOPE and Rotary to provide construction services and medical care. In another case, he enlisted business executives as volunteers to study the inner workings of drug cartels and recommend ways to thwart their business and financial networks.

In part, it was such innovation that caused the Obama Administration to tap Stavridis for the job of Supreme Allied Commander Europe, one of NATO’s top two military posts, in 2009. Before him, no Navy commander had ever held the position—a particularly relevant fact at the time, given NATO’s focus on landlocked Afghanistan. The surprise pick raised eyebrows, though military observers quickly praised the choice by pointing to the admiral’s skills as a commander.

After Stavridis’ appointment, Farkas, then a NATO official, worked with him to set up public-private partnerships in Europe as well. For example, computer executives were recruited to help one of the Baltic countries set up a defense for its cyber vulnerabilities.

“The work they did pro bono,” Farkas says, “was something that even our wealthy allies would have trouble affording if we put a price tag on it, and the whole thing was done in a number of weeks.”

Such partnerships are controversial in the Defense Department. While they can help cut costs and take advantage of skills the military doesn’t have, they can upset military hierarchies and open the government up to charges of conflict of interest. Stavridis and Farkas navigated these treacherous waters by putting buffers such as an independent search committee between Defense and private enterprise to make sure that choices were based on merit and not special interests.

As head of NATO’s military strategy, Stavridis was instrumental in the drawdown of American troops in Afghanistan and the transition to Afghan forces under Obama. At the same time, he helped put soft power to the test in the part of the world marked by the most anti-American sentiment, starting programs such as a countrywide effort to teach more than 200,000 members of the Afghan coalition forces to read.

He has run into his share of skeptics for diverting resources into such programs—both privately within the military and in the punditry at large. A Pew Research Center study of humanitarian efforts, for example, pointed to opinion polls showing they made only a small dent in anti-U.S. attitudes. “The impact of humanitarian assistance should not be overstated,” it said, referring to efforts in Pakistan and Indonesia. “Solid majorities in both countries continue to have a negative impression of the U.S.”

But Stavridis remains unapologetic. “Teaching young Afghan soldiers to read is extremely in the wheelhouse of American security,” he says. “It opens a different world for young Afghans. It gives them real tools and skills. It differentiates us from the Taliban. It encourages them to participate in the political process.”

He calls such initiatives “building bridges,” in contrast to “building walls,” the strategy that has prevailed through most of the history of American security efforts. “Look back at the 20th century when we built walls and killed people to protect ourselves,” he says. “Well, how’d that work out? Sixty million dead in two world wars, a cold war that almost destroyed the planet. Frankly, that didn’t seem to be a particularly effective way of generating security.”

Among the bridges Stavridis talks about are social media, which he himself uses with gusto. He was known in the military for being unusually accessible by email, and one of his first actions at Fletcher was to set up a new blog, complete with a video introducing himself to the school. He has 15,000 followers on Twitter, where his recent tweets range from opinions on intervention in Syria to boasts about the incoming Fletcher student body and reports of a recent lunch with the prime minister of Greece.

What excites him most about social media is their potential to “change the arc of history,” as Facebook and Twitter did during the Arab Spring. “Social networks flatten hierarchies and undermine authoritarian regimes because they allow people to exchange information freely,” he says—and not just information about their own society but about any place on earth. “They can look at another’s life using a social network and see that a world of liberty and democracy and education and gender equality exists and is working, and they want that too,” he says.

Social media are a marketplace of ideas, and Stavridis thinks the United States should do more to compete in it. “We have a pretty good narrative: democracy, equality and human value—essentially the values of the Enlightenment. But in order to move our message, we need to be in that space. The lead should be at the State Department, but every level of the U.S. government has a role to play.”

Of course, the growing importance of digital networks presents threats as well as opportunities. Cyber security could become a critical strategic issue in the coming decades—so much so that in a recent Foreign Policy article, Stavridis argued for the creation of a new branch of the military, a U.S. Cyber Force, which would wage both offensive and defensive cyber operations. He compares the emergence of cyber attacks to the invention of airplanes, which eventually led to the need for an air force.

“We are on the beach at Kitty Hawk in cyber, and it is evident that there will be a military component,” he says. Already, countries have used cyber attacks to steal and destroy data, he says. We must not only learn how to defend against such attacks, but be prepared to launch them ourselves.

Two other trends will transform the military in the next 20 years, he says: the increased use of special forces for small-scale surgical strikes, such as the attack that took out Osama bin Laden, and a growing reliance on unmanned vehicles, better known as drones. “We’ll also have unmanned surface vehicles, we’ll have unmanned vessels operating at sea on the surface, and we’ll have vehicles operating at depth in the ocean,” he says. The value of drones, he argues, is threefold—they allow the military to avoid putting humans at risk, they are cheaper to operate, and they can perform in harsher conditions.

Asked about the more controversial aspects of drones, such as highly publicized civilian casualties from drone strikes, he defends their use, saying that the more precise targeting technology of drones actually reduces so-called collateral damage, a benefit that will only increase as technology improves.

“Many of the same arguments were made with submarines—that they were illegal, that they were surreptitious and operated without warning and sunk innocent ships,” he says. “Yet over time, we’ve become very comfortable with submarines as part of military operations, and I think it’s going to be the same with airborne drones.” He adds that drones are widely used for humanitarian operations, such as monitoring disaster relief sites, aiding agricultural development and dropping food and medical supplies in hard-to-reach areas. “That’s part of the message we need to express more clearly.”

In all of these areas, Stavridis’ forward-looking ideas have revised the traditional conception of the military. His friends and colleagues don’t doubt he’ll bring equally innovative ideas to the realm of international relations as Fletcher’s new dean. “First of all he knows the school,” says his former advisor, Jerry Cohen. “But beyond that he is a man of real vision. He is thinking of what’s over the horizon, not just what’s happening now.”

In his inaugural blog for Fletcher, Stavidis included a list of emerging issues in international relations that would hardly be on the lips of mainstream analysts—including the Arctic, biosciences and environmental challenges. “I think we’re passing out the age of information,” he says by way of explanation. “The next radical set of changes will come through biology.” He points to examples such as food and crop security, response to pandemic, genetic manipulation and increased human performance. He adds that it’s an area Fletcher is uniquely suited to address in collaboration with Tufts’ “constellation” of life science schools.

#### Future pandemics threaten human survival

**Carpenter and Bishop 2009** (P. A., P. C., July 10, Graduate Program in Studies of the Future, School of Human Sciences and Humanities, University of Houston-Clear Lake, Houston, TX, USA, Graduate Program in Futures Studies, College of Technology, University of Houston, Houston, TX, USA. A review of previous mass extinctions and historic catastrophic events, ScienceDirect)

The flu of 1890, 1918–1919 Spanish flu, 1957 Asian flu, 1968 Hong Kong flu, and 1977 Russian flu all led to mass deaths. Pandemics such as these remain major threats to human health that could lead to extremely high death rates. The 1918 pandemic is believed to have killed 50 million people [27]. AIDS (HIV) has killed an estimated 23 million people from 1978 to 2001 [15]. And there have been numerous other incidents of diseases such as cholera, dysentery, influenza, scurvy, smallpox, typhus, and plague that have caused the deaths of many millions throughout history. Clearly, these biological diseases are much greater threats to human survival than other natural or environmental disasters. Because bacterium and viral strains experience antigenic shifts (which are small changes in the virus that happen continually over time, eventually producing new virus strains that might not be recognized by the body’s immune system), another devastating pandemic could appear at any time. It should also be noted that the threat from biological weapons is quite real. In fact, scientists from the former Soviet Union’s bioweapons program claim to have developed an antibiotic-resistant strain of the plague [26].

#### Agricultural instability leads to either mass starvation of a multitude of wars—untold death results

**Ikerd ‘02** Professor Emeritus, University of Missouri (John, “Small Farms: The Foundation for Long-Run Food Security” Presented at “A Time to Act: Providing Educators with Resources to Address Small Farm Issues,” sponsored by University of Illinois, Agroecology/Sustainable Agriculture Program <http://web.missouri.edu/ikerdj/papers/IllSmall.html>//JC)

But **in times of crisis, a nation that can’t feed itself is no more secure than is a nation that can’t defend itself.** Perhaps we won’t abandon agriculture completely, but we could easily become as dependent on the rest of the world for our food as we are today for our oil. Perhaps, we can keep our food imports flowing, as we do for oil, but how large a military force will it take, **how many “small wars” will we have to fight, and how many people will be killed.**

**Cybersecurity threats will cause accidental launch that triggers the Dead Hand and nuclear war**

**Fritz 9** (Jason, BS – St. Cloud, “Hacking Nuclear Command and Control”, Study Commissioned on Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament, July, www.icnnd.org/Documents/Jason\_Fritz\_Hacking\_NC2.doc)  
*Direct control of launch*

The US uses the two-man rule to achieve a higher level of security in nuclear affairs. Under this rule two authorized personnel must be present and in agreement during critical stages of nuclear command and control. The President must jointly issue a launch order with the Secretary of Defense; Minuteman missile operators must agree that the launch order is valid; and on a submarine, both the commanding officer and executive officer must agree that the order to launch is valid. In the US, in order to execute a nuclear launch, an Emergency Action Message (EAM) is needed. This is a preformatted message that directs nuclear forces to execute a specific attack. The contents of an EAM change daily and consist of a complex code read by a human voice. Regular monitoring by shortwave listeners and videos posted to YouTube provide insight into how these work. These are issued from the NMCC, or in the event of destruction, from the designated hierarchy of command and control centres. Once a command centre has confirmed the EAM, using the two-man rule, the Permissive Action Link (PAL) codes are entered to arm the weapons and the message is sent out. These messages are sent in digital format via the secure Automatic Digital Network and then relayed to aircraft via single-sideband radio transmitters of the High Frequency Global Communications System, and, at least in the past, sent to nuclear capable submarines via Very Low Frequency (Greenemeier 2008, Hardisty 1985). The technical details of VLF submarine communication methods can be found online, including PC-based VLF reception. Some reports have noted a Pentagon review, which showed a potential “electronic back door into the US Navy’s system for broadcasting nuclear launch orders to Trident submarines” (Peterson 2004). The investigation showed that cyber terrorists could potentially infiltrate this network and insert false orders for launch. The investigation led to “elaborate new instructions for validating launch orders” (Blair 2003). Adding further to the concern of cyber terrorists seizing control over submarine launched nuclear missiles; The Royal Navy announced in 2008 that it would be installing a Microsoft Windows operating system on its nuclear submarines (Page 2008). The choice of operating system, apparently based on Windows XP, is not as alarming as the advertising of such a system is. This may attract hackers and narrow the necessary reconnaissance to learning its details and potential exploits. It is unlikely that the operating system would play a direct role in the signal to launch, although this is far from certain. Knowledge of the operating system may lead to the insertion of malicious code, which could be used to gain accelerating privileges, tracking, valuable information, and deception that could subsequently be used to initiate a launch. Remember from Chapter 2 that the UK’s nuclear submarines have the authority to launch if they believe the central command has been destroyed. Attempts by cyber terrorists to create the illusion of a decapitating strike could also be used to engage fail-deadly systems. Open source knowledge is scarce as to whether Russia continues to operate such a system. However evidence suggests that they have in the past. Perimetr, also known as Dead Hand, was an automated system set to launch a mass scale nuclear attack in the event of a decapitation strike against Soviet leadership and military. In a crisis, military officials would send a coded message to the bunkers, switching on the dead hand. If nearby ground-level sensors detected a nuclear attack on Moscow, and if a break was detected in communications links with top military commanders, the system would send low-frequency signals over underground antennas to special rockets. Flying high over missile fields and other military sites, these rockets in turn would broadcast attack orders to missiles, bombers and, via radio relays, submarines at sea. Contrary to some Western beliefs, Dr. Blair says, many of Russia's nuclear-armed missiles in underground silos and on mobile launchers can be fired automatically. (Broad 1993) Assuming such a system is still active, cyber terrorists would need to create a crisis situation in order to activate Perimetr, and then fool it into believing a decapitating strike had taken place. While this is not an easy task, the information age makes it easier. Cyber reconnaissance could help locate the machine and learn its inner workings. This could be done by targeting the computers high of level official’s—anyone who has reportedly worked on such a project, or individuals involved in military operations at underground facilities, such as those reported to be located at Yamantau and Kosvinksy mountains in the central southern Urals (Rosenbaum 2007, Blair 2008) Indirect Control of Launch Cyber terrorists could cause incorrect information to be transmitted, received, or displayed at nuclear command and control centres, or shut down these centres’ computer networks completely. In 1995, a Norwegian scientific sounding rocket was mistaken by Russian early warning systems as a nuclear missile launched from a US submarine. A radar operator used Krokus to notify a general on duty who decided to alert the highest levels. Kavkaz was implemented, all three chegets activated, and the countdown for a nuclear decision began. It took eight minutes before the missile was properly identified—a considerable amount of time considering the speed with which a nuclear response must be decided upon (Aftergood 2000). Creating a false signal in these early warning systems would be relatively easy using computer network operations. The real difficulty would be gaining access to these systems as they are most likely on a closed network. However, if they are transmitting wirelessly, that may provide an entry point, and information gained through the internet may reveal the details, such as passwords and software, for gaining entrance to the closed network. If access was obtained, a false alarm could be followed by something like a DDoS attack, so the operators believe an attack may be imminent, yet they can no longer verify it. This could add pressure to the decision making process, and if coordinated precisely, could appear as a first round EMP burst. Terrorist groups could also attempt to launch a non-nuclear missile, such as the one used by Norway, in an attempt to fool the system. The number of states who possess such technology is far greater than the number of states who possess nuclear weapons. Obtaining them would be considerably easier, especially when enhancing operations through computer network operations. Combining traditional terrorist methods with cyber techniques opens opportunities neither could accomplish on their own. For example, radar stations might be more vulnerable to a computer attack, while satellites are more vulnerable to jamming from a laser beam, thus together they deny dual phenomenology. Mapping communications networks through cyber reconnaissance may expose weaknesses, and automated scanning devices created by more experienced hackers can be readily found on the internet. Intercepting or spoofing communications is a highly complex science. These systems are designed to protect against the world’s most powerful and well funded militaries. Yet, there are recurring gaffes, and the very nature of asymmetric warfare is to bypass complexities by finding simple loopholes. For example, commercially available software for voice-morphing could be used to capture voice commands within the command and control structure, cut these sound bytes into phonemes, and splice it back together in order to issue false voice commands (Andersen 2001, Chapter 16). Spoofing could also be used to escalate a volatile situation in the hopes of starting a nuclear war. “ \*\*[they cut off the paragraph]\*\* “In June 1998, a group of international hackers calling themselves Milw0rm hacked the web site of India’s Bhabha Atomic Research Center (BARC) and put up a spoofed web page showing a mushroom cloud and the text “If a nuclear war does start, you will be the first to scream” (Denning 1999). Hacker web-page defacements like these are often derided by critics of cyber terrorism as simply being a nuisance which causes no significant harm. However, web-page defacements are becoming more common, and they point towards alarming possibilities in subversion. During the 2007 cyber attacks against Estonia, a counterfeit letter of apology from Prime Minister Andrus Ansip was planted on his political party website (Grant 2007). This took place amid the confusion of mass DDoS attacks, real world protests, and accusations between governments.

#### Climate Change causes Extinction

Tickell 08 – (Oliver Tickell is an environmental Researcher. He is the founder of the Kyoto2 climate initiative, a researcher of the Oxford Climate Associates and specialized in international climate policy. Published August 11th, 2008 (<http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/aug/11/climatechange>)

We need to get prepared for four degrees of global warming, Bob Watson [PhD in Chemistry, Award for Scientific Freedom and Responsibility from the American Association for the Advacement of Science] told the Guardian last week. At first sight this looks like wise counsel from the climate science adviser to Defra. But the idea that we could adapt to a 4C rise is absurd and dangerous. Global warming on this scale would be a catastrophe that would mean**,** in the immortal words that Chief Seattle probably never spoke, "the end of living and the beginning of survival" for humankind. Or perhaps the beginning of our extinction. The collapse of the polar ice caps would become inevitable, bringing long-term sea level rises of 70-80 metres. All the world's coastal plains would be lost, complete with ports, cities, transport and industrial infrastructure, and much of the world's most productive farmland. The world's geography would be transformed much as it was at the end of the last ice age, when sea levels rose by about 120 metres to create the Channel, the North Sea and Cardigan Bay out of dry land. Weather would become extreme and unpredictable, with more frequent and severe droughts, floods and hurricanes. The Earth's carrying capacity would be hugely reduced. Billions would undoubtedly die. Watson's call was supported by the government's former chief scientific adviser, Sir David King [Director of the Smith School of Enterprise and the Environment at the University of Oxford], who warned that "if we get to a four-degree rise it is quite possible that we would begin to see a runaway increase". This is a remarkable understatement. The climate system is already experiencing significant feedbacks, notably the summer melting of the Arctic sea ice. The more the ice melts, the more sunshine is absorbed by the sea, and the more the Arctic warms. And as the Arctic warms, the release of billions of tonnes of methane – a greenhouse gas 70 times stronger than carbon dioxide over 20 years – captured under melting permafrost is already under way. To see how far this process could go, look 55.5m years to the Palaeocene-Eocene Thermal Maximum, when a global temperature increase of 6C coincided with the release of about 5,000 gigatonnes of carbon into the atmosphere, both as CO2 and as methane from bogs and seabed sediments. Lush subtropical forests grew in polar regions, and sea levels rose to 100m higher than today. It appears that an initial warming pulse triggered other warming processes. Many scientists warn that this historical event may be analogous to the present: the warming caused by human emissions could propel us towards a similar hothouse Earth.

#### Drug trafficking turns stability – makes suppressing violence impossible

**Kleiman, 4**

(Mark, B.A. magna cum laude, Haverford College, M.P.P., Harvard Kennedy School, Ph.D., Harvard, Professor of Public Policy in the UCLA School of Public Affairs, “Illicit Drugs and the Terrorist Threat: Causal Links and Implications for Domestic Drug Control Policy”, Congressional Research Service, 4/20/2004, http://www.fas.org/irp/crs/RL32334.pdf, JKahn)

Drug dealing can generate chaos and instability in source and transit countries by sustaining violence, both within and among groups of traffickers and between traffickers on the one hand and ordinary citizens and public authorities on the other. The growth of a criminal economy is also a potentially destabilizing factor. Drug law enforcement can create friction between law enforcement and military authorities on the one hand and ordinary citizens, including small farmers who illicitly grow drug crops, on the other. The secretive techniques of drug investigation can become entangled with the practice of authoritarian rule, as appears to have happened under the Fujimori16 government in Peru. In addition, traffickers can deliberately create chaos in order to weaken the ability of the institutions of government and civil society to interfere with their illegal business. In Colombia, for example, the Medellin Cartel attempted to use terror to deter the Colombian government from proceeding with vigorous law enforcement measures.17 The same effects can also take place in consumer countries. The retail drug traffic, especially when it grows violent, can be a powerful source of chaos, as many American neighborhoods discovered as the crack trade spread in the 1980s and early 1990s. It has been suggested, though not demonstrated, that drug trafficking has been used as a form of low-intensity conflict.18 The theory is that forces hostile to a given country might attempt to introduce or aggravate drug addiction problems there as a means of attack.

#### Engagement with Cuba boosts overall U.S. *soft power* — the plan increases momentum and credibility.

Dickerson 10 — Sergio M. Dickerson, Lieutenant Colonel in the United States Army, 2010 (“United States Security Strategy Towards Cuba,” Strategy Research Project submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Master of Strategic Studies Degree at the U.S. Army War College, January 14th, Available Online at http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA518053, Accessed 05-20-2013, p. 21-22)

Today, 20 years have passed since the fall of the Berlin Wall – it’s time to chip away at the diplomatic wall that still remains between U.S. and Cuba. As we seek a new foreign policy with Cuba it is imperative that we take into consideration that distrust will characterize negotiations with the Cuban government. On the other hand, consider that loosening or lifting the embargo could also be mutually beneficial. Cuba’s need and America’s surplus capability to provide goods and services could be profitable and [end page 21] eventually addictive to Cuba. Under these conditions, diplomacy has a better chance to flourish.

If the Cuban model succeeds President Obama will be seen as a true leader for multilateralism. Success in Cuba could afford the international momentum and credibility to solve other seemingly “wicked problems” like the Middle East and Kashmir. President Obama could leverage this international reputation with other rogue nations like Iran and North Korea who might associate their plight with Cuba.35 The U.S. could begin to lead again and reverse its perceived decline in the greater global order bringing true peace for years to come.

#### Proliferation risks nuclear conflict—inexperienced nations will be more likely to use their nukes

Horowitz 9­­—Professor of Political Science at University of Pennsylvania [Michael Horowitz, “The Spread of Nuclear Weapons and International Conflict: Does Experience Matter?” *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Volume 53 Number 2, April 2009 pg. 234-257]

Learning as states gain experience with nuclear weapons is complicated. While to some extent nuclear acquisition might provide information about resolve or capabilities, it also generates uncertainty about the way an actual conflict would go – given the new risk of nuclear escalation – and uncertainty about relative capabilities. Rapid proliferation may especially heighten uncertainty given the potential for reasonable states to disagree at times about the quality of the capabilities each possesses. 3

What follows is an attempt to describe the implications of inexperience and incomplete information on the behavior of nuclear states and their potential opponents over time. Since it is impossible to detail all possible lines of argumentation and possible responses, the following discussion is necessarily incomplete. This is a first step. The acquisition of nuclear weapons increases the confidence of adopters in their ability to impose costs in the case of a conflict and the expectations of likely costs if war occurs by potential opponents. The key questions are whether nuclear states learn over time about how to leverage nuclear weapons and the implications of that learning, along with whether or not actions by nuclear states, over time, convey information that leads to changes in the expectations of their behavior – shifts in uncertainty – on the part of potential adversaries.

Learning to Leverage?

When a new state acquires nuclear weapons, how does it influence the way the state behaves and how might that change over time? Though nuclear acquisition might be orthogonal to a particular dispute, it might be related to a particular security challenge, might signal revisionist aims with regard to an enduring dispute, or might signal the desire to reinforce the status quo.

This section focuses on how acquiring nuclear weapons influences both the new nuclear state and potential adversaries. In theory, system-wide perceptions of nuclear danger could allow new nuclear states to partially skip the early Cold War learning process concerning the risks of nuclear war and enter a proliferated world more cognizant of nuclear brinksmanship and bargaining than their predecessors. However, each new nuclear state has to resolve its own particular civil-military issues surrounding operational control and plan its national strategy in light of its new capabilities. Empirical research by Sagan, Feaver, and Blair suggests that viewing the behavior of other states does not create the necessary tacit knowledge; there is no substitute for experience when it comes to handling a nuclear arsenal, even if experience itself cannot totally prevent accidents (Blair 1993; Feaver 1992; Sagan 1993). Sagan contends that civil-military instability in many likely new proliferators and pressures generated by the requirements to handle the responsibility of dealing with nuclear weapons will skew decision-making towards more offensive strategies (Sagan 1995). The questions surrounding Pakistan’s nuclear command and control suggest there is no magic bullet when it comes to new nuclear powers making control and delegation decisions (Bowen and Wolvén 1999).

Sagan and others focus on inexperience on the part of new nuclear states as a key behavioral driver. Inexperienced operators, and the bureaucratic desire to “justify” the costs spent developing nuclear weapons, combined with organizational biases that may favor escalation to avoid decapitation, the “use it or lose it” mindset, may cause new nuclear states to adopt riskier launch postures, like launch on warning, or at least be perceived that way by other states (Blair 1993; Feaver 1992; Sagan 1995). 4

Acquiring nuclear weapons could alter state preferences and make them more likely to escalate disputes once they start, given their new capabilities.5 But their general lack of experience at leveraging their nuclear arsenal and effectively communicating nuclear threats could mean new nuclear states will be more likely to select adversaries poorly and find themselves in disputes with resolved adversaries that will reciprocate militarized challenges.

The “nuclear experience” logic also suggests that more experienced nuclear states should gain knowledge over time from nuclearized interactions that helps leaders effectively identify the situations in which their nuclear arsenal is likely to make a difference. Experienced nuclear states learn to select into cases where their comparative advantage, nuclear weapons, is more likely to be effective, increasing the probability that an adversary will not reciprocate.

Coming from a slightly different perspective, uncertainty about the consequences of proliferation on the balance of power and the behavior of new nuclear states on the part of their potential adversaries could also shape behavior in similar ways (Schelling 1966; Blainey 1988). While a stable and credible nuclear arsenal communicates clear information about the likely costs of conflict, in the short-term nuclear proliferation is likely to increase uncertainty about the trajectory of a war, the balance of power, and the preferences of the adopter.

### Advantage Two is Human Rights

#### The Cuban embargo is the worst and most destructive of all policies enacted by the United States—it systematically denies Cubans of their most basic rights

**Wall, 97** contributing Editor of The Christian Century magazine (James M. Wall, June 1997, “Cruel squeeze on Cuba”, Ebsco)//EM

IT IS HARD to think of any single foreign policy act by the United States that is meaner, more demeaning and altogether less defensible than the American embargo on medicine, medical supplies and food to Cuba." That stinging rebuke was delivered by Stephen S. Rosenfeld in the Washington Post. The embargo, first put in place in 1961 in an effort to topple Fidel Castro, is not only mean and demeaning; it is also a complete failure. Castro is still in power. In addition, by including medicine and food in the embargo, the U.S. is violating international human rights conventions which call for the free movement of food and medicine, even in wartime, to civilian populations. Seventeen years ago I spoke to a small Southern Baptist congregation in Havana. During the social hour a woman told me of her daughter's need for a medication. At that time she could get drugs from Eastern Europe, but the particular drug she needed was available only from a U.S. company. Did I think, she asked, that after the upcoming presidential election her fellow Southern Baptist, Jimmy Carter, would lift the embargo on food and medicine? I told her that I had good reason to believe that Carter, if re-elected, would indeed lift that part of the ban. Three weeks later, Carter lost the presidency to Ronald Reagan. The embargo is not only still in place; it has been tightened. In 1992 George Bush signed the Cuban Democracy Act during a campaign stop in Florida, and in 1996 President Clinton signed the Helms-Burton Act during his re-election campaign. It is the Helms-Burton Act which is so stringent that it prevents foreign companies from doing business in the U.S. if they "traffic" with Cuban companies that hold properties that Castro nationalized in 1960. The U.S., which in recent years has turned to the United Nations to sanction its military actions in Iraq and in the former Yugoslavia, has ignored UN resolutions that condemn the Cuba embargo and which call for the U.S. to rescind provisions of the embargo that violate both the UN Charter and international law. The damage inflicted on the Cuban people by the ban on food and medicine has been documented in a recent year-long study conducted by the American Association for World Health. The medical investigators, directed by physician Peter Bourne, chair of the AAWH board and a former official in the Carter administration, interviewed medical professionals and government officials, surveyed 12 American medical and pharmaceutical companies, and documented the experience of Cuban import firms. AAWH concluded that the U.S. embargo is "taking a tragic human toll" on the Cuban people. Indeed, "the embargo has closed so many windows that in some instances Cuban physicians have found it impossible to obtain lifesaving machines from any source, under any circumstances. Patients have died." According to the report, until 1990 all Cuban women over the age of 35 received mammograms on a regular basis at no cost. Today, without adequate equipment, mammograms are no longer employed as a routine preventive procedure; they are used only for high-risk patients. In 1994 and 1995, the lack of X-ray film halted all mammograms in Havana institutions and in 15 mobile units. The AAWH found that "the embargo prevents the Eastman Kodak company or any subsidiary from selling the U.S.-produced Kodak Mini-R film--a product specifically recommended by the World Health Organization because it exposes women to less radiation." During the 1980s, as many as 15 mastectomies were performed daily; now, because of the lack of surgical supplies, the number has dropped to two or three a day. Cuba tried to buy X-ray film from third-party trading companies, but ran into two problems: markups priced the film out of the government's reach, and these third-party intermediaries were reluctant to purchase sufficient quantities to sell to Cuba even at inflated prices because large purchases would call U.S. attention to sales that would be illegal under U.S. law. The AAWH team also reported that since 1992 Cuba has been unable to purchase parts for the chlorination system that treats 70 percent of the country's drinking water. Morbidity rates from water-born diseases have doubled since 1989. A shortage of anesthetics and related equipment and of antibiotics has forced a drop in the number of surgeries from 885,790 in 1990 to 536,547 in 1995. When the AAWH team visited one pediatric ward, it found that 35 children were vomiting 28 to 30 times a day from their chemotherapy treatment, a reaction that is normally minimized with a drug readily available in the U.S. New drugs for breast cancer and children's leukemia are denied to women and children in Cuba. The political logic behind a policy of deliberately blocking Cuba from access to medical supplies and drugs is quite simple: some U.S. politicians and their financial backers, most notably Cuban-Americans who live in South Florida and New Jersey and dream of one day returning to Cuba, don't like Fidel Castro. Neither did Dwight Eisenhower, who began the embargo in 1961 at the height of the cold war when Castro nationalized the U.S. corporations in Cuba and declared his Marxist sympathies. That move brought him decades of financial support from the Soviet Union, but it also launched the U.S. embargo. When the Soviet Union collapsed in 1989, its financial backing for Cuba ended. The U.S. embargo continues. Following the release of the AAWH report, the U.S. State Department quickly rejected "any allegation that the United States government is responsible for the deplorable state of health care in Cuba." A spokesman for Secretary of State Madeleine Albright maintained that a "loophole" in the embargo allows for U.S. humanitarian shipments to Cuba from nongovernmental agencies. According to AAWH, however, "donations from U.S. NGOs, international agencies and third countries do not compensate to any major degree for the hardships inflicted by the embargo on the health care system and the health of the Cuban people. Restrictions placed on charitable donations from the U.S. which are similar to those imposed on commercial trade have the same discouraging impact, severely limiting what might otherwise be contributed." The AAWH's conclusions are supported by statistics and extensive interviews with medical professionals in Cuba and the U.S. But individual cases tell an even more powerful story. "In one instance," the AAWH reports, "Cuban cardiologists diagnosed a heart attack patient with a ventricular arrhythmia. He required an implantable defibrillator to survive. Though the U.S. firm CPI, which then held a virtual monopoly on the device, expressed a willingness to make the sale, the U.S. government denied a license for it. Two months later the patient died."

#### Furthermore, it legitimizes the Castro regime, which destroys human rights

**HRW, 8** (Human Rights Watch, 2/19/8, “Cuba: Fidel Castro’s Abusive Machinery Remains Intact”, http://www.hrw.org/news/2008/02/18/cuba-fidel-castro-s-abusive-machinery-remains-intact)//EM

Despite Fidel Castro’s resignation today, Cuba’s abusive legal and institutional mechanisms continue to deprive Cubans of their basic rights, Human Rights Watch said today. The counterproductive US embargo policy continues to give the Cuban government a pretext for human rights violations. “Even if Castro no longer calls the shots, the repressive machinery he constructed over almost half a century remains fully intact,” said José Miguel Vivanco, Americas director at Human Rights Watch. “Until that changes, it’s unlikely there will be any real progress on human rights in Cuba.” For almost five decades, Cuba has restricted nearly all avenues of political dissent. Cuban citizens have been systematically deprived of their fundamental rights to free expression, privacy, association, assembly, movement, and due process of law. Tactics for enforcing political conformity have included police warnings, surveillance, short-term detentions, house arrests, travel restrictions, criminal prosecutions, and politically motivated dismissals from employment. Cuba’s legal and institutional structures have been at the root of its rights violations. The rights to freedom of expression, association, assembly, movement, and the press are strictly limited under Cuban law. By criminalizing enemy propaganda, the spreading of “unauthorized news,” and insult to patriotic symbols, the government curbs freedom of speech under the guise of protecting state security. The courts are not independent; they undermine the right to fair trial by restricting the right to a defense, and frequently fail to observe the few due process rights available to defendants under domestic law. “Since Fidel Castro first turned power over to his brother, the Cuban government has occasionally indicated a willingness to reconsider its approach to human rights,” said Vivanco. “But so far it hasn’t taken any of the steps needed to end its abusive practices.” In December 2007, the Cuban government announced its intention to ratify the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. The ratification, if it occurs, would represent an important break from Cuba's longstanding refusal to recognize these core human rights treaties. However, the Cuban government still needs to take concrete steps to decriminalize political dissent, Human Rights Watch said. Specifically, it should unconditionally release all political dissidents. It should also repeal the provisions of the penal code that provide the basis for gross violations of human rights. “This would be a good time for the US government to revisit its failed embargo policy,” said Vivanco. “By lifting the embargo, Washington could deprive Raúl Castro of the underdog image that his brother exploited so effectively.” For more than four decades, the US government has used Cuba’s dismal rights record to justify a sweeping economic embargo aimed at toppling the Castro regime. Yet the policy did nothing to bring change to Cuba. On the contrary, it helped consolidate Castro’s hold on power by providing his government with an excuse for its problems and a justification for its abuses. Moreover, because the policy was imposed in such a heavy-handed fashion, it enabled Castro to garner sympathy abroad, neutralizing international pressure rather than increasing it.

#### Such sanctions are an immoral and calculative form of foreign policy that is evil and should be rejected

**Addis, 3** William Ray Forrester Professor of Public and Constitutional Law at Tulane University Law School. He received his B.A. and LL.B. (Honours) from Macquarie University (Australia), and an LL.M. and a J.S.D from Yale.(Adeno Addis, 2003, “Economic Sanctions and the Problem of Evil”, *Human Rights Quarterly* 25.3, Project Muse)//EM

As sanctions have proliferated, however, their use has come under intense challenge from various sources. The reasons for such challenges are as diverse as the critics themselves, but one could group the critics into three general categories. One group of critics simply challenges that sanctions do in fact achieve the purpose for which they are often adopted. Proponents of sanctions often state that sanctions are imposed for purposes of persuading or forcing the regime of the target state to change its conduct or policy in relation to a particular area of concern by making the cost of pursuing that policy greater than the benefit to be gained from it. Critics of this line of reasoning argue that sanctions, whether unilateral or multilateral, often fail to bring about the desired behavioral or policy change. 12 The challenge here is, by and large, empirical not normative. Other critics may concede that more often than not such measures would lead to the desired behavior modification, but at a cost that is often unacceptably high. Economic sanctions deprive citizens of the target state many of the basic necessities of life, leading to massive disruption and even destruction of life. The often high cost in life, liberty, and property that economic sanctions exact on innocent citizens and sectors of the target state are, to these critics, simply unacceptable even if at the end there was to be a change in the action and behavior of the regime of the target state. The moral and material costs that sanctions entail are, to these critics, simply too high to bear. Actually, there are two versions of the moral argument. The weak version is utilitarian in nature. It claims that often the cost in innocent human life and infrastructural damage is far greater than the benefit that is gained by imposing these sanctions. 13 The strong version of the moral argument is Kantian in its outlook. It objects to economic sanctions on the ground that often, if not always, sanctions target innocent civilians for suffering as a means to achieving a foreign policy objective, contrary to Kant's categorical imperative that we treat "humanity, whether in [our] person or in the person of any other, never simply as a means, but always at the same time as an end." 14 The argument here is that it is morally [End Page 576] unacceptable to impose suffering on innocent sectors of the target state, as economic sanctions do, for an objective that does not involve the prevention of the deaths of other innocent persons. 15

#### Maintaining a moral order that respects human rights is crucial for human survival.

Annas et al. 2 — George J. Annas, Edward R. Utley Professor and Chair of the Health Law Department at the Boston University School of Public Health, Professor of SocioMedical Sciences and Community Medicine at Boston University School of Medicine, Professor of Law at Boston University School of Law, holds a J.D. from Harvard Law School and an M.P.H. from Harvard School of Public Health, et al., with Lori B. Andrews, Distinguished Professor of Law at the Chicago-Kent College of Law, Director of the Institute for Science, Law, and Technology at the Illinois Institute of Technology, holds a J.D. from Yale Law School, and Rosario M. Isasi, Health Law and Bioethics Fellow in the Health Law Department at the Boston University School of Public Health, holds a J.D. from Pontificia Universidad Catolica del Peru and an M.P.H. from the Boston University School of Public Health, 2002 (“Protecting the Endangered Human: Toward an International Treaty Prohibiting Cloning and Inheritable Alterations,” *American Journal of Law & Medicine* (28 Am. J. L. and Med. 151), Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via Lexis-Nexis)

II. HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE HUMAN SPECIES

The development of the atomic bomb not only presented to the world for the first time the prospect of total annihilation, but also, paradoxically, led to a renewed emphasis on the "nuclear family," complete with its personal bomb shelter. The conclusion of World War II (with the dropping of the only two atomic bombs ever used in war) led to the recognition that world wars were now suicidal to the entire species and to the formation of the United Nations with the primary goal of preventing such wars. n2 Prevention, of course, must be based on the recognition that all humans are fundamentally the same, rather than on an emphasis on our differences. In the aftermath of the Cuban missile crisis, the closest the world has ever come to nuclear war, President John F. Kennedy, in an address to the former Soviet Union, underscored the necessity for recognizing similarities for our survival:

Let us not be blind to our differences, but let us also direct attention to our common interests and the means by which those differences can be resolved . . . . For, in the final analysis, our most basic common link is that we all inhabit this small planet. We all breathe the same air. We all cherish our children's future. And we are all mortal. n3

That we are all fundamentally the same, all human, all with the same dignity and rights, is at the core of the most important document to come out of World War II, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and the two treaties that followed it (together known as the "International Bill of Rights"). n4 The recognition of universal human rights, based on human dignity and equality as well as the principle of nondiscrimination, is fundamental to the development of a species consciousness. As Daniel Lev of Human Rights Watch/Asia said in 1993, shortly before the Vienna Human Rights Conference:

Whatever else may separate them, human beings belong to a single biological species, the simplest and most fundamental commonality before which the significance of human differences quickly fades. . . . We are all capable, in exactly the same ways, of feeling pain, hunger, [\*153] and a hundred kinds of deprivation. Consequently, people nowhere routinely concede that those with enough power to do so ought to be able to kill, torture, imprison, and generally abuse others. . . . The idea of universal human rights shares the recognition of one common humanity, and provides a minimum solution to deal with its miseries. n5

Membership in the human species is central to the meaning and enforcement of human rights, and respect for basic human rights is essential for the survival of the human species. The development of the concept of "crimes against humanity" was a milestone for universalizing human rights in that it recognized that there were certain actions, such as slavery and genocide, that implicated the welfare of the entire species and therefore merited universal condemnation. n6 Nuclear weapons were immediately seen as a technology that required international control, as extreme genetic manipulations like cloning and inheritable genetic alterations have come to be seen today. In fact, cloning and inheritable genetic alterations can be seen as crimes against humanity of a unique sort: they are techniques that can alter the essence of humanity itself (and thus threaten to change the foundation of human rights) by taking human evolution into our own hands and directing it toward the development of a new species, sometimes termed the "posthuman." n7 It may be that species-altering techniques, like cloning and inheritable genetic modifications, could provide benefits to the human species in extraordinary circumstances. For example, asexual genetic replication could potentially save humans from extinction if all humans were rendered sterile by some catastrophic event. But no such necessity currently exists or is on the horizon.

#### Dehumanization is the worst comprehensible impact: it outweighs everything

Montagu & Matson, anthropologist and professor of American Studies, 83

(Ashley and Floyd, “The Dehumanization of Man,” 1983)

This book is concerned with an invisible disease, an affliction of the spirit, which has been ravaging humanity in recent times without surcrease and virtually without resistance, and which has now reached epidemic proportions in the Western world. The contagion is unknown to science and unreckognized by medicine (pyschiatry aside); yet its wasting symptoms are plain for all to see and its lethal effects are everywhere on display. It neither kills outright nor inflicts apparent physical harm, yet the extent of its destructive toll is already greater than that of any war, plague, famine, or natural calamity on record-and it's potential damage to the quality of human life and the fabric of civilized society is beyond calculation. For that reason the sickness of the soul might well be called the "Fifth horseman of the apocalypse." It's more conventional name, of course, is dehumanization.

## Solvency

#### Want change in Cuba? End U.S. embargo now

Perez Jr. 10 Louis A. Perez Jr. is the J. Carlyle Sitterson professor of history and the director of the Institute for the Study of the Americas at the[*University[http://savingsslider-a.akamaihd.net/items/it/img/arrow-10x10.png](http://www.cnn.com/2010/OPINION/09/20/perez.cuba.embargo/index.html?iref=allsearch)*](http://www.cnn.com/2010/OPINION/09/20/perez.cuba.embargo/index.html?iref=allsearch)of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. He holds a **M.A. from the University of Arizona, 1966 and a  
Ph.D. from the University of New Mexico, 1970** Among his books are "[*Cuba in the American Imagination: Metaphor and the Imperial Ethos*](http://uncpress.unc.edu/browse/book_detail?title_id=1535/)," and "Cuba: Between Reform and Revolution"

(CNN) - In April 2009, the White House released a presidential memorandum declaring that democracy and human rights in Cuba were "national interests of the United States." Assistant Secretary of State Arturo Valenzuela repeated the message in May of this year to the Cuban-American National Foundation in Miami. The Obama administration, he said, wanted "to promote respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms ... in ways that will empower the Cuban people and advance our national interests." Fine words. But if the administration really wanted to do something in the national interest, it would end the 50-year-old policy of political and economic isolation of Cuba. The Cuban embargo can no longer even pretend to be plausible. On the contrary, it has contributed to the very conditions that stifle democracy and human rights there. For 50 years, its brunt has fallen mainly on the Cuban people.

This is not by accident. On the contrary, the embargo was designed to impose suffering and hunger on Cubans in the hope that they would rise up and overturn their government. "The only foreseeable means of alienating internal support," the Department of State insisted as early as April 1960, "is through disenchantment and disaffection based on economic dissatisfaction and hardship." The United States tightened the screws in the post-Soviet years with the Torricelli Act and the Helms-Burton Act -- measures designed, Sen. Robert Torricelli said, "to wreak havoc on that island." The post-Soviet years were [indeed[http://savingsslider-a.akamaihd.net/items/it/img/arrow-10x10.png](http://www.cnn.com/2010/OPINION/09/20/perez.cuba.embargo/index.html?iref=allsearch)](http://www.cnn.com/2010/OPINION/09/20/perez.cuba.embargo/index.html?iref=allsearch) calamitous. Throughout the 1990s, Cubans faced growing scarcities, deteriorating services and increased rationing. Meeting the needs of ordinary life took extraordinary effort. And therein lies the problem that still bedevils U.S. policy today. Far from inspiring the Cuban people to revolution, the embargo keeps them down and distracted. Dire need and urgent want are hardly optimum circumstances for a people to contemplate the benefits of democracy. A people preoccupied with survival have little interest or inclination to bestir themselves in behalf of anything else.

In Cuba, routine household errands and chores consume overwhelming amounts of time and energy, day after day: hours in lines at the local grocery store or waiting for public transportation. Cubans in vast numbers choose to emigrate. Others burrow deeper into the black market, struggling to make do and carry on. Many commit suicide. (Cuba has one of the highest suicide rates in the world; in 2000, the latest year for which we have statistics, it was 16.4 per 100,000 people.) A June 2008 survey in The New York Times reported that less than 10 percent of Cubans identified the lack of political freedom as the island's main problem. As one Cuban colleague recently suggested to me: "First necessities, later democracy." The United States should consider a change of policy, one that would offer Cubans relief from the all-consuming ordeal of daily life. Improved material circumstances would allow Cubans to turn their attention to other aspirations. Ending the embargo would also imply respect for the Cuban people, an acknowledgment that they have the vision and vitality to enact needed reforms, and that transition in Cuba, whatever form it may take, is wholly a Cuban affair.

A good-faith effort to engage Cuba, moreover, would counter the common perception there that the United States is a threat to its sovereignty. It would deny Cuban leaders the chance to use U.S. policy as pretext to limit public debate and stifle dissent -- all to the good of democracy and human rights.

And it would serve the national interest.