## Neolib

### 1NC

**1) Components of neoliberalism include free trade and foreign direct investment- lifting the embargo would inevitably lead to this in Cuba**

**Fanelli, York University Sociologist, 2008**

(Carlo, November, “’Cubanalismo’: The Cuban Alternative to Neoliberalism,” New Proposals: Journal of Marxism and Interdisciplinary Inquiry, Volume 2, pg 7-16 FG)

**Central to neoliberalism** is the belief that **a laissez-faire approach to economics, which encourages** free trade, the liberalization of the marketplace, increased efficiency and competition, and the **limited role of governments** to protecting the interests of capital, is the solution to the developing world’s backwardness and inability to catch-up. Neoliberal discourses attempt to roll-back the boundaries of the state by emphasizing the inherent efficiency of market competition, the role of individual capitalists in determining superior economic performance, **and the belief that supply and demand will lead to factors of production being paid what the market determines they are worth** (Palley 2005). According to this perspective, government regulation and intervention of the economy should be limited to protecting the private interests of capital since, according to neoliberal economists, influences outside the realm of the free market inevitably distort the natural efficiency of self-regulating markets. Following this line of reasoning, the introduction of labour unions, governmentally-mandated tariffs, subsidies and protective measures, for example, ultimately leads to an inflated and destabilized marketplace, which will eventually result in fiscal and monetary policies ballooning out of control. Rather, an autonomous market free from external influences ensures that factors of production automatically self-adjust removing the need for government institutions to regulate economic activities and interfere with the so-called superior performance of unfettered markets (Palley 2005). The “invisible hand” of the free market, it is argued, will automatically adjust to fluctuating market demands by letting economic forces run their natural course. While neoliberalism **assumes that the market is inherently efficient due to self-regulation, cutthroat competition, and continuous information and technological developments, government intervention into the economy is naturally inefficient due to its bureaucratic nature, large size, and conflicting interests** (political/social versus economic). Proponents of neoliberalism include theInternational Monetary Fund (IMF), World Trade Organization (WTO) and World Bank (WB), while **countries that encourage neoliberal policies** also **include the US**, Canada, Japan, members of the European Union, and a number of other nations throughout the rest of the world. As a means of advancement, **neoliberals advocate for the liberalization of foreign trade, the opening-up of domestic economies to** international competition and foreign direct investment (**FDI**), **the removal of market rigidities, and the limitation of public-sector activity and employment** (Palley 2005). A contemporary example of this is the IMF’s and WB’s structural adjustment programs (Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers), which are most often a prerequisite if developing countries are to access grants or soft loans. In order to be eligible, countries must enter into a neoliberal framework that often compels nations to focus on export-led growth, privatization of public-sector employment, the lifting of import and export restrictions, emphasis on balanced budgets, the removal of price controls and state subsidies, as well as the devaluation of currencies in order to make exports cheaper to purchase on the international marketplace (Saad-Filho 2005a). Unfortunately, however, what **proponents of neoliberalism often do not account** for are the **social and human costs associated with the unfettered pursuit of wealth and resources, which are inextricably linked to the implementation of neoliberalism on a global scale.**

#### 2) Neoliberal engagement of Latin America results in inequality, political oppression, and military intervention—moral obligation to put those sacrificed by Western growth at the center of decision making.

**Makwana 6** (Rajesh, STWR, 23rd November 06, <http://www.stwr.org/globalization/neoliberalism-and-economic-globalization.html>, ZBurdette)

Neoliberalism and Economic Globalization¶ The goal of neoliberal economic globalization is the removal of all barriers to commerce, and the privatization of all available resources and services. In this scenario, public life will be at the mercy of market forces, as the extracted profits benefit the few, writes Rajesh Makwana.¶ The thrust of international policy behind the phenomenon of economic globalization is neoliberal in nature. Being hugely profitable to corporations and the wealthy elite, neoliberal polices are propagated through the IMF, World Bank and WTO. Neoliberalism favours the free-market as the most efficient method of global resource allocation. Consequently it favours large-scale, corporate commerce and the privatization of resources.¶ There has been much international attention recently on neoliberalism. Its ideologies have been rejected by influential countries in Latin America and its moral basis is now widely questioned. Recent protests against the WTO, IMF and World Bank were essentially protests against the neoliberal policies that these organizations implement, particularly in low-income countries.¶ The neoliberal experiment has failed to combat extreme poverty, has exacerbated global inequality, and is hampering international aid and development efforts. This article presents an overview of neoliberalism and its effect on low income countries.¶ Introduction ¶ After the Second World War, corporate enterprises helped to create a wealthy class in society which enjoyed excessive political influence on their government in the US and Europe. Neoliberalism surfaced as a reaction by these wealthy elites to counteract post-war policies that favoured the working class and strengthened the welfare state.¶ Neoliberal policies advocate market forces and commercial activity as the most efficient methods for producing and supplying goods and services. At the same time they shun the role of the state and discourage government intervention into economic, financial and even social affairs. The process of economic globalization is driven by this ideology; removing borders and barriers between nations so that market forces can drive the global economy. The policies were readily taken up by governments and still continue to pervade classical economic thought, allowing corporations and affluent countries to secure their financial advantage within the world economy.¶ The policies were most ardently enforced in the US and Europe in the1980s during the Regan–Thatcher–Kohl era. These leaders believed that expanding the free-market and private ownership would create greater economic efficiency and social well-being. The resulting deregulation, privatization and the removal of border restrictions provided fertile ground for corporate activity, and over the next 25 years corporations grew rapidly in size and influence. Corporations are now the most productive economic units in the world, more so than most countries. With their huge financial, economic and political leverage, they continue to further their neoliberal objectives.¶ There is a consensus between the financial elite, neoclassical economists and the political classes in most countries that neoliberal policies will create global prosperity. So entrenched is their position that this view determines the policies of the international agencies (IMF, World Bank and WTO), and through them dictates the functioning of the global economy. Despite reservations from within many UN agencies, neoliberal policies are accepted by most development agencies as the most likely means of reducing poverty and inequality in the poorest regions.¶ There is a huge discrepancy between the measurable result of economic globalization and its proposed benefits. Neoliberal policies have unarguably generated massive wealth for some people, but most crucially, they have been unable to benefit those living in extreme poverty who are most in need of financial aid. Excluding China, annual economic growth in developing countries between 1960 and 1980 was 3.2%. This dropped drastically between 1980 and 2000 to a mere 0.7 %. This second period is when neoliberalism was most prevalent in global economic policy. (Interestingly, China was not following the neoliberal model during these periods, and its economic growth per capita grew to over 8% between 1980 and 2000.)¶ Neoliberalism has also been unable to address growing levels of global inequality. Over the last 25 years, the income inequalities have increased dramatically, both within and between countries. Between 1980 and 1998, the income of richest 10% as share of poorest 10% became 19% more unequal; and the income of richest 1% as share of poorest 1% became 77% more unequal (again, not including China).¶ The shortcomings of neoliberal policy are also apparent in the well documented economic disasters suffered by countries in Latin America and South Asia in the 1990s. These countries were left with no choice but to follow the neoliberal model of privatization and deregulation, due to their financial problems and pressure from the IMF. Countries such as Venezuela, Cuba, Argentina and Bolivia have since rejected foreign corporate control and the advice of the IMF and World Bank. Instead they have favoured a redistribution of wealth, the re-nationalization of industry and have prioritized the provision of healthcare and education. They are also sharing resources such as oil and medical expertise throughout the region and with other countries around the world.¶ The dramatic economic and social improvement seen in these countries has not stopped them from being demonized by the US. Cuba is a well known example of this propaganda. Deemed to be a danger to ‘freedom and the American way of life’, Cuba has been subject to intense US political, economic and military pressure in order to tow the neoliberal line. Washington and the mainstream media in the US have recently embarked on a similar propaganda exercise aimed at Venezuela’s president Chavez. This over-reaction by Washington to ‘economic nationalism’ is consistent with their foreign policy objectives which have not changed significantly for the past 150 years. Securing resources and economic dominance has been and continues to be the USA’s main economic objective.¶ According to Maria Páez Victor:¶ “Since 1846 the United States has carried out no fewer than 50 military invasions and destabilizing operations involving 12 different Latin American countries. Yet, none of these countries has ever had the capacity to threaten US security in any significant way. The US intervened because of perceived threats to its economic control and expansion. For this reason it has also supported some of the region’s most vicious dictators such as Batista, Somoza, Trujillo, and Pinochet.”¶ As a result of corporate and US influence, the key international bodies that developing countries are forced to turn to for assistance, such as the World Bank and IMF, are major exponents of the neoliberal agenda. The WTO openly asserts its intention to improve global business opportunities; the IMF is heavily influenced by the Wall Street and private financiers, and the World Bank ensures corporations benefit from development project contracts. They all gain considerably from the neo-liberal model.¶ So influential are corporations at this time that many of the worst violators of human rights have even entered a Global Compact with the United Nations, the world’s foremost humanitarian body. Due to this international convergence of economic ideology, it is no coincidence that the assumptions that are key to increasing corporate welfare and growth are the same assumptions that form the thrust of mainstream global economic policy.¶ However, there are huge differences between the neoliberal dogma that the US and EU dictate to the world and the policies that they themselves adopt. Whilst fiercely advocating the removal of barriers to trade, investment and employment, The US economy remains one of the most protected in the world. Industrialized nations only reached their state of economic development by fiercely protecting their industries from foreign markets and investment. For economic growth to benefit developing countries, the international community must be allowed to nurture their infant industries. Instead economically dominant countries are ‘kicking away the ladder’ to achieving development by imposing an ideology that suits their own economic needs.¶ The US and EU also provide huge subsidies to many sectors of industry. These devastate small industries in developing countries, particularly farmers who cannot compete with the price of subsidized goods in international markets. Despite their neoliberal rhetoric, most ‘capitalist’ countries have increased their levels of state intervention over the past 25 years, and the size of their government has increased. The requirement is to ‘do as I say, not as I do’.¶ Given the tiny proportion of individuals that benefit from neoliberal policies, the chasm between what is good for the economy and what serves the public good is growing fast. Decisions to follow these policies are out of the hands of the public, and the national sovereignty of many developing countries continues to be violated, preventing them from prioritizing urgent national needs.¶ Below we examine the false assumptions of neoliberal policies and their effect on the global economy.¶ Economic Growth¶ Economic growth, as measured in GDP, is the yardstick of economic globalization which is fiercely pursued by multinationals and countries alike. It is the commercial activity of the tiny portion of multinational corporations that drives economic growth in industrialized nations. Two hundred corporations account for a third of global economic growth. Corporate trade currently accounts for over 50% of global economic growth and as much as 75% of GDP in the EU. The proportion of trade to GDP continues to grow, highlighting the belief that economic growth is the only way to prosper a country and reduce poverty.¶ Logically, however, a model for continual financial growth is unsustainable. Corporations have to go to extraordinary lengths in order to reflect endless growth in their accounting books. As a result, finite resources are wasted and the environment is dangerously neglected. The equivalent of two football fields of natural forest is cleared each second by profit hungry corporations.¶ Economic growth is also used by the World Bank and government economists to measure progress in developing countries. But, whilst economic growth clearly does have benefits, the evidence strongly suggests that these benefits do not trickle down to the 986 million people living in extreme poverty, representing 18 percent of the world population (World Bank, 2007). Nor has economic growth addressed inequality and income distribution. In addition, accurate assessments of both poverty levels and the overall benefits of economic growth have proved impossible due to the inadequacy of the statistical measures employed.¶ The mandate for economic growth is the perfect platform for corporations which, as a result, have grown rapidly in their economic activity, profitability and political influence. Yet this very model is also the cause of the growing inequalities seen across the globe. The privatization of resources and profits by the few at the expense of the many, and the inability of the poorest people to afford market prices, are both likely causes.¶ Free Trade¶ Free trade is the foremost demand of neoliberal globalization. In its current form, it simply translates as greater access to emerging markets for corporations and their host nations. These demands are contrary to the original assumptions of free trade as affluent countries adopt and maintain protectionist measures. Protectionism allows a nation to strengthen its industries by levying taxes and quotas on imports, thus increasing their own industrial capacity, output and revenue. Subsidies in the US and EU allow corporations to keep their prices low, effectively pushing smaller producers in developing countries out of the market and impeding development.¶ With this self interest driving globalization, economically powerful nations have created a global trading regime with which they can determine the terms of trade.¶ The North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) between the US, Canada, and Mexico is an example of free-market fundamentalism that gives corporations legal rights at the expense of national sovereignty. Since its implementation it has caused job loss, undermined labour rights, privatized essential services, increased inequality and caused environmental destruction.¶ In Europe only 5% of EU citizens work in agriculture, generating just 1.6% of EU GDP compared to more than 50% of citizens in developing countries. However, the European Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) provides subsidies to EU farmers to the tune of £30 billion, 80% of which goes to only 20% of farmers to guarantee their viability, however inefficient this may be.¶ The General Agreement on Trade and Services (GATS) was agreed at the World Trade Organization (WTO) in 1994. Its aim is to remove any restrictions and internal government regulations that are considered to be "barriers to trade". The agreement effectively abolishes a government’s sovereign right to regulate subsidies and provide essential national services on behalf of its citizens. The Trade Related agreement on International Property Rights (TRIPS) forces developing countries to extend property rights to seeds and plant varieties. Control over these resources and services are instead granted to corporate interests through the GATS and TRIPS framework.¶ These examples represent modern free trade which is clearly biased in its approach. It fosters corporate globalization at the expense of local economies, the environment, democracy and human rights. The primary beneficiaries of international trade are large, multinational corporations who fiercely lobby at all levels of national and global governance to further the free trade agenda.¶ Liberalization¶ The World Bank, IMF and WTO have been the main portals for implementing the neoliberal agenda on a global scale. Unlike the United Nations, these institutions are over-funded, continuously lobbied by corporations, and are politically and financially dominated by Washington, Wall Street, corporations and their agencies. As a result, the key governance structures of the global economy have been primed to serve the interests of this group, and market liberalization has been another of their key policies.¶ According to neoliberal ideology, in order for international trade to be ‘free’ all markets should be open to competition, and market forces should determine economic relationships. But the overall result of a completely open and free market is of course market dominance by corporate heavy-weights. The playing field is not even; all developing countries are at a great financial and economic disadvantage and simply cannot compete.¶ Liberalization, through Structural Adjustment Programs, forces poorer countries to open their markets to foreign products which largely destroys local industries. It creates dependency upon commodities which have artificially low prices as they are heavily subsidized by economically dominant nations. Financial liberalization removes barriers to currency speculation from abroad. The resulting rapid inflow and outflow of currencies is often responsible for acute financial and economic crisis in many developing countries. At the same time, foreign speculators and large financial firms make huge gains. Market liberalization poses a clear economic risk; hence the EU and US heavily protect their own markets.¶ A liberalized global market provides corporations with new resources to capitalize and new markets to exploit. Neoliberal dominance over global governance structures has enforced access to these markets. Under WTO agreements, a sovereign country cannot interfere with a corporation’s intentions to trade even if their operations go against domestic environmental and employment guidelines. Those governments that do stand up for their sovereign rights are frequently sued by corporations for loss of profit, and even loss of potential profit. Without this pressure they would have been able to stimulate domestic industry and self sufficiency, thereby reducing poverty. They would then be in a better position to compete in international markets.

#### 3) The alternative is to reject the neoliberalism in the plan – creates bottom-up open discussion and puts pressure on real-world policymakers

**Roberts, Cornell government professor, 2009**

(Kenneth, Beyond Neoliberalism in Latin America?, pg 1-7)

In recent years voters in Latin America have elected a series of left-of-center presidents, starting with Venezuela in 1998 and continuing (to date) with Chile, Brazil, Argentina, Uruguay, Bolivia, Nicaragua, Ecuador, and Paraguay. Although this political "left turn" has bypassed a number of countries, and the new governments that are part of it comprise a remarkably heterogeneous lot, there seems little doubt that the political winds have shifted in the region. The turn to the left has followed a decade-and-a-half of free market or "neoliberal" reform, when technocrats throughout the region-with staunch support from the U.S. government and international financial institutions-forged a powerful policymaking consensus around the virtues of free trade, deregulated markets, and private entrepreneurship. Since it is not clear whether the region's new leftist governments have identified, much less consolidated, viable alternatives to market liberalism, it is far too early to claim that Latin America has entered a post-neoliberal era of development. What is clear, however, is that the shift to the left signals a "repoliticization" of development issues in Latin America-that is, a demise of the "Washington Consensus" (Williamson 1990) for free market capitalism and the onset of a highly contested search for alternatives that lie "beyond neoliberalism." In short, Latin America is no longer (if it ever was) suspended at "the end of politics" (Colburn 2002), where technocratic consensus is complemented (or secured) by a combination of social demobilization, political resignation, and mass consumerism. The repoliticization of development has both policy and process dimensions. On the policy front, it signifies that neoliberalism is no longer the only game in town; although predefined socialist alternatives to capitalism have long since evaporated, vigorous debates have emerged around non-neoliberal "varieties of capitalism" that envision a more active role for state power in asserting national autonomy, shaping investment priorities, ameliorating inequalities, and providing social services and other public goods. In terms of process, repoliticization entails the emergence or revival of popular subjectivities that are contesting the technocratic monopolization of policymaking space-in some cases at the ballot box, in others on the streets. Repoliticization, therefore, involves a reciprocal interaction between the rise of new actors and an expansion of the issue agenda to include a broader range of alternatives. This book tries to make sense of these new subjectivities-that is, to identify some of Latin America's new social and political actors and to explain the origins, inspirations, and interests that lie behind their activation. In contrast to much of the emerging work on Latin America's left turn, we look beyond the rise of left-leaning governments and their policy choices to focus attention on the socioeconomic and cultural terrain in which new political options are being forged. Individual chapters thus explore how neoliberalism has shaped and constrained popular subjects by breaking down some traditional actors, transforming others, and providing a stimulus for the emergence of new ones-at least some of which bear the seeds of potential social orders beyond neoliberalism. Our approach starts with the recognition that neoliberal "structural adjustment" programs represented much more than a simple change in development policies. By slashing tariffs and other trade barriers, privatizing state-owned enterprises and social services, and deregulating markets to encourage the free flow of capital, neoliberal reforms realigned existing relationships among states, markets, and societies in fundamental ways (Garret6n 2003a). As such, they transformed the social, political, and cultural landscapes that had developed during the mid-twentieth-century era of state-led import-substitution industrialization (ISI). Initially, this meant breaking down the popular collective subjects of the lSI era-in particular, organized labor and labor-based parties-and imposing market discipline over everlarger swaths of social life. As labor unions weakened, however, new popular subjects, such as community-based organizations and indigenous movements, that rejected the insecurities of market individualism and its commodification of social relationships began to emerge. Their diverse attempts to reweave the social fabric are the primary focus of this volume. The essays included here trace many of the contours of this rapidly evolving, neoliberal social and political landscape. Collectively, the essays explore three basic sets of questions. First, what are the new patterns of social interaction generated by the process of market restructuring, and how do these reshape the ways in which societal interests and identities are articulated, organized, and represented in the political arena? Interests and identities are often redefined as market reforms create new economic niches (or destroy old ones), commodify social relationships, alter traditional uses of land, water, or natural resources, and shift the scale or locus of public policymaking. Second, what new social and political actors have emerged, and how do they respond to the multifaceted changes associated with market restructuring? Traditional actors may enter into decline, but new ones invariably arise; we must ask, then, how these new actors are constituted, how they adapt to market opportunities and insecurities, and what strategies they follow when they try to enter the political arena, redefine the policy agenda, and contest public authority. Third, and finally, to what extent do these actors and their responses provide the building blocks for new paths of social, economic, and political development that might be more equitable and inclusive than those that have characterized the neoliberal era? What lies "beyond neoliberalism" is unlikely to be determined by grand ideological visions or political blueprints; instead, it will be constructed piece by piece, from below, through the grassroots participation and decentralized experimentation of new popular subjects. This volume offers no simple answers to these complex questions, much less a new theory of neoliberal politics. Instead, it offers a series of portraits written from a variety of disciplinary perspectives about how people adapt and respond-both individually and collectively-when their economic moorings shift and the social fabric is torn asunder. These portraits are hardly comprehensive; they do not cover every country in Latin America, much less all the stations in the region's heterogeneous and fragmented sociocultural landscape. The editors do not claim that the particular set of actors and issues included in this volume is the best or the only one that could have been chosen. Nevertheless, we have selected topics based on their importance and the quality of research they have generated, and we believe our portraits jointly illuminate the diverse experiences of social actors during the neoliberal era. These portraits provide compelling evidence that capitalism is, as Schumpeter (1950) aptly characterized it, a force of "creative destruction" that simultaneously breaks down and reconfigures various fields of social interaction. Our chapters are replete with examples of the dialectical interplay between capitalism's advance and the social, cultural, and political responses it elicits-though not, as will become evident, in the manner classically envisioned by Marx. These responses, whether deliberate or reactive, bear the seeds of what may in fact lie beyond neoliberalism, a horizon that remains opaque but is increasingly being sketched by a diverse array of popular movements in the region. As explained later, the various dimensions of this dialectical interplay lie beyond the scope of any single academic discipline, making an interdisciplinary approach vital to a more comprehensive understanding. An Integral Approach to Economic Reform, Social Change, and Political Response Social and political changes in Latin America have long been conditioned by patterns of economic development. This can be seen, for example, in the nineteenth-century association between oligarchic politics and agro-export development models, or in the rise of populist social and political mobilization during the early stages of industrialization in the middle of the twentieth lower class groups. These demands were typically funneled through the corporatist intermediary channels of mass party and union organizations, which brokered exchanges between states and organized societal interests. In short, lSI encouraged groups-defined primarily in terms of class categories-to self-organize in order to advance their interests in a policymaking environment where states increasingly penetrated and regulated social and economic relationships, including labor markets and land tenure arrangements. Together, these two processes encouraged strong labor and, in some cases, peasant movements to develop, which in turn provided a social foundation for Latin America's first mass party organizations. The social, cultural, and political construction of popular subjects during the lSI era was thus anchored in the favorable combination of rapid industrialization, state interventionism, and social reform. These linkages between state-led industrialization and grassroots organization were frayed, however, by economic pressures and political polarization in the 1960s and 1970s (O'Donnell 1973), and they were largely severed by the debt crisis of the 1980s. While neoliberal structural adjustment policies helped restore economic stability in the aftermath of the debt crisis, they exacerbated-indeed, they often institutionalized-the social dislocations wrought by the crisis itself. Changes in labor markets-in particular growing informalization, a greater reliance on subcontracting and temporary labor, and flexible rules for hiring and firing-made collective action in the workplace increasingly difficult to sustain, leading to a sharp decline in trade union density in most of the region. Likewise, the parcelization of landholdings and the penetration of market relations in the countryside undermined historic patterns of peasant mobilization for land reform in much of the region (Kurtz 2004). The retreat of the state subjected new sectors of the economy and society to market discipline, undermining the rationale and effectiveness of collective action aimed at eliciting state redress . Historic labor-based parties entered into decline or adapted in part by distancing themselves from labor and other organized mass constituencies. This trend that was propelled both by the structural conditions of neoliberal capitalism and by technological advances in political communication (most prominently, television) that rendered mass party organizations increasingly dispensable for electoral mobilization. Following the restoration of democratic rule in most of Latin America in the 1980s, U.S.-style media-based advertising and campaign tactics diffused rapidly across the region, allowing candidates to appeal directly to voters without the mediation of mass membership party organizations. Latin America entered the new millennium, then, largely devoid of the mass social and party organizations that dominated the landscape during the populist/lSI era. Labor movements had been downsized and politically marginalized, and they were less capable of representing the diverse interests and identities of a precarious and in formalized workforce. Likewise, where they survived at all, mass parties were transformed into professionalized or patronage-based electoral machines (see, e.g., Levitsky 2003); elsewhere, they were displaced by independent personalities and populist outsiders. The dominant trends pointed toward a fragmentation and pluralization of civil society-with a multitude of interests, identities, and decentralized groups struggling to make their voices heard (Ox horn 1998a)-and a deinstitutionalization of political representation, as evidenced by extreme levels of electoral volatility and the rise of personality-based, antiparty candidates. A bottom-up perspective is thus essential to understand how the demise of lSI and the transition to neoliberalism realigned the social landscape in ways that disarticulated the class-based popular subjects of the lSI era. Such a perspective is also essential, however, for explaining popular responses to market liberalization and the openings that eventually emerged for the construction of new types of collective subjects that bear the seeds of what may lie beyond neoliberalism. Neoliberal reforms are directed-indeed, often imposed-by state officials in collaboration with (or under the pressure of) transnational power centers, but civil society and grassroots actors are hardly passive bystanders (Arce 2005). These actors invariably seek to exploit, resist, evade, or cope with state initiatives, and their responses often produce outcomes that are quite different from those envisioned by policymakers and economic elites. In particular, grassroots actors employ a variety of measures to alleviate material hardships and reduce exposure to market insecurities; as Karl Polanyi (1944) argues, there are social and political limits to the commodification of social relationships, and these limits may be quickly breached in contexts of egregious inequalities such as those prevailing in contemporary Latin America. Popular responses thus attempt to reweave a social fabric torn by economic crisis and market dislocation. These responses are often local, decentralized, and territorially based, building on traditions of communitybased organizing, or focused on ethnic and cultural claims rather than the class/corporatist patterns of interest representation that were hallmarks of the lSI era. Although new popular subjects may not initially target public authorities or policymaking arenas, grassroots activism often becomes politicized over time, posing the formidable challenge analyzed by Benjamin Goldfrank in chapter three-that of translating local initiatives into nationallevel political alternatives. This challenge highlights the importance of a bottom-up perspective in the construction of new popular subjects in the neoliberal era. The primary objectives of this volume, then, are to develop an interdisciplinary perspective on the multiple forms of societal responses to market liberalization and to assess their effects. We do this in four principal fields where neoliberalism has altered the social landscape: electoral politics, ethnic mobilization, environmental governance, transnational migration. In each area we explore new patterns of social interaction, identify various responses, and analyze the potential impact of emerging popular subjects.

### PTX

#### 1) Obama needs to become more focused on TPA for it to pass

Atkinson, 2/06 ((Robert D., Ph.D. President, Information Technology and Innovation Foundation

Huffington Post, “Selling the President's Ambitious Trade Agenda”,

02/06/2014 12:36 pm EST, QDKM))

That's because of the stiff resistance Mr. Froman has already encountered to the two most pressing parts of the president's agenda: trade promotion, or fast track authority, and the Trans Pacific Partnership (TPP), which is in the final stages of negotiations and could help reshape the nature and scope of future U.S. trade agreements. Judging by congressional reaction to the trade elements in the State of the Union, President Obama still has his work cut out for him if he's going to sell his plan to reticent Democrats (who remain unconvinced of the benefits of trade) and Republicans (who may not want to give him a big "win" in an election year). The bottom line is that the president is going to have to become far more involved if he wants to see movement on his top trade priorities this year. To be clear, there's plenty at stake. Apart from removing the most obvious barriers to trade, like tariffs, U.S. negotiators are pushing for the TPP to contain strong and enforceable protections for intellectual property (IP), as well as reductions in non-tariff barriers in order to help ensure the U.S. maintains its global edge in innovation. This push is especially important in areas such as life sciences and information technology, where growth in exports means growth in high-paying jobs.

#### Plan saps Obama’s capital

Birns & Mills, Council on Hemispheric Affairs director and senior research fellow, 1/30/13

(Larry and Frederick B., Council on Hemispheric Affairs, “Best Time for U.S.– Cuba Rapprochement Is Now,” <http://www.coha.org/best-time-for-u-s-cuba-rapprochement-is-now/>, Accessed 7/9/13)

Despite the basic intransigence of US policy towards Cuba, in recent years, important changes have been introduced by Havana: state control over the economy has been diminished; most travel restrictions affecting both Americans and Cubans on the island have been lifted; and the “group of 75” Cuban dissidents detained in 2003 have been freed. Washington has all but ignored these positive changes by Havana, but when it comes to interacting with old foes such as those of Myanmar, North Korea, and Somalia, somehow constructive dialogue is the order of the day. One reason for this inconsistency is the continued opposition by the anti-Castro lobby to a change of course by Washington. The anti-Castro lobby and their allies in the US Congress argue that the reforms coming out of Havana are too little too late and that political repression continues unabated. They continue to see the embargo as a tool for coercing either more dramatic reforms or regime change. It is true that the reformist tendency in Cuba does not include a qualitative move from a one party system to political pluralism. Lamentably, Cuba reportedly continues to use temporary detentions and the occasional jailing of non-violent dissidents to limit the parameters of political debate and total freedom of association. The authors agree that no non-violent Cuban dissident should be intimidated, detained or jailed. But continuing to maliciously turn the screws on Havana has never provided an incentive for more democracy in any sense of the word nor has it created a political opening into which Cuba, with confidence, could enter. The easing of tensions between Washington and Havana is more likely to contribute to the evolution of a more democratic form of socialism on the island, the early stages of which we may presently be witnessing. In any case the precise form of such change inevitably should and will be decided in Cuba, not in Washington or Miami. To further moves towards rapprochement with Cuba, the U.S. State Department should remove the country from the list of state sponsors of terrorism. It is an invention to depict Havana as a state sponsor of terrorism, a charge only levied by the State Department under pressure from Hill hardliners. As researcher Kevin Edmunds, quite properly points out: “This position is highly problematic, as the United States has actively engaged in over 50 years of economic and covert destabilization in Cuba, going so far as blindly protecting wanted terrorists such as Luis Posada Carilles and Orlando Bosch, both former CIA agents accused of dozens of terrorist attacks in Cuba and the United States ” (Nov. 15, 2012, Kevin Edmonds blog). It was precisely the propensity of some anti-Castro extremists to plan terrorist attacks against Cuba that urgently motivated the infiltration of such groups by the Cuban five as well as the close monitoring of these organizations by the FBI. Another gesture of good will would be for the White House to grant clemency to the Cuban five: Gerardo Hernandez, Ramón Labañino, Fernando Gonzalez, Antonio Guerrero and René Gonzalez. They are Cuban nationals who were convicted in a Miami court in 2001 and subsequently sentenced to terms ranging from 15 years to double life, mostly on charges of conspiracy to commit espionage. Despite requests for a change of venue out of Miami, which at first was granted and later denied, the trial took place in a politically charged Miami atmosphere that arguably tainted the proceedings and compromised justice. Supporters maintain that the Cuban five had infiltrated extremist anti-Castro organizations in order to prevent terrorist attacks against Cuba and did not pose any security threat to the United States. It would be an important humanitarian gesture to let them go home. Perhaps such a gesture might facilitate reciprocity on the part of Cuban authorities when it comes to American engineer Alan Gross who is presently being detained in a Cuban jail. There would probably be a political price to pay by the Obama administration for taking steps towards reconciliation with Havana, but if Obama’s election to a second term means that there is to be a progressive dividend, surely such a dividend ought to include a change in US policy towards the island. Mirabile dictu, the Administration can build on the small steps it has already taken. Since 2009, Washington has lifted some of the restrictions on travel between the US and Cuba and now allows Cuban Americans to send remittances to relatives on the island. The Cuba Reconciliation Act (HR 214) introduced by Representative Jose Serrano (D-NY) on January 4, 2013, and sitting in a number of congressional committees, would repeal the harsh terms of the Cuban Democracy Act of 1992 and the Helms-Burton Act of 1996, both of which toughened the embargo during the special period in Cuba. The Cuba Reconciliation Act, however, is unlikely to get much traction, especially with ultra-hardliner Representative Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (R-FL), chairing the House Foreign Relations Committee, and her counterpart, Robert Menendez (D-NJ), who is about to lead the Senate Foreign Relations Body. Some of the anti-Castro Cuban American community would likely view any of the three measures advocated here as a capitulation to the Castro brothers. But as we have argued, a pro-democracy and humanist position is not in any way undermined, but might in fact be advanced by détente. An end to the embargo has been long overdue, and the judgment of history may very well be that it ought never to have been started.

#### Obama’s PC alone can pass TPA

McKenna, 2-9 ((Barrie, Globe and Mail, Washington’s tangled politics could slow Trans-Pacific Partnership, Sunday, Feb. 09 2014, 8:56 PM EST, <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/report-on-business/international-business/us-business/washingtons-tangled-politics-could-slow-trans-pacific-partnership/article16771118/>, QDKM))

A new TPA bill is now before Congress. But the odds of it being approved don’t look good. Mr. Obama’s popularity has been dented by the Obamacare debate and its troubled implementation. It’s tougher for him to get what he wants. Many key Democrats in Congress, including Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, along with a key slice of Mr. Obama’s voter base – environmentalists and labour unions – are opposed to the legislation. Free-trade advocates and political watchers say Mr. Obama has been slow to use his political muscle to push the TPA bill. “This should have been driven by presidential leadership a year ago, and as a result it’s going to be an enormous challenge,” said Philip English, a former Republican House member from Pennsylvania and now co-chair of government relations at the Arent Fox law firm in Washington, D.C. “The White House and [the U.S. Trade Representative] will have to expend political capital to make the progress necessary.”

#### D. Impact – Trans-Pacific Partnership

#### 1. TPP key to US leadership – that checks protectionism

Suominen, German Marshall Fund of the United States resident fellow, 12

(Kati, 7-6-12, Foreign Policy, “America the Absent,” http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/07/06/america\_the\_absent?page=full, accessed 7-7-12)

In the 20th century, beginning with the creation of the Bretton Woods system in 1944, America's great contribution was to champion an economic paradigm and set of institutions that promoted open markets and economic stability around the world. The successive Groups of Five, Seven, and Eight, first formed in the early 1970s, helped coordinate macroeconomic policies among the world's leading economies and combat global financial imbalances that burdened U.S. trade politics. The International Monetary Fund (IMF) spread the Washington Consensus across Asia and Latin America, and shepherded economies in transition toward capitalism. Eight multilateral trade rounds brought down barriers to global commerce, culminating in the establishment of the World Trade Organization (WTO) in 1995.¶ Meanwhile, a wave of bank deregulation and financial liberalization began in the United States and proliferated around the world, making credit more available and affordable while propelling consumption and entrepreneurship the world over. The U.S. dollar, the world's venerable reserve currency, economized global transactions and fueled international trade. Central bank independence spread from Washington to the world and helped usher in the Great Moderation, which has produced a quarter-century of low and steady inflation around the world.¶ Globalization was not wished into being: It was the U.S.-led order that generated prosperity unimaginable only a few decades ago. Since 1980, global GDP has quadrupled, world trade has grown more than sixfold, the stock of foreign direct investment has shot up by 20 times, and portfolio capital flows have surged to almost $200 trillion annually, roughly four times the size of the global economy. Economic reforms and global economic integration helped vibrant emerging markets emerge: The "Asian Tigers" (Hong Kong, Singapore, South Korea, and Taiwan) that boomed in the 1980s were joined in the 1990s by the awakening giants of Brazil, China, and India.¶ It was the United States that quarterbacked the play, brokering differences among nations and providing the right mix of global public goods: a universal reserve currency, an open-trade regime, deep financial markets, and vigorous economic growth. Trade liberalization alone paid off handsomely, adding $1 trillion annually to the postwar U.S. economy.¶ Talk about American decline notwithstanding, the economic order created by the United States persists. In fact, at first blush, it appears to have only been reinforced in the past few years. New institutions such as the G-20, a forum for the world's leading economies, and the Financial Stability Board, a watchdog for the international financial system, are but sequels to U.S.-created entities: the Group of Five and the Financial Stability Forum. Investors still view America as a financial safe haven, and the dollar remains the world's lead currency. Open markets have survived, and 1930s-style protectionism has not materialized. The WTO continues to resolve trade disputes and recently welcomed Russia as its 154th member, while the mission and resources of the Bretton Woods twins -- the World Bank and IMF -- have only expanded. No country has pulled out of these institutions; instead, emerging nations such as China and India are demanding greater power at the table. Countries have opted in, not out, of the American-led order, reflecting a reality of global governance: There are no rival orders that can yet match this one's promise of mutual economic gains.¶ Still, while the American order is peerless, it is also imperiled. The deepening European debt crisis, discord over national policies to restore growth, and the all-but-dead Doha Development Round of WTO negotiations speak to the failures of the global economy's existing instruments to manage 21st-century challenges. Instead of coordinating policies, leading countries are trapped in a prisoner's dilemma, elbowing for an edge in world trade and jockeying for power on the world stage. Tensions simmer over issues such as exchange-rate manipulation, capital controls, creeping protectionism, and financial nationalism.¶ Right at the moment when we most need to shore up the troubled global economic order, America -- the architect of this very order -- is failing to lead. Even as the United States remains pivotal to global growth, U.S. corporations -- the engines of the American economy -- are stifled by taxes, regulations, and policy uncertainty. Gaping fiscal deficits in the United States are undermining the dollar, exacerbating trade deficits, and undercutting U.S. economic dynamism and credibility in world affairs, but political posturing has obstructed the country's path to solvency. Earlier this week, the IMF warned that if political deadlock takes America to the so-called fiscal cliff of automatic tax hikes and spending cuts in January 2013, it could have a devastating impact on the U.S. and world economies. No wonder America's image as the global economic superpower is receding around the world.¶ Europe's travails, meanwhile, are reducing U.S. companies' exports and overseas profits, threatening America's recovery. And yet Congress has balked at boosting the IMF's resources to fight the eurozone crisis while the Obama administration has deflected responsibility, framing the crisis as Europe's to manage. It has fallen to countries such as Brazil, China, India, Mexico, and Russia to instead build the firewall that will shield the rest of the world from Europe.¶ The welcome momentum in negotiations between the United States and Pacific Rim countries on the Trans-Pacific Partnership free trade agreement does not undo over three years of drift in U.S. trade policy that has jeopardized the very global trading system that the United States built and powered in the postwar era. The only trade deals that the Obama administration has passed -- with Colombia, Panama, and South Korea -- were launched and negotiated by the Bush administration.¶ The world is now facing a triple threat of global economic instability, divisions among top powers, and a global leadership vacuum. This perfect storm could produce a world disorder of mercurial financial markets, widening global imbalances, spreading state capitalism, and beggar-thy-neighbor protectionism -- a scenario with a sorry past and few safe exits.¶ In the late 1940s, a new world order arose because of American strength, vision, and leadership, not because global governance was in vogue. Leadership was never easy: Resistance from allies, protectionist pressures at home, and resource-draining wars all stood in the way. But capitalism spread, trade and financial markets were liberalized, and emerging-market crises were defeated. Global economic integration forged ahead.¶ Today, American leadership is again essential. China prioritizes mercantilism over multilateralism, and emerging nations have yet to fully step up to the plate when it comes to global governance, while Europe and Japan are neither able nor willing to lead. In placing their faith in multilateralism, liberal institutionalists often fail to realize that the world economic order is built on American primacy and power, and Washington's willingness to project it.¶ To lead abroad, the United States must reform at home by imposing ironclad fiscal discipline, cutting taxes and red tape for businesses, and locking in long-term policies -- summoning the private sector to reform schools and rebuild infrastructure, for instance -- that harness the productivity of America's future generations.¶ Abroad, the United States needs to focus on pre-empting instability and integrating the global economy. It should push the IMF to address financial risks before they mushroom into catastrophes, revise the multilateral trade regime to allow for fast deals among a critical mass of members rather than agonizing, decade-long talks requiring the consent of the full membership, and work toward unfettered global financial markets -- all the while deepening access to U.S. goods, services, and investment around the world. A Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement and a transatlantic free trade pact are low-hanging fruits that can jump-start global growth without any new stimulus dollars.¶ The quintessential challenge facing U.S. policymakers is to convince other nations to buy into a rules-based order rather than respond to the siren calls of currency wars and capital controls. For example, with most emerging economies uneasy about Beijing's trade and foreign policies, Washington must incentivize others to take the high ground and strengthen investor protections, enforce intellectual property rights, and adhere to trade rules. With others playing by the rules of the game, a misbehaving China would be turned into a pariah.¶ A stable, integrated, and growing world economy serves our national interests. But such a world is America's to make.

**2. Protectionism escalates to global war**

**Cho, Professor Chicago-Kent law professor, 7**

[Sungjoon, Illinois Institute of Technology "Doha's Development," 25 Berkeley J. Int'l L. 165]

Second, **the mercantilist nature of the current competitive regionalism tends to evoke the strikingly similar phenomenon of the interwar period, which precipitated economic balkanization and led to the outbreak of the Second World War**. n182 **Highly preferential regional trading blocs instituted worldwide during this period eliminated the political space needed for multilateral economic cooperation and instead nurtured the Hobbesean struggle among major economic powers.** n183 The interwar **regionalist competition is a textbook** [\*195] example of the **prisoners' dilemma. Beggar-thy-neighbor trade policies entailed a global economic crisis that eventually exacerbated, not reduced, the evils of the Great Depression**. Out of this history comes an undeniable historical lesson: the **fragmented global trading system is vulnerable to a chain of unfortunate events such as tension, hostility, and violence. Considering that recent trade policies are inextricably linked to security and other foreign affairs concerns,** n184 **this lesson should be taken seriously lest we repeat the same historical errors and are punished for them.**

### 1NC

#### Cuba is such a small country- they cannot be key to ag- other countries can solve

#### **Their evidence is wrong- US Ag exports have tripled in the last ten years and is high now**

USAgNet - 02/13/2014 ((Wisconsin Agriculture Connection, “U.S. Farm Exports Nearly Tripled Since 2000”, [http://www.wisconsinagconnection.com/story-national.php?Id=347&yr=2014<](http://www.wisconsinagconnection.com/story-national.php?Id=347&yr=2014%3c) QDKM))

U.S. agricultural exports nearly tripled between 2000 and 2013, reaching a record $140.9 billion in U.S. fiscal year 2012-13. According to the Economic Research Service at USDA, growth has been driven by higher incomes and rising food and feed demand in developing countries. Sales to developing countries were up about 250 percent between 2000 and 2013, and they now account for two-thirds of U.S. agricultural exports. Rising prices have been the other key driver of growth in U.S. agricultural exports. Both rising demand from the growing middle classes of developing countries and the falling value of the dollar have been important factors in boosting the world market prices of grains, oilseeds, and cotton-the traditional bulk commodities. Between 2000 and 2013, the volume of bulk commodities shipped from the United States actually fell slightly, but their value rose almost 8 percent annually. High-value product exports rose even more than bulk products in value terms, and the value of U.S. agricultural exports in 2013 was still more heavily concentrated in livestock, horticultural and other HVPs than in bulk products. For HVP exports, developing countries have also played a larger role than developed country markets.

#### **And exports will remain high in near future**

Shanghai Daily 2/14/14 ((“U.S. agricultural exports to stay high over next decade: report”, Feb 14,2014 ,http://www.shanghaidaily.com/article/article\_xinhua.aspx?id=200448, QDKM))

WASHINGTON, Feb. 13 (Xinhua) -- U.S. agricultural exports will remain historically high over much of the next decade, the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) said on Thursday. "World economic growth, particularly sustained relatively high growth in developing countries, provides a foundation for increases in global food demand, trade, and U.S. agricultural exports," the USDA said, with the expectation that the global economy will grow at an annual average rate of about 3.2 percent over the next decade. Continued global biofuel demand and a weak U.S. dollar also contribute to rising commodity prices and gains in U.S. export values beyond 2016, according to the annual long-term projections report published by the USDA's Chief Economist Office. While the value of U.S. agricultural exports will decline slightly in the next two years, it is projected to grow again over the rest of the decade and surpass the 2013 record, the report said. High commodity prices pushed the value of U.S. agricultural exports to high levels in the past several years, including a record 141 billion U.S. dollars in 2013, it said.

#### Ag industry will be fine- Obama administration to spend billions to fix problems caused by climate change

Wilson, 2/14/14 ((Brett, Seattle-based reporter for Circle of Blue, Circle of Blue, “Obama Pledges Over $2 Billion for U.S. Drought Relief, Climate Adaptation” FRIDAY, 14 FEBRUARY 2014 06:00, <http://www.circleofblue.org/waternews/2014/world/obama-announces-us-1-2-billion-drought-aid-package-proposes-us-1-billion-climate-resilience-fund/>, QDKM))

Acting on climate change and the growing toll it’s taking on U.S. agriculture, President Obama today will announce a $US 1.2 billion aid package for farmers, ranchers, and communities in California and several more agricultural states pummeled by a series of devastating droughts and snowstorms in the past year. The president also will make public a climate-related item in his 2015 budget weeks before its March due date, a proposal to spend $US 1 billion more for a climate resilience fund. The money will facilitate research, data collection, and the development of new technologies and infrastructure that will help the United States adapt to stronger storms, longer droughts, and rising seas caused by climate change, according to a briefing by top administration officials. Senior Obama administration officials said the president will announce both measures during his stop this afternoon in Fresno, California, a farming city of more than 500,000 residents and the epicenter of a three-year drought that is deepening in the nation’s largest state. The direct $1.2 billion federal drought aid will be available for California, and for states in the Great Plains and the Midwest, said the administration. The aid package and the climate fund reflect the growing cost of natural disasters – $7 billion dollars in 2013 alone – and the important role the federal government has been playing to help residents in rural communities cope with increasingly erratic weather.

#### 5. Economic downturn will not cause withdrawal from the world economy or war – the depression analogy is outdated

Mohammed Bamyeh, Visiting Associate Professor in the Edmund Walsh School of Foreign Service at Georgetown, 2000, The Ends of Globalization, p. 66

Thus under traditional imperialism, as we have known it from the colonial period until the 1980s, political domination was one of the important and conscious means of economically incorporating tributary regions into world systems. Under contemporary transnationalism, how- ever, coercive force is scarcely needed for the incorporation of regions into world systems; the whole world is already incorporated into an interactive economic grid, since embeddedness in a global economic order is sought voluntarily. Even amid the recent outbreak of turmoil in global financial markets, only one country (Malaysia) has opted to isolate itself (temporarily) from the global market. In earlier times half of the world would have done so, as during the Great Depression. The common response now to global financial uncertainty is for countries to delve deeper into the global economy, to accept currency devaluation, or to link one’s currency to more stable ones elsewhere. Under such conditions, political control is needed only for bare-bones system maintenance, since it is expected that a global economic system is (1) either capable of functioning on its own with minimal political support, (2) requires a diminished state role in order to operate properly, or (3) is just too complex for any global- level political adoption of it to be effective. In sum, whereas the old imperialism invoked the necessity of political domination for the expansion and maintenance of an economic system, globalization today structures the economic system so that it functions via its own internal capacity, without the necessity of political support. Transnationalism, in other words, describes a form of capitalism that has outgrown imperialism.

#### **US Econ High Now- stocks up and weather is hiding the real numbers**

Bost, 2/14/14 ((Callie, staff writer, Bloomberg Business Week, “U.S. Stocks Advance Amid Earnings, Optimism in Economy”, February 14, 2014, <http://www.businessweek.com/news/2014-02-14/u-dot-s-dot-stock-index-futures-are-little-changed-before-output-data>, QDKM))

U.S. stocks rose, with the Standard & Poor’s 500 Index headed toward a second straight weekly advance, amid better-than-forecast earnings and speculation a disappointing factory report may mask economic strength. Occidental Petroleum Corp. gained 3.1 percent after saying it will split its operations in California as one of the final steps of a breakup plan. Cliffs Natural Resources Inc. (CLF:US) and Campbell Soup Co. (CPB:US) added more than 4.1 percent as earnings beat forecasts. Men’s Wearhouse Inc. tumbled 7.1 percent after its acquisition target, Jos. A. Bank Clothiers Inc., proposed to buy the Eddie Bauer brand. The S&P 500 rose 0.2 percent to 1,833.21 at 11:10 a.m. in New York. The Dow Jones Industrial Average added 60.19 points, or 0.4 percent, to 16,087.78. Trading in S&P 500 stocks was 13 percent below the 30-day average during this time of the day. STORY: Reasons to Ride Out the Stock Market Storm “The weather is so horrible everywhere, much of the data could be very distorted,” Bruce Bittles, chief investment strategist at RW Baird & Co., said by telephone from Sarasota, Florida. His firm oversees $120 billion. “The Fed is going to wait until the weather clears and until we get some more numbers in March and April to consider the data. The picture will start to clear on how great or how poor the economy is.” The S&P 500 has jumped 5.3 percent from a three-month low on Feb. 3 amid speculation economic growth is strong enough to withstand further cuts to Federal Reserve monetary stimulus. The index is less than 1 percent below its all-time high reached on Jan. 15.

### 1NC

#### Sanctions won’t block US safety response – Helix proves.

Bolstad ‘12

Erika Bolstad is a reporter who covers Washington for the Anchorage Daily News, the Idaho Statesman and McClatchy Newspapers. This evidence internally quotes Lee Hunt, the former president of the International Association of Drilling Contractors. Hunt, in this instance, is arguably not biased in favor of drilling, as he is speaking to safety and clean-up regimes and he is speaking before a liberal think-tank in favor of human rights – McClatchy Newspapers – May 10, 2012 – http://www.mcclatchydc.com/2012/05/10/148433/cuba-embargo-could-threaten-oil.html#.UaoUWpyADq0

Several of the experts said Thursday they are confident that the Treasury Department could react quickly in an emergency to allow U.S. oil response teams to get emergency permits to do business with the Cuban government.¶ The department, which oversees the embargo, has authorized an American firm, Helix Energy Solutions, to handle spill response for Repsol. It’s a red-tape ordeal that company officials said they’ll have to repeat when working with the other companies that have contracted to use the same rig next in Cuban waters.

#### Cuban and non-US prevention efforts are sufficient now.

Sadowski ‘11

Richard Sadowski is a Class of 2012 J.D. candidate, at Hofstra University¶ School of Law, NY. Mr. Sadowski is also the Managing Editor of Production of¶ the Journal of International Business and Law Vol. XI. “Cuban Offshore Drilling: Preparation and¶ Prevention within the Framework of the United¶ States’ Embargo” – ¶ Sustainable Development Law & Policy¶ Volume 12; Issue 1 Fall 2011: Natural Resource Conflicts Article 10 – <http://digitalcommons.wcl.american.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1497&context=sdlp>

Fears that Cuban offshore drilling poses serious environmental¶ threats because of the proximity to the United States and¶ the prohibition on U.S. technology transfer are overblown. Cuba¶ has at least as much incentive to ensure safe-drilling practices¶ as does the United States, and reports indicate that Cuba is taking¶ safety seriously.64 Lee Hunt, President of the Houston-based¶ International Association of Drilling Contractors, said, “[t]he¶ Cuban oil industry has put a lot of research, study and thought¶ into what will be required to safely drill,” and that “they are¶ very knowledgeable of international industry practices and have¶ incorporated many of these principles into their safety and regulatory¶ planning and requirements.”65 Thus, while the economic¶ embargo of Cuba restricts American technology from being utilized,¶ foreign sources have provided supplemental alternatives.66

#### No drilling in the squo – all companies have bailed.

O’Grady ‘13

Mary O'Grady is a member of the editorial board at The Wall Street Journal – WSJ – April 24, 2013 – <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887324474004578442511561458392.html>

Then came promises of an oil boom and last week the predictable bust. The Brazilian state-owned Petrobras PETR4.BR +1.01% had given up on deep-sea drilling in Cuban waters in 2011. Repsol REP.MC -2.46% gave up in May 2012. The deep water platform it was using was then passed to Malaysia's state-owned Petronas, which also came up empty. Venezuela's PdVSA had no luck either. In November Cuba announced that the rig that had been in use would be heading to Asia. Last week came the end of shallow-water drilling.

#### Cuban oil spills stay contained – no risk of large spread

Whittle ‘12

Daniel J. Whittle et al, Cuba Program Director for the Oceans Program, Environmental Defense Fund, 2012, “Bridging the Gulf: Finding Common Ground on Environmental and Safety Preparedness for Offshore Oil and Gas in Cuba,” http://www.edf.org/sites/default/files/EDF-Bridging\_the\_Gulf-2012.pdf

While areas at risk of immediate impact appear to be those along the Straits of Florida and U.S. south Atlantic coast, scientists are careful to note that the models are far from precise, authoritative forecasts. NOAA specialists themselves emphasize that the models vary significantly based on weather data and location of the drilling site. Richard Sears, who served as chief scientific advisor on the federal commission that investigated the Deepwater Horizon disaster, stressed there was significant uncertainty in projecting the path of the BP oil slick in 2010, even with the combined technical expertise of federal agencies and private companies.42 “There were a wide array of models surrounding the BP spill, ranging from most of the oil projected to come ashore to Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and Florida—to a significant portion going out through the Straits of Florida and up the East Coast towards North Carolina,” Sears said in a personal interview. “Neither of those happened.”

#### Oil spills are recoverable – no long term environmental impacts

EDWARDS, ‘2

[11.24, Rob, “It's natural to panic about oil spills, but how bad are they” Sunday Herald, http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_qn4156/is\_20021124/ai\_n12579324]

But **the pollution**, worrying as it can be, **does not last for ever. Oil is a naturally occurring mineral that is eventually broken down by bacteria in the sea. So an oil spill**, although it can inflict immediate damage, **rarely causes long-lasting or irreversible harm** to natural ecosystems. "It is a natural reaction after a major incident to get out the dictionary of superlatives and talk about disaster and catastrophe," says John Baxter, the national oil spill advisory officer with the government conservation agency Scottish Natural Heritage. "While in the short term major spills can have a dramatic impact on certain species, such as birds, **the marine environment is extremely robust and will recover quite quickly."** Baxter estimates that it would only take five to 10 years for the diversity of wildlife to return to oil-polluted areas. "It is a major event when it occurs, but in ecological terms it is only a short- term problem," he explained

#### Many alternate causalities

Edward B. **Barbier**, et al, Beijer Institute of Ecological Economics, 19**94**, Paradise Lost?: The Ecological Economics of Biodiversity, p. 62

Habitat change by humans is caused directly through land-use changes, urbanization, infrastructure development and agricultural expansion. Habitat change is also caused indirectly through environmental effects caused by the use and extraction of resources from the environment, and the introduction of species to new areas. Biodiversity loss is also affected by the discharge of wastes to air, soil and water, and by the global climatic changes due to fossil fuel burning, and emissions of greenhouse and ozone depleting gases.

#### The impacts are empirically denied

Lawrence E. **Johnson**, Flinders University, South Australia, 19**91**, A Morally Deep World, p. 257

So long as there is a strong enough life-support system to maintain human life, and so long as there are enough unique and beautiful things to satisfy human desires, there is no practical need for us to concern ourselves with the fate of minor ecosystems and species that are useless to us. We have already managed to dispense with many species, and with many complete but (in our own selfish terms) unimportant ecosystems, all without ill effects. Nobody *really* needs the snail darter. The fact is that a partially degraded biosphere can be quite comfortable.

### Statism

#### Timeframe- none

No actual solvency- ridiculous

### 1NC

#### 1. The media is all hype –Castro has no intention of loosening his grip

Mike Gonzalez, 2011, Vice President of Communications at Heritage, “Media Fails to Report on Castro Regime’s Brutal Oppression” AP  
http://blog.heritage.org/2011/07/26/media-fails-to-report-on-castro-regimes-brutal-oppression/

Last week, just outside Cuba’s holiest Catholic shrine, government thugs attacked in plain daylight a group of opposition women — beating them, stoning them and stripping them naked to the waist. The women, mostly black and middle-aged, suffered this public humiliation because they were trying to find a dignified way to bring attention to the plight of their husbands, who are in prison for freely speaking their minds.¶ The archbishop of Santiago de Cuba has condemned the attack. You can find an eyewitness account in Spanish in the above video.¶ It should make for poignant watching today, the anniversary of the start of the Cuban Revolution.¶ Unfortunately, there’s nothing unusual in this grotesque attack on the Damas de Blanco (or Ladies in White, the harassed association of wives of political prisoners) on the street outside the shrine of Our Lady of La Caridad del Cobre. It’s routine for Cubans to be publicly degraded, brutalized and imprisoned when they dare speak their minds. Their daily existence has been one of fear and wretched suffering for 50 years now.¶ Yet the chances are that you probably haven’t heard about this story. A quick Google search of the attacks on the Damas de Blanco turned up only about five hits, none from a major publication. Why?¶ Not because it’s a dog-bites-man story (literally, in this case), as some journalists might have you believe. No, it’s simply because the media don’t report the daily attacks on the Cuban dissidents.¶ All the major international news wires, and at least two TV networks, have bureaus in Cuba. But they’re either so afraid of being expelled, or have so bought into the regime’s propaganda, that all they report is how Raul Castro is bringing economic reforms to Cuba.¶ So little is the story of Cuba’s oppression known outside that island prison that, were the constant repression reported occasionally, it might actually cause a stir.¶ Clearly, Raul—Fidel’s brother, who was handed the day-to-day reins of the island when his elder brother fell ill a couple of years back—has no intention of doing anything that will threaten communism’s firm grip on Cuba. Otherwise, his goons would feel no need to terrorize and drag a bunch of older women naked through the streets.¶ What this dearth of news on the Gulag Next Door has produced is a strange double standard, where similar repression in far-away Burma, Zimbabwe or Libya — also by leftist regimes — gets far better coverage. Such is the ignorance of events in Cuba that MSNBC host Chris Matthews two years ago asked this question in an interview:¶ “Congressman Burton, why do you think Cubans on the island still support the Castro brothers? What is it that allows that lock on those people to continue?”¶ Well, Chris, here’s your answer to what happens to Cubans when they try to pick that lock. Leaving Cuba is illegal, so you either stay silent, brave shark-infested waters on inner tubes (it is illegal to own boats in Cuba, for reasons that should be apparent), or risk suffering the fate of the Damas de Blanco.¶

#### 2. Cuba will continue to be anti-Americanism

Suchlicki 3/4, the Emilio Bacardi Moreau Distinguished Professor and Director, Institute for Cuban and Cuban-American Studies at the University of Miami. He is the author of *Cuba: From Columbus to Castro, Mexico: From Montezuma to NAFTA* and *Breve Historia de Cuba*. (Jamie “Why Cuba Will Still Be Anti-American After Castro.” 7/12/13. <http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2013/03/why-cuba-will-still-be-anti-american-after-castro/273680/>. KJ)

Similarly, any serious overtures to the U.S. do not seem likely in the near future. It would mean the rejection of one of Fidel Castro's main legacies: anti-Americanism. It may create uncertainty within the government, leading to frictions and factionalism. It would require the weakening of Cuba's anti-American alliance with radical regimes in Latin America and elsewhere.¶ Raul is unwilling to renounce the support and close collaboration of countries like Venezuela, China, Iran and Russia in exchange for an uncertain relationship with the United States. At a time that anti-Americanism is strong in Latin America and the Middle East, Raul's policies are more likely to remain closer to regimes that are not particularly friendly to the United States and that demand little from Cuba in return for generous aid.¶ Raul does not seem ready to provide meaningful and irreversible concessions for a U.S. - Cuba normalization. Like his brother in the past, public statements and speeches are politically motivated and directed at audiences in Cuba, the United States and Europe. Serious negotiations on important issues are not carried out in speeches from the plaza. They are usually carried out through the normal diplomatic avenues open to the Cubans in Havana, Washington and the United Nations or other countries, if they wish. These avenues have never been closed as evidenced by the migration accord and the anti-hijacking agreement between the United States and Cuba.¶ Raul remains a loyal follower and cheerleader of Fidel's anti-American policies.¶ The issue between Cuba and the U.S. is not about negotiations or talking. These are not sufficient. There has to be a willingness on the part of the Cuban leadership to offer real concessions - in the area of human rights and political and economic openings as well as cooperation on anti-terrorism and drug interdiction - for the United States to change it[it’s] policies.

#### 3. Cuba Has and Will Continue to Avoid Foreign Partnerships

Feinberg, Latin American Columnist, 2012

[Richard, December 2012, Brookings, “The New Cuban Economy What Roles for Foreign Investment?”, <http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/papers/2012/12/cuba%20economy%20feinberg/cuba%20economy%20feinberg%209.pdf>, 7-12-13, JB & ML]

In the case of biotechnology, government officials voice fears that foreign partners will take advantage of Cuban firms and pirate their innovations . Rather than turn to the European and Japanese ¶ multinational pharmaceutical giants to assist in marketing Cuban innovations and pharmaceutical ¶ products, Cuba has preferred to seek state-to-state commercial deals with developing countries ¶ (notably Venezuela), and to attempt JVs abroad (notably in China), where Cuban firms are the ¶ foreign investors

#### 4. Lifting the embargo wouldn’t help the Cuban people-internal blockades mean that no goods go to the people

Carter, Washington Times Writer, 2k

(Tom, Sept 21, 2000 Cubanet, “Doctors testify lifting Cuba sanctions would not help average citizens” <http://www.cubanet.org/CNews/y00/sep00/21e6.htm>, accessed 7/9/13, KR)

Lifting the U.S. economic embargo to allow the sale of food and medicine to Cuba will do nothing to help the average Cuban, two doctors who recently defected from the island nation testified on Capitol Hill yesterday. ¶ "We consider that only cutting the umbilical cord that sustains [Cuban President Fidel Castro's] empire, and by this we mean suspending any external aid, we can suffocate the malignancy that is killing [the Cuban people] today," said Dr. Leonel Cordova, 31, a general practitioner from Havana, before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.¶ Speaking as a doctor who served his patients, he said he believed no food or medicine sent from the United States would help the Cuban people if it went through a government organization.¶ "The U.S. embargo on Cuba does not affect the people of Cuba. The revolutionary leaders have everything, every kind of medicine from the United States," said Dr. Cordova, who defected in May while on a medical mission to Zimbabwe. "No food or medicine will reach the people. It is all funneled through the Cuban government for high-level Communist officials and tourists."¶ At a luncheon at the Heritage Foundation earlier, Dr. Noris Pena, a dentist who also defected in Zimbabwe, elaborated.¶ "It is not the external embargo that is the problem with Cuba's medical system, it is the internal blockade. With or without the U.S. embargo, the Cuban people will suffer," she said.

**5. Lifting the embargo boosts Castro’s power- the government controls the businesses that would be profiting**

**Rubin, Resident Scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, 2012**

(Michael, 11/27/12, “The Mockery of Cuban Sanctions Exceptions,” Online: <http://www.commentarymagazine.com/2012/11/27/the-mockery-of-cuba-sanctions-exceptions/> FG)

Now, the wisdom of Cuba sanctions is another issue. I support the sanctions, and will push back on those who wish to dismantle them simply because they see them as a relic from the past. The major problem with lifting the sanctions at this point is that the main beneficiaries of tourist dollars will not be the Cuban people, but rather the government which owns and operates most of the tourist facilities at which most high-end tourists will stay. Indeed, from what I understand from Cuba watchers, it is not simply the government which is invested most deeply in these facilities but the Cuban military and Raul Castro himself. The idea of pumping money into an aging and decrepit dictatorship risks snatching defeat from the jaws of victory.

#### The embargo prevents Cuban environmental destruction—prevents tourism and economic struggle fosters eco-sustainability

PBS Nature 10

[9/26/10, “Cuba: The Accidental Eden—A Brief Environmental History,” <http://www.pbs.org/wnet/nature/episodes/cuba-the-accidental-eden/a-brief-environmental-history/5830/>, accessed 7/9/13, YGS]

Cuba has been called the “Accidental Eden” for its exceptional biodiversity and unique historical development. The island nation and its archipelagos support thousands of plant and animal species, many of which are endemic, making Cuba the most naturally diverse Caribbean nation and a destination for biological scientists and ecotourists.¶ Cuba’s natural blessings are the result of a manifold historical trajectory. The American trade and tourism embargo and the collapse of the Soviet Union have both made “accidental” contributions to the survival of Cuban wildlife.¶ Cuba’s low population density (about 102 people per square kilometer) and relative land isolation as an island have afforded it moderately low levels of environmental destruction and high levels of endemism. And Cuba remains biologically diverse, but it has seen its share of loss.¶ Spanish colonialism invited new plants, animals, and diseases, and some native lifeforms failed to cope. Species unique to Cuba became extinct, including varieties of sloths and monkeys, among other animals.¶ The expansion of Cuban commercialism and industry, particularly with the influence of European and American capital, continued to threaten Cuban wildlife populations. Tobacco and more significantly sugar transformed the country from a Spanish shipping port to a major agricultural exporter. As sugar demand rose, habitat was destroyed for farming. Today, farmers still compete with wildlife for use of the land. At the same time, heavy industrial development polluted Cuban air, land, and water.¶ Cuba’s 1959 revolution set the country on a path apart from other post-colonial nations. Although revolutionary Cuba instituted policies around agriculture, industry, forests, and water, like most states in the 1960s, its moderate environmental efforts had mixed results. Focusing more heavily on agriculture rather than heavy industry probably did more to save Cuban wildlife in the ‘60s and ‘70s than did any environmentally conscious policies.¶ While global capitalism continued on a general course of thoughtless environmental destruction, the U.S. embargo against Cuba, including a travel ban, freed the country from its most salient environmental threat while putting the nation under great economic strain. Cuba traded and underwent forms of “development,” but in many ways avoided the developments of late century American capitalism. While both “capitalism” and “communism” ultimately undervalued natural resources, American executive and legislative dispositions helped nurture the blossoming of Cuban wildlife.¶ A dramatic shift toward agriculture, industry, and the environment appeared after the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991. With shortages in fossil fuels and the disappearance of 80% of both imports and exports, Cuba entered the “Special Period,” an economic depression that required new techniques to help the country become more self-sustaining. Although Cuban beaches were opened to international tourism, an environmentally significant aspect of the Special Period was the adoption of permaculture agriculture and land use strategies.¶ Circumstances since the ’90s have led the Cuban government to take a stronger legislative and rhetorical stance toward environmental management. Although initially centered around the human species, Fidel Castro’s 1992 address to the UN Earth Summit in Rio De Janeiro expresses this attitude of environmental awareness and urgency:¶ “An important biological species is in danger of disappearing due to the fast and progressive destruction of its natural living conditions: mankind. We have now become aware of this problem when it is almost too late to stop it. … Tomorrow it will be too late to do what we should have done a long time ago.”¶ Today Cuba exhibits thriving natural diversity, though it may be tenuous. Agricultural pollution, habitat destruction, and significantly tourism all threaten the island’s plants and animals and compete for land and water use.¶ Every moment brings Cuba closer to the possibility of a lifted U.S. embargo, which would dramatically affect Cuba’s economic possibilities and thus its wildlife. One of the many mixed blessing would be increased tourism.¶ Marine conservationist Fernando Bretos notes that “The tourism impact has really been minimal in Cuba, but that’s going to change. When you go from 2 million tourists a year to 4 to 6 to 8, everything will change.”