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#### Chinese influence in Cuba is high now.

Xinhua 7/24(7/24/13, “Chinese leader stresses close ties with Cuba,” http://english.peopledaily.com.cn/90883/8340137.html)//DR. H

Chinese leader Liu Yunshan said Wednesday that China and Cuba are closely tied with common aspiration and belief despite the two countries being geographically far apart.

Liu, a member of the Standing Committee of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China (CPC), made the remark as he met with Jose Ramon Balaguer, head of the International Department of the Communist Party of Cuba.

Liu said the new Chinese leadership with Xi Jinping as general secretary of the CPC Central Committee cherishes the time-honored friendship between China and Cuba. The leadership will continue to work with the Communist Party of Cuba to step up the exchange of experience in governance, boost cooperation in various fields, promote friendly contact between the two countries and peoples and open up a new era of China-Cuba friendship.

Liu praised the new achievements Cuba has made in its socialist development and briefed the guests about the domestic situation of China.

Balaguenr said Cuba places great importance on relations between the two countries and their ruling parties. He expressed readiness to work with China to maintain and advance the rapid development of Cuba-China relations. He briefed Liu on the current situation of Cuba and the Communist Party of Cuba.

#### Changes in US-Cuba policy effect overall influence in Latin America – crowds China out.

Doherty 8 (Patrick, "An Obama Policy for Cuba," McClathy Newspapers, December 12, cuba.newamerica.net/publications/articles/2008/obama\_policy\_cuba\_9301)

**With his national security team in place**, President-elect Barack Obama's foreign policy principals will be immediately struck by how many complex and expensive challenges they will face. Iraq, Iran, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Israel-Palestine and Russia, will all require enormous energy, all the tools in our foreign policy toolbox, and will all take years to resolve, if they can be resolved. **None of these crises will allow President Obama to signal swiftly to the world the kind of changes he proposes in American foreign policy. In contrast,** U.S.-Cuba policy is low-hanging fruit: though of marginal importance domestically, it could be changed immediately at little cost. At **present, that policy is a major black spot on America's international reputation. For the rest of the world, our failed, obsolete and 50-year old policy toward Cuba goes against everything that Obama campaigned for, and the recent 185-3 U.N. vote to condemn the centerpiece of that policy,** the embargo – the 16th such vote in as many years – **makes that clear.** The entire world believes our policy is wrong. And the world is right. The fact is that since Cuba stopped exporting revolution and started exporting doctors and nurses, it ceased being a national security concern for the United States. And yet we restrict travel to the island - unconstitutionally - and constrain Cuban-Americans in the amount of money they can send to their families on the island. Moreover, the economic embargo hurts the Cuban people more than the Cuban leadership, and **our** Helms-Burton **legislation imposes Washington's will on foreign businesses who wish to trade with Cuba, creating ill will in business communities from Canada to Brazil.** Our Cuba policy is also an obstacle to striking a new relationship with the nations of Latin America**. Any 21st-century policy toward Latin America will have to shift** from the Cold War-era emphasis on right-wing governments and top-down economic adjustment **to creating a hemispheric partnership to address many critical issues: the revival of militant leftism, the twin challenges of sustainability and inclusive economic growth, and the rising hemispheric influence of Russia and China. But until Washington ends the extraordinary sanctions that comprise the Cuba embargo, Latin America will remain at arms-length**, and the problems in our backyard - Hugo Chavez, drugs, immigration, energy insecurity - will simply fester.

#### Chinese influence in Latin America is key to maintain their economic growth.

Arnson et al. ‘9(Cynthia Anderson, Mark Mohr, Riordan Roett, writers for Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, “Enter the Dragon? China’s Presence in Latin America”, http://www.wilsoncenter.org/sites/default/files/EnterDragonFinal.pdf) (JN)

China’s role in Latin America is, above all, based on trade, despite U.S. concerns about China’s military inﬂuence in Latin America. The major exception to this rule is Cuba, for which China represents a political relationship as well as one based on economic interests. Although Venezuelan authorities may also prefer that its relationship with China have political as well as economic dimensions, it is not clear that China has the same expectations of its relationship with Venezuela. To China, Latin America represents a signiﬁcant source of the necessary natural resources that will help China maintain its economic growth. Due primarily to trade with China, Latin America’s trade volume grew from $2.8 billion in 1988 to $49 billion in 2005. Also, and as publicly announced, China intends to surpass $180 billion in trade with Latin America by 2010, not only due to the country’s need for natural resources, but also as a result of China’s intention to diversify and expand its markets in the region. Thus, Latin America represents a substantial market for Chinese goods.

#### Chinese economic decline causes great power war.

**Kane 01** [Thomas Kane, PhD in Security Studies from the University of Hull & Lawrence Serewicz, Autumn, http://www.carlisle.army.mil/usawc/Parameters/01autumn/Kane.htm]

Despite China's problems with its food supply, the Chinese do not appear to be in danger of widespread starvation. Nevertheless, one cannot rule out the prospect entirely, especially if the earth's climate actually is getting warmer. The consequences of general famine in a country with over a billion people clearly would be catastrophic. The effects of oil shortages and industrial stagnation would be less lurid, but economic collapse would endanger China's political stability whether that collapse came with a bang or a whimper. PRC society has become dangerously fractured. As the coastal cities grow richer and more cosmopolitan while the rural inland provinces grow poorer, the political interests of the two regions become ever less compatible. Increasing the prospects for division yet further, Deng Xiaoping's administrative reforms have strengthened regional potentates at the expense of central authority. As Kent Calder observes, In part, this change [erosion of power at the center] is a conscious devolution, initiated by Deng Xiaoping in 1991 to outflank conservative opponents of economic reforms in Beijing nomenclature. But devolution has fed on itself, spurred by the natural desire of local authorities in the affluent and increasingly powerful coastal provinces to appropriate more and more of the fruits of growth to themselves alone.[ 49] Other social and economic developments deepen the rifts in Chinese society. The one-child policy, for instance, is disrupting traditional family life, with unknowable consequences for Chinese mores and social cohesion.[ 50] As families resort to abortion or infanticide to ensure that their one child is a son, the population may come to include an unprecedented preponderance of young, single men. If common gender prejudices have any basis in fact, these males are unlikely to be a source of social stability. Under these circumstances, China is vulnerable to unrest of many kinds. Unemployment or severe hardship, not to mention actual starvation, could easily trigger popular uprisings. Provincial leaders might be tempted to secede, perhaps openly or perhaps by quietly ceasing to obey Beijing's directives. China's leaders, in turn, might adopt drastic measures to forestall such developments. If faced with internal strife, supporters of China's existing regime may return to a more overt form of communist dictatorship. The PRC has, after all, oscillated between experimentation and orthodoxy continually throughout its existence. Spectacular examples include Mao's Hundred Flowers campaign and the return to conventional Marxism-Leninism after the leftist experiments of the Cultural Revolution, but the process continued throughout the 1980s, when the Chinese referred to it as the "fang-shou cycle." (Fang means to loosen one's grip; shou means to tighten it.)[ 51] If order broke down, the Chinese would not be the only people to suffer. Civil unrest in the PRC would disrupt trade relationships, send refugees flowing across borders, and force outside powers to consider intervention. If different countries chose to intervene on different sides, China's struggle could lead to major war. In a less apocalyptic but still grim scenario, China's government might try to ward off its demise by attacking adjacent countries.

Embargo limits drilling now – plan unlocks ***large-scale*** Cuban production.

Padgett ‘8

Tim Padgett joined TIME in 1996 as Mexico City bureau chief covering Latin America. In 1999 he moved to Florida to become TIME’s Miami & Latin America bureau chief, reporting on the hemisphere from Tallahassee to Tierra del Fuego. He has chronicled Mexico’s democratization and drug war as well as the rise of Latin leaders like Lula and Hugo Chavez, “How Cuba’s Oil Find Could Change the US Embargo”¶ Time Magazine – Oct. 23, 2008 – internally quoting Jonathan Benjamin-Alvarado, a Cuba oil analyst at the University of Nebraska-Omaha.

http://www.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,¶ 1853252,00.html#ixzz13Li5cosN

The Spanish energy company Repsol-YPF has entered into a production-sharing agreement with Cupet and is scheduled to start drilling the first real well in the EEZ next year. Other international firms, including Norway's StatoilHidro and India's Oil & Natural Gas Corp., are part of the Repsol-led consortium. Venezuela's state-run Petroleos de Venezuela is considered a lesser player because it has little deep-water drilling experience. (China is also interested but so far only involved in onshore drilling in Cuba.) Cuba is now in important negotiations with Brazil's Petrobras, which just made its own multibillion-barrel oil find off its coast near Rio de Janeiro and could, analysts say, be the major offshore drilling partner for Cuba if it jumps in.¶ Still, the concessions so far represent less than a quarter of the 59 drilling blocks that Cuba hopes to exploit in the 43,000-sq.-mi. (112,000 sq km) EEZ. Analysts say one reason is the daunting infrastructural difficulties facing any company that drills in Cuba: firms have to bring much more of their own capital, equipment, technology and on-the-ground know-how than usual. This year's severe hurricane damage in Cuba has made the situation worse. Canada's Sherritt, in fact, recently dropped out of its four-block contract. "Who else is going to be willing to actually come in and take the risk in Cuba?" says Benjamin-Alvarado. "In terms of proximity and technology, the only people really able to do it to the extent the Cubans need are the Americans."

#### That trades-off with US- Mid-East oil ties.

Alhaiji and Maris ‘4

[Dr. A. F. Alhajji is an energy economist and George Patton Chair of Business and Economics at the College of Business Administration at Ohio Northern, Terry L. Maris is the founding executive director of the Center for Cuban. Business Studies and professor of management, “The Future of Cuba’s Energy Sector,” Cuba Today, 2004, http://web.gc.cuny.edu/dept/bildn/publications/cubatodaybookcomplete.pdf#page=105]

The current economic, political, and social trends in Cuba indicate that¶ energy consumption will increase substantially in the future. Transition to a¶ market economy would accelerate this trend. In this article the word “transition”¶ refers to any movement towards a market economy. It does not necessarily¶ mean regime change.¶ The proximity of Cuba to the United States and the possibility of massive¶ oil deposits in Cuban waters will have a tangible impact on political, economic,¶ and social environments, not only in Cuba, but in the whole region.¶ The discovery of commercial deposits of oil would affect Cuba’s economy on¶ one hand and US energy policy and energy security on the other. If US-Cuba¶ relations improve in the future, discovery of large oil deposits could affect the¶ energy trade patterns between the two countries and affect oil trade between¶ the US and other oil producing countries, especially in the Middle East.

#### That causes Saudi Prolif.

Guzansky ‘13

Yoel Guzansky is a fellow at the Institute for National Security Studies, Tel Aviv University. His main research area is Gulf security. He has also served as Iran coordinator at Israel's National Security Council. His recent publications include The Gulf States in a Changing Strategic Environment (2012), One Year of the Arab Spring: Global and Regional Implications, and The Gulf States: Between Iran and the West – Middle East Quarterly¶ Spring 2013, pp. 59-64 – available at: http://www.meforum.org/3512/saudi-arabia-pakistan-nuclear-weapon

Continued Iranian progress toward a nuclear weapon, Iraq's increasing alignment with Tehran, and an expedited U.S. exit from Afghanistan are all changing the Saudi strategic landscape. The Obama administration's "lead from behind" approach in Libya and its hesitation to get involved in the Syrian civil war all contribute to a reassessment of U.S. commitments. With the U.S. "pivot to Asia"—taking the form of a series of military, economic, commercial, and diplomatic initiatives aimed at contending with the rising power of China—and a changing global energy map due to expansion of oil and natural gas production in the United States, Riyadh and others are beginning to prepare for a post-U.S. Middle East.¶ According to recent reports, Washington is considering expanding its nuclear cooperation with Riyadh on the basis of a 2008 memorandum of understanding: In exchange for foregoing the operation of nuclear fuel cycles on its soil, Saudi Arabia was to receive nuclear assistance.[33] Such a move, should it come to pass, may be meant to persuade Riyadh to abandon its strategic goals, prevent other players from gaining a foothold in the attractive Saudi market, and challenge Tehran's nuclear policy. The United States is still Saudi Arabia's most effective security support, but if Washington distances itself from regional matters, the gradual entrance of new players into the Gulf is inevitable.¶ The question of Saudi acquisition of a nuclear deterrent is more relevant than ever when both enemies and friends of the United States are looking at a possible regional drawdown on Washington's part as well as a lack of support for the pro-Western regimes that remain in place. If the U.S. government provides Riyadh with formal security guarantees, it would be natural for it to demand that the kingdom forego its strategic goals. But Riyadh's inclusion under a U.S. defense umbrella is not a given and depends both on the quality of relations between the two countries and other Saudi considerations. Riyadh remains skeptical over Washington's willingness to come to its aid and may thus seek to purchase a nuclear deterrent, which would provide it with more freedom vis-à-vis its stronger ally. Under present circumstances, it is not unreasonable for Riyadh to rely on other states for its defense in addition to Washington for the simple reason that it has done so in the past. Likewise, it is more than likely that the Saudis will not act transparently because they have acted in secret previously.¶ After Iran, Saudi Arabia is the number one candidate for further nuclear proliferation in the Middle East. Open source evidence remains circumstantial, but perhaps more than any other regional player, Riyadh has the requisite ideological and strategic motives as well as the financial wherewithal to act on the option.¶ The kingdom may conclude that its security constraints as well as the attendant prestige and influence generated by having a bomb outweigh the political and economic costs it will pay. The difficulty in stopping Tehran's dogged quest for a nuclear capability coupled with Riyadh's doubts about the reliability of Washington is liable to encourage Riyadh to shorten timetables for developing an independent nuclear infrastructure, as well as to opt to purchase a turnkey nuclear system, an off-the-shelf product, or to enter into a security compact of one sort with another power. Sunni-majority Pakistan has emerged as the natural candidate for such an arrangement.¶ Heavy U.S. pressure is likely to be brought to bear on the Saudis not to acquire nuclear capabilities. Indeed, it seems that, at present, the price Riyadh is likely to pay should it acquire military nuclear capabilities might outweigh the advantages of such a move. But strategic interest, motivated by considerations of survival, could have the upper hand. Should it seem that the kingdom's vital security interests are threatened, it may prefer to take a series of steps, including obtaining a nonconventional arsenal, to reduce risks and ensure the continuity of the House of Saud.

#### Saudi prolif causes nuclear war.

Edelman ‘11

(Eric –Distinguished Fellow at the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments & Former U.S. Undersecretary of Defense for Policy, Foreign Affairs, Jan/Feb, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/67162/eric-s-edelman-andrew-f-krepinevich-jr-and-evan-braden-montgomer/the-dangers-of-a-nuclear-iran)

There is, however, at least one state that could receive significant outside support: Saudi Arabia. And if it did, proliferation could accelerate throughout the region. Iran and Saudi Arabia have long been geopolitical and ideological rivals. Riyadh would face tremendous pressure to respond in some form to a nuclear-armed Iran, not only to deter Iranian coercion and subversion but also to preserve its sense that Saudi Arabia is the leading nation in the Muslim world. The Saudi government is already pursuing a nuclear power capability, which could be the first step along a slow road to nuclear weapons development. And concerns persist that it might be able to accelerate its progress by exploiting its close ties to Pakistan. During the 1980s, in response to the use of missiles during the Iran-Iraq War and their growing proliferation throughout the region, Saudi Arabia acquired several dozen css-2 intermediate-range ballistic missiles from China. The Pakistani government reportedly brokered the deal, and it may have also offered to sell Saudi Arabia nuclear warheads for the css-2s, which are not accurate enough to deliver conventional warheads effectively. There are still rumors that Riyadh and Islamabad have had discussions involving nuclear weapons, nuclear technology, or security guarantees. This “Islamabad option” could develop in one of several different ways. Pakistan could sell operational nuclear weapons and delivery systems to Saudi Arabia, or it could provide the Saudis with the infrastructure, material, and technical support they need to produce nuclear weapons themselves within a matter of years, as opposed to a decade or longer. Not only has Pakistan provided such support in the past, but it is currently building two more heavy-water reactors for plutonium production and a second chemical reprocessing facility to extract plutonium from spent nuclear fuel. In other words, it might accumulate more fissile material than it needs to maintain even a substantially expanded arsenal of its own. Alternatively, Pakistan might offer an extended deterrent guarantee to Saudi Arabia and deploy nuclear weapons, delivery systems, and troops on Saudi territory, a practice that the United States has employed for decades with its allies. This arrangement could be particularly appealing to both Saudi Arabia and Pakistan. It would allow the Saudis to argue that they are not violating the NPT since they would not be acquiring their own nuclear weapons. And an extended deterrent from Pakistan might be preferable to one from the United States because stationing foreign Muslim forces on Saudi territory would not trigger the kind of popular opposition that would accompany the deployment of U.S. troops. Pakistan, for its part, would gain financial benefits and international clout by deploying nuclear weapons in Saudi Arabia, as well as strategic depth against its chief rival, India. The Islamabad option raises a host of difficult issues, perhaps the most worrisome being how India would respond. Would it target Pakistan’s weapons in Saudi Arabia with its own conventional or nuclear weapons? How would this expanded nuclear competition influence stability during a crisis in either the Middle East or South Asia? Regardless of India’s reaction, any decision by the Saudi government to seek out nuclear weapons, by whatever means, would be highly destabilizing. It would increase the incentives of other nations in the Middle East to pursue nuclear weapons of their own. And it could increase their ability to do so by eroding the remaining barriers to nuclear proliferation: each additional state that acquires nuclear weapons weakens the nonproliferation regime, even if its particular method of acquisition only circumvents, rather than violates, the NPT. Were Saudi Arabia to acquire nuclear weapons, the Middle East would count three nuclear-armed states, and perhaps more before long. It is unclear how such an n-player competition would unfold because most analyses of nuclear deterrence are based on the U.S.- Soviet rivalry during the Cold War. It seems likely, however, that the interaction among three or more nuclear-armed powers would be more prone to miscalculation and escalation than a bipolar competition. During the Cold War, the United States and the Soviet Union only needed to concern themselves with an attack from the other. Multi- polar systems are generally considered to be less stable than bipolar systems because coalitions can shift quickly, upsetting the balance of power and creating incentives for an attack. More important, emerging nuclear powers in the Middle East might not take the costly steps necessary to preserve regional stability and avoid a nuclear exchange. For nuclear-armed states, the bedrock of deterrence is the knowledge that each side has a secure second-strike capability, so that no state can launch an attack with the expectation that it can wipe out its opponents’ forces and avoid a devastating retaliation. However, emerging nuclear powers might not invest in expensive but survivable capabilities such as hardened missile silos or submarine- based nuclear forces. Given this likely vulnerability, the close proximity of states in the Middle East, and the very short flight times of ballistic missiles in the region, any new nuclear powers might be compelled to “launch on warning” of an attack or even, during a crisis, to use their nuclear forces preemptively. Their governments might also delegate launch authority to lower-level commanders, heightening the possibility of miscalculation and escalation. Moreover, if early warning systems were not integrated into robust command-and-control systems, the risk of an unauthorized or accidental launch would increase further still. And without sophisticated early warning systems, a nuclear attack might be unattributable or attributed incorrectly. That is, assuming that the leadership of a targeted state survived a first strike, it might not be able to accurately determine which nation was responsible. And this uncertainty, when combined with the pressure to respond quickly, would create a significant risk that it would retaliate against the wrong party, potentially triggering a regional nuclear war. Most existing nuclear powers have taken steps to protect their nuclear weapons from unauthorized use: from closely screening key personnel to developing technical safety measures, such as permissive action links, which require special codes before the weapons can be armed. Yet there is no guarantee that emerging nuclear powers would be willing or able to implement these measures, creating a significant risk that their governments might lose control over the weapons or nuclear material and that nonstate actors could gain access to these items. Some states might seek to mitigate threats to their nuclear arsenals; for instance, they might hide their weapons. In that case, however, a single intelligence compromise could leave their weapons vulnerable to attack or theft. Meanwhile, states outside the Middle East could also be a source of instability. Throughout the Cold War, the United States and the Soviet Union were engaged in a nuclear arms race that other nations were essentially powerless to influence. In a multipolar nuclear Middle East, other nuclear powers and states with advanced military technology could influence—for good or ill—the military competition within the region by selling or transferring technologies that most local actors lack today: solid-fuel rocket motors, enhanced missile-guidance systems, war- head miniaturization technology, early warning systems, air and missile defenses. Such transfers could stabilize a fragile nuclear balance if the emerging nuclear powers acquired more survivable arsenals as a result. But they could also be highly destabilizing. If, for example, an outside power sought to curry favor with a potential client state or gain influence with a prospective ally, it might share with that state the technology it needed to enhance the accuracy of its missiles and thereby increase its ability to launch a disarming first strike against any adversary. The ability of existing nuclear powers and other technically advanced military states to shape the emerging nuclear competition in the Middle East could lead to a new Great Game, with unpredictable consequences.

#### A. Interpretation - ‘Its’ is a possessive pronoun showing ownership

**Glossary of English Grammar Terms, 2005**

(http://www.usingenglish.com/glossary/possessive-pronoun.html)

Mine, yours, his, hers, its, ours, theirs are the possessive pronouns used to substitute a noun and to show possession or ownership.

EG. This is your disk and that's mine. (Mine substitutes the word disk and shows that it belongs to me.)

#### B. Violation – the plan results in an increase in Cuba and the private sector’s economic engagement – not USFG economic engagement. There’s a difference

**Daga, 13** - director of research at Politicas Publicas para la Libertad, in Bolivia, and a visiting senior policy analyst at the Heritage Foundation (Sergio, “Economics of the 2013-2014 Debate Topic:

U.S. Economic Engagement Toward Cuba, Mexico or Venezuela”, National Center for Policy Analysis, 5/15, http://www.ncpa.org/pdfs/Message\_to\_Debaters\_6-7-13.pdf)

Economic engagement between or among countries can take many forms, but this document will focus on government-to-government engagement through 1) international trade agreements designed to lower barriers to trade; and 2) government foreign aid; next, we will contrast government-to-government economic engagement with private economic engagement through 3) international investment, called foreign direct investment; and 4) remittances and migration by individuals. All of these areas are important with respect to the countries mentioned in the debate resolution; however, when discussing economic engagement by the U.S. federal government, some issues are more important with respect to some countries than to others.

#### C. Voting issue –

**1. limits –offering for Cuba to engage allows for thousands of single commodity affs that would be topical—there are also infinite private actors that could export or import from Cuba**

**2. negative ground – the offer avoids core neg generics-- means we lose good links to diplomatic capital, politics, USFG action based CPs, and critiques**

#### **Text: The People’s Republic of China (PRC) should substantially increase its investment in Cuba including investment and the PRC should open its markets to the Cuban agriculture sector.**

#### CP solves.

Hsiang 09(Antonio C. Hsiang, Associate Professor at Chihlee Institute of Technology in Taiwan China Rising in Latin America: More Opportunities than Challenges” Journal of Emerging Knowledge on Emerging Markets, Volume 1 issue 1 November 2009)-Karla

Because “many **Latin American countries no longer look to Washington leadership**,” the so- called **Washington Consensus “has lost traction**”.28 As a global rising power, China offers an alternative model for Latin America’s development. Even though **China** has been hurt by the 2008 financial crisis, “its economic and financial **powers have been strengthened relative to those of the West. China’s global influence will thus increase,** and Beijing will be able to undertake political and economic initiatives to increase it further.” 29 In fact, “Washington seemed to adopt a Chinese-style solution to its escalating financial problems: greater state intervention to restrict the movement of capital.”30 **Thus, Beijing’s emergence as a global economic power is seen throughout Latin America as offering an** alternative **from the Washington Consensus model for** economic development. The “Beijing Consensus” is the brainchild of Joshua Cooper Ramo, a former senior editor and foreign editor of Time magazine and later a partner at Kissinger Associates, the consulting firm of former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger. According to Ramo, **the Beijing Consensus has three features**. The first is a commitment to innovation and constant experimentation in reforms. The second, a **rejection of per capita** GDP as the only measure of progress, as sustainability and equality also count. **And** the third, **a commitment to** self- determination. Less developed countries should therefore ensure their own financial integrity and keep great powers in check. 31 **The Beijing Consensus has evolved to describe a plethora of alternative plans for economic development in the underdeveloped world**. Ramo argues that China and India, who “most pointedly” ignored the World Bank and the IMF-championed Washington Consensus, “now have records that speak for themselves.” 32 Consequently, **the so-called the “Beijing Consensus” has been attracting attention in Latin Americ**a because of “China’s distinctive development model, . . . [**which] posits far more state intervention in the economy and a greater concern with** political stability **and strong government to guide the development process.”** 33

#### Text: The government of the People’s Republic of China should deploy large-scale atmospheric carbon-capture systems to address global emissions, construct and maintain self-sufficient, global, remote, permanently occupied refuges meant to protect humanity from extinction events, support the cultivation and distribution of natural history collections modeled on the Darwin Initiative. The United States federal government should not militarily intervene in Cuba.

#### The counterplan solves for warming – new polyethylenimine material discoveries make it possible

Dillow 12– staff writer, Popular Science(Jan 2012, Clay, http://www.popsci.com/science/article/2012-01/new-material-can-pull-carbon-dioxide-right-out-air-unprecedented-rates)JCP

If cleaning carbon dioxide from the atmosphere was easy, we’d already be doing it. But carbon capture has proven to be a tough technology to feasibly roll out on a grand scale, and that means all the things we do that produce carbon dioxide emissions--which seems to be just about everything these days--are still roughly as bad for the planet as they were several years ago. That’s a problem in a warming world, and one that a team of researchers may have just found a solution for via an inexpensive polymeric material.

Reporting their findings in the Journal of the American Chemical Society, the team (which includes a Nobel laureate in chemistry) descirbes a new solid material based on polyethylenimine that can be used to capture carbon dioxide at the source--be that an industrial smokestack or a car’s exhaust pipe--under real-world conditions where the air contains moisture.

Science, Clay Dillow, carbon capture, carbon dioxide, carbon sequestration, energy, environment, greenhouse gas emissionsThat last part is important. Previous methods of scrubbing CO2 from the air have enjoyed varying degrees of success (usually under controlled conditions), but none has been particularly effective in the presence of humidity. The new material, which is inexpensive and readily available, has shown some of the highest carbon dioxide removal rates of any material ever tested in the presence of humidity.

It’s also reusable. After capturing carbon, the material also gives it up easily so it can be sequestered or recycled through the manufacture of other substances. The polyethylenimine material can then also be reused over and over again to capture more carbon dioxide. Used to line smokestacks or even out in the open atmosphere, the material could blunt the impact of all of those things we humans do that are contributing to the carbon glut in the atmosphere.

#### History plank solves.

James et al 11, Postdoctoral researcher at the Natural History Museum in London**,** [ February, Karen E. James, Adrian M. Lister, Ellinor Michel, Mark Spencer, Jonathan A. Todd, Eugenia Valsami-Jones, Jeremy R. Young, John R. Stewart, Climate Change and Biosphere Response: Unlocking the Collections Vault ]

Over the past few decades, ecologists have been using data from repeated surveys, time-series stations, and other monitoring activities to study the biotic response to climate change (e.g., Eggleton et al. 2009). Such surveys are the most powerful tools we have for finding correlations between biotic changes and climate change; however, the numbers of these surveys and their duration have been limited, and funding has often been intermittent. For many questions, data of this type are simply unavailable, and alternative sources of data must be creatively repurposed. Historical records provide a second source of temporal information on biotic change; these include diaries and memoirs, collection logs, official catch or hunting records, personal memories, ships’ logs, photographs, and paintings and other images of landscapes or biota. Such sources recently have been mined for information in ways previously unexplored (Wheeler and García-Herrera 2008). Natural history collections (NHCs), held worldwide in museums and research institutions, provide a third valu- able set of resources for climate change research (Pyke and Ehrlich 2010). These collections hold billions of specimens collected over the past two centuries, each potentially wit- ness to past ecological conditions and irrefutable evidence of historical biogeographic distributions (Krishtalka and Humphrey 2000). These collections have evolved ad hoc in response to changing institutional collecting priorities. Most were assembled to serve research in taxonomy, sys- tematics, and biogeography, and were supplemented by material obtained through the opportunistic acquisition of donations, rescue of orphaned collections, and purchase of specimens for exhibition. This history presents opportuni- ties and barriers to the use of NHCs in research on biotic response to climate change. One advantage is that NHCs typically have broad taxonomic and geographic coverage, and often include material obtained through repeated col- lecting over long periods using a variety of methods. These complementary collections are usually held by multiple institutions and will require enhanced tools for discovery and integration. Existing NHCs can possibly provide a more complete sampling of biotic diversity than other sources; some examples of NHC resources are published systematic works and floral and faunal lists, unpublished reports, new survey observations, or new collections (Mikkelsen and Bieler 2000). Moreover, study of NHCs can inform the need for new surveys and suggest areas to be resampled, informa- tion that is invaluable when resources are limited and the need for results is urgent.

#### CP prevents the worst effects of warming.

Matheny 07 Jason G., Research Associate at the Future of Human Institute at Oxford University, Ph.D. Candidate in Applied Economics at Johns Hopkins University, holds a Master’s in Public Health from the Bloomberg School of Public Health at Johns Hopkins University and an M.B.A. from the Fuqua School of Business at Duke University, 2007 (“Reducing the Risk of Human Extinction,” *Risk Analysis*, Volume 27, Issue 5, October, Available Online at http://jgmatheny.org/matheny\_extinction\_risk.htm, Accessed 07-04-2011)

Perhaps more cost effective than building refuges in space would be building them on Earth. Elaborate bunkers exist for government leaders to occupy during a nuclear war (McCamley, 2007). And remote facilities are planned to protect crop seeds from "nuclear war, asteroid strikes, and climate change" (Hopkin, 2007). But I k now of no self-sufficient, remote, permanently occupied refuge meant to protect humanity from a range of possible extinction events. Hanson (2007) argues that a refuge permanently housing as few as 100 people would significantly improve the chances of human survival during a range of global catastrophes. The Americas and Polynesia were originally populated by fewer than 100 founders (Hey, 2005 ; Murray-McIntosh et al., 1998 ). Although it would take thousands of years for 100 people to repopulate Earth, this would be a small setback compared to extinction.

**Immigration is Obama’s top priority, it will pass and capital is key**

**Matthews, 10/16/13** (Laura, International Business Times, “2013 Immigration Reform Bill: 'I'm Going To Push To Call A Vote,' Says Obama2013 Immigration Reform Bill: 'I'm Going To Push To Call A Vote,' Says Obama” http://www.ibtimes.com/2013-immigration-reform-bill-im-going-push-call-vote-says-obama-1429220)

When Congress finally passes a bipartisan bill that kicks the fiscal battles over to early next year, the spotlight could return to comprehensive immigration reform before 2013 ends.

At least that’s the hope of President Barack Obama and his fellow Chicagoan Rep. Luis Gutierrez, D-Ill., chairman of the Immigration Task Force of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus and one of the most vocal advocates for immigration reform in the House of Representatives.

“When we emerge from this crazy partisan eruption from the Republicans, there will be a huge incentive for sensible Republicans who **want to repair some of the damage they have done** to themselves,” Gutierrez said in a statement. “Immigration reform remains the one issue popular with both Democratic and Republican voters on which the two parties can work together to deliver real, substantive solutions in the Congress this year.”

Reforming the status quo has consistently been favored by a majority of Americans. Earlier this year, at least two-thirds of Americans supported several major steps to make the system work better, according to a Gallup poll. Those steps include implementing an E-verify system for employers to check electronically the immigration status of would-be employees (85 percent), a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants, (72 percent), an entry-exit check system to make sure people who enter the country then leave it (71 percent), more high-skilled visas (71 percent) and increased border security (68 percent).

The Senate passed its version of a 2013 immigration reform bill in June that includes, but is not limited to, a pathway to citizenship for immigrants without documentation and doubling security on the southern border. But that measure has stalled in the House, where Republicans are adamant they will take a piecemeal approach.

The momentum that lawmakers showed for reform has been sapped by the stalemate that that has shut down the government for 16 days and brought the U.S. to the brink of default. The Senate has agreed on Wednesday to a bipartisan solution to break the gridlock.

When the shutdown and default threat is resolved (for a time), that’s when Obama will renew his push to get Congress to move on immigration reform. On Tuesday the president said reform will become his **top priority.**

“Once that’s done, you know, the day after, I’m going to be pushing to say, call a vote on immigration reform,” Obama told Univision affiliate KMEX-TV in Los Angeles. “And if I have to join with other advocates and continue to speak out on that, and keep pushing, I’m going to do so because I think it’s really important for the country. And now is the time to do it.”

The president pointed the finger at House Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, for not allowing the bill to be brought to the floor for a vote. Boehner had promised that the Senate’s bill would not be voted on unless a majority of the majority in the House supports it -- the same principle he was holding out for on the government shutdown before he gave in.

“We had a very strong Democratic and Republican vote in the Senate,” Obama said. “The only thing right now that’s holding it back is, again, Speaker Boehner not willing to call the bill on the floor of the House of Representatives. So we’re going to have to get through this crisis that was unnecessary, that was created because of the obsession of a small faction of the Republican Party on the Affordable Care Act.”

Republicans are opposing the Democratic view of immigration reform because of its inclusion of a 13-year path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants. They said this amounted to “amnesty.” Some Republicans prefer to give them legal resident status instead.

Immigration advocates have also been urging Obama to use his executive authority to halt the more than 1,000 deportations taking place daily. Like the activists, Gutierrez said the government shutdown didn’t do anything to slow the number of daily deportations.

Some Republicans who welcomed Sen. Ted Cruz’s filibuster over Obamacare because it shifted the focus from immigration.

“If Ted [didn’t] spin the filibuster, if we don’t make this the focus, we had already heard what was coming,” Rep. Louie Gohmert, R-Texas, told Fox News on Tuesday. “As soon as we got beyond this summer, we were going to have an amnesty bill come to the floor. That’s what we would have been talking about. And that’s where the pivot would have been if we had not focused America on Obamacare.”

Still, pro-immigration advocates are hopeful they can attain their goal soon. “With **more prodding from the president** and the American people,” Gutierrez said, “we can get immigration reform legislation passed in the House and signed into law.”

#### Drains capital – Backlash and hostage taking on unrelated priority legislation is empirically proven, likely in future and specifically true for Rubio – Cuba policy is totally unique

LeoGrande, 12

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

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

#### Immigration reform generates an effective base of IT experts - solves cyberterror

\*top 20 firms conclude H1-B visa requestors are oversees – increasing IT experts, the majority of which are overseas, cannot come to the US, talented students that have tremendous ability to develop tech and scientific advances don’t have the ability to come to the US – collapses response mechanisms

**McLarty 09 –** (Thomas F. III, President – McLarty Associates and Former White House Chief of Staff and Task Force Co-Chair, “U.S. Immigration Policy: Report of a CFR-Sponsored Independent Task Force”, 7-8, http://www.cfr.org/ publication/19759/us\_immigration\_policy.html)

We have seen, when you look at the table of the top 20 firms that are H1-B visa requestors, at least 15 of those are IT firms. And as we're seeing across industry, much of the hardware and software that's used in this country is not only manufactured now overseas, but it's developed overseas by scientists and engineers who were educated here in the United States. We're seeing a lot more activity around cyber-security, certainly noteworthy attacks here very recently. It's becoming an increasingly dominant set of requirements across not only to the Department of Defense, but the Department of Homeland Security and the critical infrastructure that's held in private hands. Was there any discussion or any interest from DOD or DHS as you undertook this review on the security things about what can be done to try to **generate a more effective group of IT experts** here in the **U**nited **S**tates, many of which are coming to the U.S. institutions, academic institutions from overseas and often returning back? This potentially puts us at a competitive disadvantage going forward. MCLARTY: Yes. And I think your question largely is the answer as well. I mean, clearly we have less talented students here studying -- or put another way, more talented students studying in other countries that are gifted, talented, really have a **tremendous ability to develop** these kind of **tech**nology **and scientific advances**, we're going to be put at an increasingly disadvantage. Where if they come here -- and I kind of like Dr. Land's approach of the green card being handed to them or carefully put in their billfold or purse as they graduate -- then, obviously, that's going to **strengthen**, I think, our system, **our security needs**.

#### A successful cyber-attack ensures accidental nuclear war

**Fritz 09 –** (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)

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.** “ “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.

#### Taiwan war won’t happen since nobody cares anymore. They ignore new political shifts

**Saunders and Kastner 09** – \*Senior Research Fellow at the Institute for National Strategic Studies at the National

Defense University, \*Assistant Professor in the Department of Government and Politics

at the University of Maryland and former China Security Fellow at the Institute for National

Strategic Studies (Phillip and Scott, International Security, 33.4, “Bridge over troubled water? Envisioning a China-Taiwan peace agreement”, http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/pdf/10.1162/isec.2009.33.4.87, WEA)

Most observers agree that the issue of Taiwan’s status is not ripe for resolution. China remains committed to the ultimate goal of unification and refuses to renounce the use of force to prevent Taiwan independence. Former President Jiang Zemin emphasized the goal of unification, and China’s policies sometimes implied a timetable for achievement of that objective.2 China’s policy toward the Taiwan issue, however, has undergone a significant shift under President Hu Jintao, who has emphasized the short-to-medium-term goal of deterring Taiwan independence, postponing unification into the indefinite future.3

On Taiwan, public opinion polls consistently show strong (more than 75 percent) public support for maintaining the status quo. Only a small percentage favors either immediate independence or immediate unification with China.4 Although this polling reflects conditional preferences that factor in the likelihood of China using force if Taiwan were to declare independence,5 it accurately reflects the widespread view on Taiwan that permanent resolution of the issue of Taiwan’s status is not presently possible. While the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP) has sought to mobilize voters by highlighting Taiwan’s separate identity and sought ways to emphasize Taiwan’s sovereignty during President Chen Shui-bian’s term in office, the KMT has adjusted the emphasis in its cross-strait policy to more closely match the views of mainstream Taiwan voters. In the 2008 presidential campaign, KMT candidate (and eventual victor) Ma Ying-jeou articulated “three nos” that would govern policy toward China in his administration. These were a pledge that there would be no pursuit of de jure independence, no negotiations with the mainland about unification, and no use of force.6 President Ma reiterated these points in his May 20, 2008, inaugural address.

Collectively, these positions suggest that China and Taiwan may be prepared to defer the issue of Taiwan’s status for resolution at some point in the future. **Both sides have expressed the desire to improve relations, expand cross-strait contacts, and negotiate a peace agreement** between Taipei and Beijing. These goals were articulated in the joint press communiqué issued following KMT Chairman Lien Chan’s April 2005 meeting with Chinese President Hu Jintao.7 Hu Jintao reiterated China’s willingness to negotiate a peace agreement with Taiwan in his statements at the October 2007 17th Party Congress: “On the basis of the one-China principle, let us discuss a formal end to the state of hostility between the two sides, reach a peace agreement, construct a framework for peaceful development of cross-straits relations, and thus usher in a new phase of peaceful development.”8 Both candidates in Taiwan’s 2008 presidential election called for negotiation of a peace agreement with Beijing, and President Ma repeated the call in his inaugural address.9 Upon assuming office, Ma moved quickly to restart dialogue between Taiwan’s Straits Exchange Foundation (SEF) and the PRC’s Association for Relations Across the Taiwan Straits (ARATS), the semiofficial bodies that previously served as vehicles for cross-strait dialogue.10

#### Cuban economy improving now – newest reforms sufficient

**AFP 9/26** American Free Press (26 SEPTEMBER 2013 Cuba expands list of allowed private sector jobs <http://www.france24.com/en/20130926-cuba-expands-list-allowed-private-sector-jobs>) // czhang

AFP - Cuba on Thursday expanded the list of occupations open to the communist-ruled island's fledgling private sector as part of a gradual reform of its Soviet-style economy. The Communist Party daily Granma reported that among the 18 newly authorized private sector occupations is that of real estate agent, in keeping with an earlier decision to legalize private real estate transactions. Vendors of agricultural produce and telecommunications salespeople also have been added to the list. The goal "is to further develop... a climate of trust and legality," as Cuba makes the transition to an economy where private enterprise is not only tolerated, but actively encouraged, Granma wrote. The Communist Party daily added that the legalization of these positions will help "generate jobs, increase the supply of goods and services to the population, and allow the state to focus on activities that bolster economic development." At present, some 463,000 Cubans earn their living as self-employed workers, including restaurant owners, barbers, electricians, mechanics and other skilled trades. President Raul Castro in 2010 introduced reforms to try to rescue the foundering Cuban economy, including deep projected cuts in the number of workers employed by the state.

Internal Link Turn **– Lifting the embargo makes the situation worse for a laundry list of reasons**

**Suchlicki 2k**, Director of the Institute for Cuban and Cuban-American Studies at the University of Miami, 00 (Jaime, 6/2000, University of Miami, “The U.S. Embargo of Cuba,” http://www6.miami.edu/iccas/USEmbargo.pdf, p. 2-4, accessed 6/24/13, IC)

Introduction ¶ Opponents of U.S. policy toward Cuba claim that if the embargo and ¶ the travel ban are lifted, the Cuban people would benefit economically; ¶ American companies will penetrate and influence the Cuban market; the ¶ Communist system would begin to crumble and a transition to a democratic ¶ society would be accelerated. ¶ These expectations are based on several incorrect assumptions. First, ¶ that Castro and the Cuban leadership are naïve and inexperienced and, ¶ therefore, would allow tourists and investments from the U.S. to subvert the ¶ revolution and influence internal developments in the island. Second, that ¶ Cuba would open up and allow U.S. investments in all sectors of the ¶ economy, instead of selecting which companies could trade and invest. ¶ Third, that Castro is so interested in close relations with the U.S. that he is ¶ willing to risk what has been upper-most in his mind for 40 years – total ¶ control of power and a legacy of opposition to “Yankee imperialism,” – in ¶ exchange for economic improvements for his people. During the Fifth ¶ Communist Party Congress in 1997, Castro emphasized “We will do what is ¶ necessary without renouncing our principles. We do not like capitalism and ¶ we will not abandon our Socialist system.” ¶ Castro also reiterated his long-standing anti-American posture, ¶ accusing the U.S. of waging economic war against his government and ¶ calling for “military preparedness against imperialist hostility.” A change in U.S. policy toward Cuba may have different and ¶ unintended results. The lifting of the embargo and the travel ban without ¶ meaningful changes in Cuba will: ¶ Guarantee the continuation of the current totalitarian structures. ¶ Strengthen state enterprises, since money will flow into businesses ¶ owned by the Cuban government. Most businesses are owned in ¶ Cuba by the state and, in all foreign investments, the Cuban ¶ government retains a partnership interest. ¶ Lead to greater repression and control since Castro and the ¶ leadership will fear that U.S. influence will subvert the revolution ¶ and weaken the Communist party’s hold on the Cuban people. ¶ Delay instead of accelerate a transition to democracy on the island. ¶ Allow Castro to borrow from international organizations such as ¶ the IMF, the World Bank, etc. Since Cuba owes billions of dollars ¶ to the former Soviet Union, to the Club of Paris, and to others, and ¶ has refused in the past to acknowledge or pay these debts, new ¶ loans will be wasted by Castro’s inefficient and wasteful system, ¶ and will be uncollectible. The reason Castro has been unable to pay ¶ back loans is not because of the U.S. embargo, but because his ¶ economic system stifles productivity and he continues to spend on ¶ the military, on adventures abroad, and on supporting a bankrupt ¶ welfare system on the island. Perpetuate the rather extensive control that the military holds over ¶ the economy and foster the further development of “Mafia type” ¶ groups that manage and profit from important sectors of the ¶ economy, particularly tourism, biotechnology, and agriculture. ¶ Negate the basic tenets of U.S. policy in Latin America which ¶ emphasize democracy, human rights, and market economies. ¶ Send the wrong message to the enemies of the U.S.: that a foreign ¶ leader can seize U.S. properties without compensation; allow the ¶ use of his territory for the introduction of nuclear missiles aimed at ¶ the U.S.; espouse terrorismand anti-U.S. causes throughout the ¶ world; and eventually the U.S. will “forget and forgive,” and ¶ reward him with tourism, investments, and economic aid. ¶

#### Status quo solves FDI – New Panama Canal lures

**Frank 9/23** writer at Reuters (Marc, “Cuba bids to lure foreign investment with new port and trade zone Sep 23, 2013<http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/09/23/us-cuba-investment-idUSBRE98M12H20130923>) // czhang

(Reuters) - Cuba published rules and regulations on Monday governing its first special development zone, touting new port facilities in Mariel Bay in a bid to attract investors and take advantage of a renovated Panama Canal. The decree establishing the zone and related rules takes effect on November 1 and includes significant tax and customs breaks for foreign and Cuban companies while maintaining restrictive policies, including for labor. Cuba hopes the zone, and others it plans for the future, will "increase exports, the effective substitution of imports, (spur) high-technology and local development projects, as well as contribute to the creation of new jobs," according to reform plans issued by the ruling Communist Party in 2011. The plan spoke positively of foreign investment, promised a review of the cumbersome approval process and said special economic zones, joint venture golf courses, marinas and new manufacturing projects were planned. Most experts believe large flows of direct investment will be needed for development and to create jobs if the government follows through with plans to lay off up to a million workers in an attempt to lift the country out of its economic malaise. The Mariel special development zone covers 180 square miles (466 square km) west of Havana and is centered around a new container terminal under construction in Mariel Bay, 28 miles from the Cuban capital. The zone will be administered by a new state entity under the Council of Ministers, and investors will be given up to 50-year contracts, compared with the current 25 years, with the possibility of renewal. They can have up to 100 percent ownership during the contract, according to Cuba's foreign investment law. Investors will be charged virtually no labor or local taxes and will be granted a 10-year reprieve from paying a 12 percent tax on profits. They will, however, pay a 14 percent social security tax, a 1 percent sales or service tax for local transactions, and 0.5 percent of income to a zone maintenance and development fund.

#### No risk of a biodiversity impact.

Pearce, 6/3 – author and journalist (Fred, “Humans Have Shaped Earth for Millenia,” The Breakthrough, 6/3/13, http://thebreakthrough.org/index.php/programs/conservation-and-development/humanitys-pervasive-environmental-influence-began-long-ago/, SMS)

Are there any pristine ecosystems out there? The evidence is growing that our ideas about virgin nature are often faulty. In fact, the lush rainforest or wind-blown moorland we think is natural may be a human creation, with alien creatures from distant lands living beside native species. Realizing this will change our ideas about how ecosystems work and how we should do conservation. We like to think that most nature was pristine and largely untouched until recent times. But two major studies in recent weeks say we are deluded. In one, Erle Ellis, a geographer at the University of Maryland Baltimore County, and colleagues have calculated that at least a fifth of the land across most of the world had been transformed by humans as early as 5,000 years ago — a proportion that past studies of historical land use had assumed was only reached in the past 100 years or so. The human footprint was huge from the day, perhaps 60,000 years ago, when we began burning grasslands and forests for hunting, according to the Ellis study. It extended further with swidden “slash-and-burn” agriculture, and became more intense when farmers began to domesticate animals and plow the land. This seems odd given how few we were back then — tens of millions at most — and how primitive our technology was. But, says co-author Steve Vavrus of the University of Wisconsin, “early farmers didn’t need to be as efficient as modern farmers and therefore, counterintuitively, they used much more land per capita.” In other words, they spread out.¶ In fact, they farmed large areas that today look like virgin forests. But we now know that as much as a tenth of the trees in the Amazon rainforest grow on man-made “dark earths,” or terra preta, which archaeologists believe were created by pre-Columbian farmers who added organic wastes and charcoal to improve nutrient supply and boost yields. Much of the Amazon, Ellis concludes, is actually forest regrowth. Or — judging by the profusion of fruit trees and other valuable species still growing in terra preta areas – perhaps overgrown gardens. Other tropical rainforests also seem to have been farmed. In the past couple of years, James Fraser of Lancaster University in England has found dark earths in until-recently forested West Africa. And last year Doug Sheil and colleagues reported similar findings from Borneo. Other studies have found oil-palm nuts over wide areas of the central African jungle, suggesting the place was covered in palm-oil plantations 2,000 years ago.¶ Nor is this just about rainforests. The bison-grazed plains of North America were remade by Native Americans long before Europeans showed up. Many of the mist-shrouded treeless grasslands of the tropical Andes, known as the paramos, are the result of burning and grazing after locals cut down the natural forests centuries ago. In colder climes, the Scottish highlands tell a similar story. Just as geographers and archaeologists are hard-pressed to find untouched landscapes, so biologists are having similar trouble locating pristine ecosystems.¶ A new book, Novel Ecosystems, edited by Richard Hobbs of the University of Western Australia and others, shows how many superficially natural ecosystems are heavily influenced by the introduction of alien species. Whether intentional or accidental, most introductions seem to have human origins.¶ This is disconcerting. “Over large parts of the globe, the ‘wilderness’ that people refer back to never existed,” says one of the book’s authors, Michael Perring, also of the University of Western Australia.¶ Nature has always had open borders for alien species on the move. Those itinerants may have been a driving force of evolution. But human activity has dramatically increased their travel options. We move many deliberately, as commercial crops or domesticated animals, for instance. Today, others can hitch a ride on ship hulls or in ballast tanks, aboard planes or on the wheels of trucks or the backs of domesticated animals. This phenomenon seems to have been going on for much longer than we sometimes imagine. Conventionally, we regard these unwanted interlopers as a curse, destabilizing ecosystems and devouring indigenous species. Sometimes this is true, as Hobbs and his co-authors acknowledge. But they point out that, in the 21st century, aliens make up a substantial fraction of the planet’s biodiversity, and many are actively useful, even essential parts of ecosystems. Extinctions caused by new arrivals happen and can sometimes be devastating. The brown tree snake from New Guinea is eating its way through the wildlife of Guam, after arriving on a military plane. The zebra mussel, which came from the Black Sea region in the ballast water of ships, is notorious in the U.S., which returned the favor by inadvertently sending the Black Sea a jellyfish that devastated that ecosystem. But actually, such events are rare. Mostly, invaders swiftly settle down and become model eco-citizens, pollinating crops, spreading seeds, controlling predators, and providing food and habitat for native species. After a while we forget about them, or learn to love them. Where would North American be without the European honeybee? Usually, invaded ecosystems end up with more species than they had before. Places like New Zealand, Hawaii, even the Galapagos islands — all notorious for species invasions due to human activities — are actually all more biodiverse than before. Ellis calls them “anthropogenic melting pots.” Scientists who research the invaders and their hosts are discovering much that is intriguing. British researchers recently reported finding two species of native tits that have learned to eat the larvae of a wasp that was introduced to the country from the Middle East 180 years ago and that lays its eggs on the Turkey oak, another introduced species. The tits are spending more and more time in the trees, eating the larvae, especially in spring because climate change means their young now hatch before their previous food source, leaf-eating moth caterpillars appear.¶ Novel ecosystems are different, but not necessarily worse. San Francisco Bay, for instance, is widely regarded as the most invaded estuary on the planet. But that didn’t stop the U.S. government submitting it in January to the Ramsar Convention as a wetland of international importance, because of is a “key habitat for a broad suite of flora and fauna and a range of ecological services.” Much of its rich biodioversity — and some of its ecological services — is due to its alien species. Aliens may even contribute to rewilding those parts of the planet we no longer need. In Puerto Rico, abandoned sugarcane fields across half the island have sprouted new forest ecosystems, largely thanks to the invasive power of non-native species such as the African tulip tree, says Ariel Lugo of the International Institute of tropical Forestry. The tulip tree proved attractive to native birds and insects and now, after a few decades, native trees species have started to recover too.

**AG sustainable**

**Kost, 4** – agricultural economist, Specialty Crops Branch, Economic Research. Service, US Department of Agriculture (William, “CUBAN AGRICULTURE: TO BE OR NOT TO BE ORGANIC?” http://www.ascecuba.org/publications/proceedings/volume14/pdfs/kost.pdf)

Even without an organic approach to food production, is Cuba’s urban gardening system viable? In Cuba, both were an integral part of a common development. That integration is not required. While it is possible to have a high-tech and chemical-based production system in a small-scale gardening environment, it is unlikely to be sustainable at levels sufficient to provide a significant portion of a city’s food needs. Most high-tech and chemical technologies employed respond to economies of scale. Incentives to grow into commercial operations will exist and production will shift away from central cities to areas with less severe constraints on land. Urban gardening systems are also labor-intensive systems. As long as labor is freely available or wages are low elsewhere, urban gardening can afford to utilize high-labor production techniques. As the Cuban economy grows and recovers, the demand for labor in other industries will grow and wages will rise. Because it will be more profitable to work elsewhere, labor would likely be drawn away from the urban gardens. Replacing labor with mechanization could also shift production away from urban locations. Mechanization also generates benefits from economies of scale. Thus, fewer and fewer urban gardens would remain producing for the urban markets.

At the same time, economic growth in Cuba should make commercial agriculture enterprises more profitable, more productive, and better able to supply food to urban markets. Marketing infrastructures should improve. With higher incomes, urban workers would be more able to purchase needed food. Commercial agricultural sources would become increasingly competitive with food from urban gardens, and urban workers would increasingly quit growing their own food. While there might continue to be urban gardens, it is unlikely that they will have a long-term role in providing a substantial portion of urban consumers’ food needs.

# Block

#### Our interpretation is that economic engagement must be between two governments – that’s Daga – they violate this because the plan engages with non-governmental organizations – that’s a voting issue to preserve limits.

Department of State 12 (U.S. Department of State, “Fact Sheet: Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) in the United States”, January 12, 2012, http://www.humanrights.gov/2012/01/12/fact-sheet-non-governmental-organizations-ngos-in-the-united-states/, DTB)

Approximately 1.5 million NGOs operate in the United States. These NGOs undertake a wide array of activities, including political advocacy on issues such as foreign policy, elections, the environment, healthcare, women’s rights, economic development, and many other issues. Many NGOs in the United States also operate in fields that are not related to politics. These include volunteer organizations rooted in shared religious faith, labor unions, groups that help vulnerable people such as the poor or mentally ill, and groups that seek to empower youth or marginalized populations. Indeed, NGOs exist to represent virtually every cause imaginable. Their sources of finance include donations from private individuals (American or foreign), private sector for-profit companies, philanthropic foundations, or grants from federal, state, or local government. Sources of finance may also include foreign governments. There is no prohibition in U.S. law on foreign funding of NGOs, whether that foreign funding comes from governments or non-government sources.

#### Good is not good enough –

Resnick 01 – Dr. Evan Resnick, Ph.D. in Political Science from Columbia University, Assistant Professor of Political Science at Yeshiva University, “Defining Engagement”, Journal of International Affairs, Spring, 54(2), Ebsco

CONCLUSION

In matters of national security, establishing a clear definition of terms is a precondition for effective policymaking. Decisionmakers who invoke critical terms in an erratic, ad hoc fashion risk alienating their constituencies. They also risk exacerbating misperceptions and hostility among those the policies target. Scholars who commit the same error undercut their ability to conduct valuable empirical research. Hence, if scholars and policymakers fail rigorously to define "engagement," they undermine the ability to build an effective foreign policy.

#### You MUST be able to establish a theoretical baseline for topicality evaluating anything else – “knowing it when you see it” is an awful standard

Hayden 13 (Dr. Craig Hayden is an assistant professor in the International Communication Program at American University's School of International Service. “Engagement” is More Convenient than Helpful: Dissecting a Public Diplomacy Term.”, <http://intermap.org/2013/06/20/engagement-is-more-convenient-than-helpful-dissecting-a-public-diplomacy-term/>

The term engagement matters because it implies a specific practice, to facilitate a certain objective or outcome, and yet it doesn’t actually identify a practice. And as Wallin notes, it’s hard to discern engagement in relation to public diplomacy if we don’t have some standards or definition. Public diplomacy watchers and scholars may “know it when they see it,” but I’m not sure how this helps provide constructive critique.

#### Limits enable creativity.

Flood 10 (Scott, BS in Communication and Theatre Arts – St. Joseph’s College, School Board Member – Plainfield Community School Corporation, and Advertising Agent, “Business Innovation – Real Creativity Happens Inside the Box”, http://ezinearticles.com\/?Business-Innovation---Real-Creativity-Happens-Inside-the-Box&id=4793692)

It seems that we can accomplish anything if we're brave enough to step out of that bad, bad box, and thinking "creatively" has come to be synonymous with ignoring rules and constraints or pretending they just don't exist. Nonsense. Real creativity is put to the test within the box. In fact, that's where it really shines. It might surprise you, but it's actually easier to think outside the box than within its confines. How can that be? It's simple. When you're working outside the box, you don't face rules, or boundaries, or assumptions. You create your own as you go along. If you want to throw convention aside, you can do it. If you want to throw proven practices out the window, have at it. You have the freedom to create your own world. Now, I'm not saying there's anything wrong with thinking outside the box. At times, it's absolutely essential - such as when you're facing the biggest oil spill in history in an environment in which all the known approaches are failing. But most of us don't have the luxury of being able to operate outside the box. We've been shoved into reality, facing a variety of limitations, from budgets, to supervisors' opinions and prejudices, to the nature of the marketplace. Even though the box may have been given a bad name, it's where most of us have to spend our time. And no matter how much we may fret about those limits, inside that box is where we need to prove ourselves. If you'll pardon the inevitable sports analogy, consider a baseball player who belts ball after ball over 450 feet. Unfortunately, he has a wee problem: he can't place those hits between the foul lines, so they're harmful strikes instead of game-winning home runs. To the out-of-the-box advocates, he's a mighty slugger who deserves admiration, but to his teammates and the fans, he's a loser who just can't get on base. He may not like the fact that he has to limit his hits to between the foul poles, but that's one of the realities of the game he chose to play. The same is true of ideas and approaches. The most dazzling and impressive tactic is essentially useless if it doesn't offer a practical, realistic way to address the need or application. Like the baseball player, we may not like the realities, but we have to operate within their limits. Often, I've seen people blame the box for their inability or unwillingness to create something workable. For example, back in my ad agency days, I remember fellow writers and designers complaining about the limitations of projects. If it was a half-page ad, they didn't feel they could truly be creative unless the space was expanded to a full page. If they were given a full page, they demanded a spread. Handed a spread, they'd fret because it wasn't a TV commercial. If the project became a TV commercial with a $25,000 budget, they'd grouse about not having a $50,000 budget. Yet the greatest artists of all time didn't complain about what they didn't have; they worked their magic using what they did. Monet captured the grace and beauty of France astonishingly well within the bounds of a canvas. Donatello exposed the breathtaking emotion that lurked within ordinary chunks of marble. And I doubt that Beethoven ever whined because there were only 88 keys on the piano. Similarly, I've watched the best of my peers do amazing things in less-than-favorable circumstances. There were brilliant commercials developed with minimal budgets and hand-held cameras. Black-and-white ads that outperformed their colorful competitors. Simple postcards that grabbed the attention of (and business from) jaded consumers. You see, real creativity isn't hampered or blocked by limits. It actually flowers in response to challenges. Even though it may be forced to remain inside the box, it leverages everything it can find in that box and makes the most of every bit of it. Real creativity is driven by a need to create. When Monet approached a blank canvas, it's safe to say that he didn't agonize over its size. He wanted to capture something he'd seen and share how it looked through his eyes. The size of the canvas was incidental to his talent and desire. Think about the Apollo 13 mission. NASA didn't have the luxury of flying supplies or extra tools to the crew. They couldn't rewrite the laws of physics. Plus, they faced a rapidly shrinking timeline, so their box kept getting smaller and less forgiving. And yet they arrived upon a solution that was creative; more important, that was successful. The next time someone tells you that the real solution involves stepping outside the box, challenge him or her to think and work harder. After all, the best solution may very well be lurking in a corner of that familiar box.

#### Carbon removal can solve for warming globally – the location is irrelevant and cheap land and labor can make it cost-competitive

Gunther 12-contributing editor at Fortune, a senior writer at Greenbiz.com(Marc, Feb 2012, “Rethinking Carbon Dioxide: From a Pollutant to an Asset,” http://e360.yale.edu/feature/geoengineering\_carbon\_dioxide\_removal\_technology\_from\_pollutant\_to\_asset/2498/)JCP

Because greenhouse gases are dispersed around the globe, air capture can be done anywhere. This fact is key to the business plans of all three startups. Carbon Engineering’s business model, for example, revolves around what Keith calls “physical carbon arbitrage.” The company plans to build its first carbon-capture plants in places with cheap labor, cheap land, cheap construction costs, cheap natural gas to operate them and, ideally, strong demand for CO2. “If we can find all those at once,” he says, “we’re printing money.”

What this means for the environment is that carbon pollution need not be cleaned up at its source. CO2 spewing from a tailpipe in Sao Paulo or a coal plant in China can be captured by machines in Iceland or the Middle East because the atmosphere functions as a conveyor belt, moving CO2 to any sink. Air capture may prove to be the only way to absorb dispersed emissions from cars, trucks, trains, ships or planes.

It’s an exciting prospect, at least in theory. But remember — the scientific establishment says this is all pie in the sky. What’s more, for air capture to do what we’ve failed to do so far — reduce emissions on a scale that matters to climate — these tiny startups would have to spawn a giant, global industry, employing thousands of engineers and requiring many billions of dollars of investment. “If air capture is going to succeed, it’s going to take industrial might,” says Keith. To reduce atmospheric concentrations of CO2 by one part per million — they’re now at about 390 ppm, which some scientists think is too high — would require the removal of about 8 gigatons, or 8 billion tons, of CO2.

#### c) ICAO proves --- China invited Taiwan --- no longer interested in isolation because they want to support Ma.

Bloomberg, 9/27/2013. “Taiwan Makes a Breakthrough—Thanks to China,” Bruce Einhorn, http://www.businessweek.com/articles/2013-09-27/taiwan-makes-a-breakthrough-thanks-to-china.

It’s one of the obscure arms of the United Nations, but the International Civil Aviation Organization is the venue for a breakthrough in the decades-long rivalry between China’s Communists and Taiwan’s Nationalists. The ICAO is meeting in Montreal for an assembly scheduled to last until Oct. 4. And for the first time since the UN kicked out Chiang Kai-shek’s Taiwan-based Republic of China in 1971, there is a Taiwanese representative in attendance.

For Taiwan, long accustomed to international isolation, this is a major development. The island has diplomatic relations with [only 23 countries](http://www.ey.gov.tw/en/cp.aspx?n=59750F1C600BAD33). The most significant is the Vatican, which has long been at odds with the People’s Republic of China over the Communist government’s hostility to the Catholic Church. The other governments that recognize Taiwan are poor and small, mostly in Latin America and the Caribbean as well as a few in Africa and Oceania.

The Taiwanese have been trying for years to break out of their diplomatic isolation and have targeted the ICAO. The success winning “international support for Taiwan’s meaningful participation is greatly appreciated,” Taiwanese[transportation minister Yeh Kuang-Shih](http://www.motc.gov.tw/en/home.jsp?id=246&parentpath=0,150) wrote in a column in [Aviation Week](http://www.aviationweek.com/Article.aspx?id=/article-xml/AW_09_23_2013_p66-616974.xml). “Taiwan has for many years strived to participate in ICAO. Our call for inclusion in the organization has been acknowledged around the world.”

The U.S., which switched recognition from Taipei to Beijing in the Carter administration, has welcomed the move, too. The Obama administration is “encouraged to see that this arrangement was reached through international cooperation and appreciate the flexibility and support of both ICAO and its members,” the State Department [said in a statement](http://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2013/09/214658.htm). “We continue to support Taiwan’s meaningful participation in multilateral organizations that do not require statehood for membership.”

Taiwan can thank an unlikely champion for its ICAO breakthrough. Taiwan got invited to Montreal only because the government in Beijing agreed to allow the island to take part as a guest under the name Chinese Taipei, the same name Taiwan’s athletes use when participating in the Olympics. According to a report in the Taiwan-based English-language newspaper [China Post,](http://www.chinapost.com.tw/taiwan/foreign-affairs/2013/09/26/389817/ICAO-president.htm%20) ICAO Council President Roberto Kobeh González yesterday said he invited Taiwan because of China’s suggestion.

**MARKED**

For China, the Montreal invite is a fairly pain-free way to show the mainland’s sincerity toward improving relations with Taiwan at a time when Taiwanese President Ma Ying-jeou’s popularity has plunged. Ma is the leader of the Kuomintang (KMT), the Nationalists who favor closer economic ties with the mainland. The worst-case scenario for Beijing is a return to power of the pro-independence Democratic Progressive Party, so any move to bolster Ma and the KMT and diminish the chances of a DPP government would likely be worthwhile for the Communists.

#### Status quo solves FDI – New Panama Canal lures

**Frank 9/23** writer at Reuters (Marc, “Cuba bids to lure foreign investment with new port and trade zone Sep 23, 2013<http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/09/23/us-cuba-investment-idUSBRE98M12H20130923>) // czhang

(Reuters) - Cuba published rules and regulations on Monday governing its first special development zone, touting new port facilities in Mariel Bay in a bid to attract investors and take advantage of a renovated Panama Canal. The decree establishing the zone and related rules takes effect on November 1 and includes significant tax and customs breaks for foreign and Cuban companies while maintaining restrictive policies, including for labor. Cuba hopes the zone, and others it plans for the future, will "increase exports, the effective substitution of imports, (spur) high-technology and local development projects, as well as contribute to the creation of new jobs," according to reform plans issued by the ruling Communist Party in 2011. The plan spoke positively of foreign investment, promised a review of the cumbersome approval process and said special economic zones, joint venture golf courses, marinas and new manufacturing projects were planned. Most experts believe large flows of direct investment will be needed for development and to create jobs if the government follows through with plans to lay off up to a million workers in an attempt to lift the country out of its economic malaise. The Mariel special development zone covers 180 square miles (466 square km) west of Havana and is centered around a new container terminal under construction in Mariel Bay, 28 miles from the Cuban capital. The zone will be administered by a new state entity under the Council of Ministers, and investors will be given up to 50-year contracts, compared with the current 25 years, with the possibility of renewal. They can have up to 100 percent ownership during the contract, according to Cuba's foreign investment law. Investors will be charged virtually no labor or local taxes and will be granted a 10-year reprieve from paying a 12 percent tax on profits. They will, however, pay a 14 percent social security tax, a 1 percent sales or service tax for local transactions, and 0.5 percent of income to a zone maintenance and development fund.

#### None of your evidence assumes the renovated Panama Canal – it’s a framing issue – it’s attracting large flows of FDI right now

#### US is not key – other countries currently provide sufficient FDI for Cuban reforms

**Frank, 10/3** (Marc, Cuba’s new port offers a small opening to the global economy October 3, 2013, <http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/bc2f5a54-2ab5-11e3-ade3-00144feab7de.html#axzz2hHxAepI5>) // czhang

When Havana hosts its annual international trade jamboree next month, officials will be sure to tout Cuba’s new container terminal and free-trade zone – the communist island’s first strategic push to join the international economy in decades. Furthermore, although Havana usually treats the trade fair as a chance to thumb its nose at the US, this year the new port may change the usual playbook. That is because the ambitious $900m scheme, built at Mariel port on Cuba’s northern coast and just 120 miles from Florida, seems predicated on an end to the 53-year-old [US embargo](http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/2/8e1be67e-febd-11e2-97dc-00144feabdc0.html#axzz2gfBGk9PP). As there is no sign of that happening soon, despite some signs that [Cuba](http://www.ft.com/topics/places/Cuba) wants a more pragmatic relationship with the US, analysts say Havana will instead have to count on friendly governments in the region and Asia to compensate for this apparent hole in the project’s business model – at least during its first phases. “The United States is the obvious market for Mariel’s FTZ exports and trans-shipments,” said Richard Feinberg, senior fellow at the Brookings Institution and author of several Cuban studies. “In the meantime, friendly governments, such as Brazil, Mexico, China, and Singapore, may incentivise modest investments by their firms.” The Mariel container terminal, built by Brazilian construction company Odebrecht, part-financed by Brazilian development loans and operated by Singapore’s PSA, is part of a larger scheme that will take over all of the facilities at Havana’s ageing port, and see the Havana Bay transformed into what could be a spectacular tourism and recreational playground. But it also reflects broader changes sweeping the Caribbean and American seaboards. The [widening of the Panama Canal](http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/4421a786-ad9e-11e2-82b8-00144feabdc0.html) is prompting many regional port authorities to upgrade facilities in order to accommodate larger container ships. Mariel’s bay has been dredged to accommodate ships with twice the draft of the Havana port, while Mariel’s port itself, 28 miles from the capital, will have 700m of berth and capacity of up to 1m containers, three times Havana’s.

#### turns transition.

**Kayyem 13**

[Juliette, columnist at The Boston Globe, writing national security and foreign affairs, “Immigration Reform after Hugo Chavez,” New York Times News Service, Hawaii Tribune Herald, 3/10/13, <http://hawaiitribune-herald.com/sections/commentary/their-views/immigration-reform-after-hugo-chavez.html>]

The United States, which is comprehensively reassessing its immigration policies, **has the capacity to change these hemispheric dynamics in its favor**. Our efforts to strangle Cuba economically have served as a lightning rod for anti-American sentiment, allowing leaders like the Castros and Chavez to mask their own horrible records of corruption. By eliminating the automatic refugee status granted to Cubans if they somehow reach U.S. soil, we would stop tempting them to take to the seas in rickety boats and inner tubes on which many lose their lives. We would also put the whole world on equal footing, determining which refugees are allowed to stay not by whether we like (or don’t like) their country’s leadership, but whether they have valid reasons to stay, including a fear of political reprisals. It is time we end a Cuba policy that has sowed ill will among our southern neighbors and non-Cuban immigrant populations in the United States. At the same time, **we can encourage more exchanges of people, and therefore commerce**, between the two nations. We could then assist Cuba **in making the political and economic reforms** that we have been demanding for years. We shouldn’t punish Cuba for taking our advice. A healthier Cuba is only of benefit to the United States: The U.S. intelligence community has not viewed Cuba as a direct threat to our national security since the 1970s. President **Obama can have his own Berlin Wall moment**. With Chavez gone, and Cuba so desperate, we can shift the relationship between the United States and South America to one of strategic interests rather than personalities. Chavez is dead. The Castros are exiting the stage. America should move on.

#### turns warming

**Meija 9** (Robert, Employment Services Manager at South Bay Workforce Investment Board, City University of New York-Baruch College , “What’s Old is New: Green Jobs & What America’s Federal Workforce Investment System Can Do Now to Develop a Green Workforce”, 1/14/09, www.southbayresource.net/articles/whatsoldisnew.pdf, tables, charts, and graphs omitted)

In addition to adaptation, science, technology and innovation may prove to be our greatest allies in the battle to defeat global warming. A number of promising eco-tech solutions to our environmental challenges are starting to emerge; they hinge on further **r**esearch and **d**evelopment, access to capital, and accommodating government regulations. Innovations such as Bio-char (a stable and rich charcoal produced from biomass) for carbon sequestration, improved soil fertility, sustainable (carbon-negative) energy production, and poverty reduction; the use of algae as an alternative fuel source; and bio- organisms and nano devices that clean up toxic spills and improve solar technology hold great potential for solving some of the world’s most difficult consumption challenges and contamination problems. Sustained advances and U.S. leadership in environmental technologies, not only in terms of global warming, but in terms of competitiveness, will rely on an expansion of the nation’s knowledge workforce, with a strong emphasis on green-centered science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM). Sadly, the U.S. lags other developed countries in its preparation of technologists, scientists, engineers and mathematicians. The U.S.’ share of the world’s scientists and engineers is projected to fall from 40 percent in 1975 to 15 percent in 2010.22 This trend must be reversed. As reported by the U.S. Department of Labor on January 15, 2008 in the Federal Register: There is a broad consensus that the long-term key to continued U.S. competitiveness and growth in an increasingly global economic environment is the adequate supply of qualified Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) workers capable of translating knowledge and skills into new processes, products and services. According to the National Science Foundation (NSF), scientific innovation has produced roughly half of all U.S. economic growth in the last fifty years and the STEM disciplines, including those who work in them, are critical engines to that innovation and growth--one recent estimate, while only five percent of the U.S. workforce is employed in STEM fields, the STEM workforce accounts for more than fifty percent of the nation’s sustained growth (Babco 2004). The National Academy of Sciences study, Rising Above the Gathering Storm (2006), argues that: Absent a serious and rapid response, the U.S. will lose quality jobs to other nations; lowering our standard of living, reducing tax revenues, and weakening the domestic market for goods and services. Once this cycle accelerates, it will be difficult to regain lost pre-eminence in technology-driven innovation and its economic benefits.23 In Thrive: The Skills Imperative, the Council on Competitiveness states that: Looking ahead, skills for sustainability could become a key competitive differentiator. As Joseph Stanislaw has noted: we are at the very beginning of a global race to create dominant green economies.(42) Global warming and competition for resources could very well change the ground rules of globalization-at the very least, the need to reduce carbon footprints and achieve higher resource productivity could alter corporate calculations about where and how to distribute operations and assets globally.America could get out in front of this paradigm shift. But it is not clear that the **U**nited **S**tates will have enough talent with the right set of skills, or has even defined the path forward on skills for sustainability.24 To defeat global warming, we must focus on developing both the intellectual and physical infrastructure of our country. A national campaign to promote STEM education in environmental technologies, with strong federal financing of community and public sector organizations to provide career and academic support, will make a difference.

**turns ag**

**Serrano, 12 -** Senior Editor at TIME.com (Alfonso, “Bitter Harvest: U.S. Farmers Blame Billion-Dollar Losses on Immigration Laws” 9/21, http://business.time.com/2012/09/21/bitter-harvest-u-s-farmers-blame-billion-dollar-losses-on-immigration-laws/#ixzz2QJ33CWwU

The Broetjes and an increasing number of farmers across the country say that a complex web of local and state anti-immigration laws account for acute labor shortages. With the harvest season in full bloom, stringent immigration laws have forced waves of undocumented immigrants to flee certain states for more-hospitable areas. In their wake, thousands of acres of crops have been left to rot in the fields, as farmers have struggled to compensate for labor shortages with domestic help.

“The enforcement of immigration policy has devastated the skilled-labor source that we’ve depended on for 20 or 30 years,” said Ralph Broetje during a recent teleconference organized by the National Immigration Forum, adding that last year Washington farmers — part of an $8 billion agriculture industry — were forced to leave 10% of their crops rotting on vines and trees. “It’s getting worse each year,” says Broetje, “and it’s going to end up putting some growers out of business if Congress doesn’t step up and do immigration reform.”

Roughly 70% of the 1.2 million people employed by the agriculture industry are undocumented. No U.S. industry is more dependent on undocumented immigrants. But acute labor shortages brought on by anti-immigration measures threaten to heap record losses on an industry emerging from years of stiff foreign competition. Nationwide, labor shortages will result in losses of up to $9 billion, according to the American Farm Bureau Federation.

“As long as the labor supply solutions are there, we can support the enforcement solutions,” Regelbrugge said.

**Here’s a crucial framing issue – view uniqueness how GOP moderates and the leadership will act – not the conservative base. Capital is key – Obama’s direct engagement is vital to a compromise**

**Balz, 10/17/13** (Dan, Washington Post, “Can Obama seize the moment and make Washington work?” <http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/can-obama-seize-the-moment-to-make-washington-work/2013/10/17/d84c1934-3753-11e3-80c6-7e6dd8d22d8f_story_1.html>)

Obama will continue to face unyielding opposition from the tea party Republicans in the House and the Senate. Sen. Ted Cruz (R-Tex.) made that clear Wednesday when he denounced the Senate compromise and praised those in the House whose opposition to the health-care law triggered the crisis.

The key now is whether the president has a strategy to **govern around them** by winning support from what he called the responsible Republicans.

Obama’s agenda

On Thursday, Obama called on Congress to focus on three priorities. But he offered few specifics about what he will ask and what he will give. Nor is it clear whether he has a strategy to win the support of some Republicans.

The first priority he talked about was the economy and the budget. Budget negotiations will resume with the goal of reaching an agreement by mid-December, lest the country face a repeat of what just happened.

Obama wants to replace the across-the-board spending reductions that have cut indiscriminately with more sensible spending priorities. He also says he is willing to negotiate over entitlements programs. He wants any agreement to include more revenue, although Republicans say he got his revenue package at the end of 2012. Republicans who opposed the shutdown (but quietly went along with it) are skeptical that Obama is truly willing to make concessions to get a satisfactory deal.

The two other legislative priorities the president cited were immigration reform and passage of the farm bill. No one can say what the prospects are for passage of an immigration bill. Much of that still depends on how House GOP leaders decide whether it is in the party’s long-term interest to pass it. Obama did not mention what should be his other major priority, the health-care law, whose implementation has gotten off to a stumbling start, to put it mildly.

All of that is on the table. Meanwhile, there is a question of **how engaged Obama will be** in the **grinding work** of trying to produce compromise with potentially willing Republicans.

**(at: Labrador) This is especially true of their uniqueness evidence which quotes Labrador as the main warrant for why immigration won’t pass – he’s a Tea Party conservative**

**Gomez, 10/17/13** (Alan, USA Today, “Shutdown over, Democrats say immigration is next”

<http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2013/10/17/government-shutdown-shift-immigration-reform/3000575/>

Rep. Raul Labrador, R-Idaho, **a Tea Party conservative** who was once a member of a bipartisan House group that tried to draft a broad immigration bill, said the prospects for even smaller bills are slim in the House.

#### More warrants

**1. Boehner will waive the Hastert rule on CIR if Obama can win moderate GOP support**

**Gomez, 10/17/13** (Alan, USA Today, “Shutdown over, Democrats say immigration is next”

<http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2013/10/17/government-shutdown-shift-immigration-reform/3000575/>

Democrats in the House saw something else going on Wednesday.

In the end, the Affordable Care Act was not delayed or dismantled and House Republicans agreed to raise the nation's $16.7 trillion debt ceiling.

"You could hear the hissing sound of the pent-up, perceived power being relieved," said Rep. Joe Garcia, D-Fla., who filed the House version of a sweeping immigration bill that has now garnered 182 Democratic co-sponsors.

Rep. Luis Gutierrez, D-Ill., one of the main proponents of getting an immigration bill through Congress, is looking to history for signs of optimism that the House can pass something.

Gutierrez was in the House during the last government shutdown in 1996, and he says Republicans emerged from the damaging closure scurrying to pass "big things" to show the country they could get things done. In the aftermath of that shutdown, the government passed welfare reform, the sweeping Kennedy-Kassebaum health care law and an increase in the minimum wage.

"It was in people's self-interest to pass some good stuff," Gutierrez said. "That's what's going to drive a lot of what goes on around here."

Rep. Xavier Becerra, R-Calif., chairman of the House Democratic Caucus, looks to more recent examples for hope. He said Boehner has violated the so-called 'Hastert Rule' — requiring support from a majority of the majority party in the House before a bill can come to the floor — on several votes that were critical, including emergency relief for victims of Superstorm Sandy.

Becerra sees a similar situation developing on immigration, where the vast majority of Democrats and a small number of Republicans could pass a bill through the House.

"Once again, the speaker for the majority party is going to be placed in a position of deciding whether he's going to put country before party and get something done," Becerra said. "We just need a few courageous Republicans to stand up and say they're ready."

**2. PC assembles a centrist coalition**

**Nicholas, 10/17/13** (Peter, Wall Street Journal, “Obama's Agenda Faces Rocky Road” <http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052702303680404579141472200495820>)

Some Democrats, meanwhile, believe Mr. Obama must be a more active player in looming fights. Sen. Dianne Feinstein (D., Calif.) said in an interview Mr. Obama "stepped back" in part because he felt "burned" by the grinding budget fights that have played out over the past three years.

"I hope that changes, because you do need presidential leadership on these" issues, she said. In "three or four months, we could be back in the same place, and we can't let ourselves be back in the same place," she said.

Mr. Obama suggested Thursday he was willing to negotiate on a range of issues, consistent with his message during the budget fight that he was prepared to bargain with lawmakers once the government was reopened and the debt ceiling raised.

Mr. Obama may find some consolation in the House vote Wednesday. In the end, 87 House Republicans voted the president's way on the debt bill. More than 17% of them hailed from districts Mr. Obama carried in 2012, suggesting a potential way forward for a president eager to **assemble a centrist coalition**.

**a) time-frame differential – takes too long to generate success – prefer our evidence, it is specific to Obama**

\*the timeframe differential for rebuilding capital is a framing issue – even if Obama can regenerate political capital in the long term, the empirical record proves that Obama loses massive amounts of political capital in the short-term obliterating his capability of passing agenda items – Health Care proves

**Silber 07** [PhD Political Science & Communication – focus on the Rhetoric of Presidential Policy-Making – Prof of Poli Sci – Samford, [Marissa, WHAT MAKES A PRESIDENT QUACK?, Prepared for delivery at the 2007 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, August 30th-September 2nd, 2007, UNDERSTANDING LAME DUCK STATUS THROUGH THE EYES OF THE MEDIA AND POLITICIANS]

Important to the discussion of political capital is whether or not it can be replenished over a term. If a President expends political capital on his agenda, can it be replaced? Light suggests that “capital declines over time – public approval consistently falls: midterm losses occur” (31). Capital can be rebuilt, but **only to a limited extent**. The decline of capital makes it difficult to access information, recruit more expertise and maintain energy. If a lame duck President can be defined by a loss of political capital, this paper helps determine if such capital can be replenished or if a lame duck can accomplish little. Before determining this, a definition of a lame duck President must be

developed.

**b) Obama cannot win – legislative wins don’t spillover**

\*prefer Obama specific evidence – even if other presidents are able to regenerate capital quickly, Obama cannot – every time Obama allocates political capital on unpopular legislation it turns into a journalistic convention of pointing fingers – makes it impossible to get legislation through

Todd **Eberly** **13** – is coordinator of Public Policy Studies and assistant professor in the Department of Political Science at St. Mary's College of Maryland. His email is teeberly@smcm.edu. This article is excerpted from his book, co-authored with Steven Schier, "American Government and Popular Discontent: Stability without Success," to published later this year by Routledge Press., **1-21**-2013 <http://articles.baltimoresun.com/2013-01-21/news/bs-ed-political-capital-20130121_1_political-system-party-support-public-opinion/2>

As Barack Obama prepares to be sworn in for the second time as president of the United States, he faces the stark reality that **little of what he hopes to accomplish** in a second term **will** likely **come to pass**. Mr. Obama occupies an office that many assume to be all powerful, but like so many of his recent predecessors, the president knows better. He faces a political capital problem and a power trap.¶ In the post-1960s American political system, presidents have found the exercise of effective leadership a difficult task. To lead well, a president needs support — or at least permission — from federal courts and Congress; steady allegiance from public opinion and fellow partisans in the electorate; backing from powerful, entrenched interest groups; and accordance with contemporary public opinion about the proper size and scope of government. This is a long list of requirements. If presidents fail to satisfy these requirements, they face the prospect of inadequate political support or political capital to back their power assertions.¶ What was so crucial about the 1960s? We can trace so much of what defines contemporary politics to trends that emerged then. Americans' confidence in government began a precipitous decline as the tumult and tragedies of the 1960s gave way to the scandals and economic uncertainties of the 1970s. Long-standing party coalitions began to fray as the New Deal coalition, which had elected Franklin Roosevelt to four terms and made Democrats the indisputable majority party, faded into history. The election of Richard Nixon in 1968 marked the beginning of an unprecedented era of divided government. Finally, the two parties began ideologically divergent journeys that resulted in intense polarization in Congress, diminishing the possibility of bipartisan compromise. These changes, combined with the growing influence of money and interest groups and the steady "thickening" of the federal bureaucracy, introduced significant challenges to presidential leadership.¶ Political capital can best be understood as a combination of the president's party support in Congress, public approval of his job performance, and the president's electoral victory margin. The components of political capital are central to the fate of presidencies. It is difficult to claim warrants for leadership in an era when job approval, congressional support and partisan affiliation provide less backing for a president than in times past. In recent years, **presidents' political capital has shrunk while their power assertions have grown,** making the president a volatile player in the national political system.¶ Jimmy Carter and George H.W. Bush joined the small ranks of incumbents defeated while seeking a second term. Ronald Reagan was elected in two landslides, yet his most successful year for domestic policy was his first year in office. Bill Clinton was twice elected by a comfortable margin, but with less than majority support, and despite a strong economy during his second term, his greatest legislative successes came during his first year with the passage of a controversial but crucial budget bill, the Family and Medical Leave Act, and the North American Free Trade Agreement. George W. Bush won election in 2000 having lost the popular vote, and though his impact on national security policy after the Sept. 11 attacks was far reaching, his greatest domestic policy successes came during 2001. Ambitious plans for Social Security reform, following his narrow re-election in 2004, went nowhere.¶ Faced with obstacles to successful leadership, recent presidents have come to rely more on their formal powers. The number of important executive orders has increased significantly since the 1960s, as have the issuance of presidential signing statements. Both are used by presidents in an attempt to shape and direct policy on their terms. Presidents have had to rely more on recess appointments as well, appointing individuals to important positions during a congressional recess (even a weekend recess) to avoid delays and obstruction often encountered in the Senate. Such power assertions typically elicit close media scrutiny and often further erode political capital.¶ Barack Obama's election in 2008 seemed to signal a change. Mr. Obama's popular vote majority was the largest for any president since 1988, and he was the first Democrat to clear the 50 percent mark since Lyndon Johnson. The president initially enjoyed strong public approval and, with a Democratic Congress, was able to produce an impressive string of legislative accomplishments during his first year and early into his second, capped by enactment of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. But with each legislative battle and success, his political capital waned. His impressive successes with Congress in 2009 and 2010 were accompanied by a shift in the public mood against him, evident in the rise of the tea party movement, the collapse in his approval rating, and the large GOP gains in the 2010 elections, which brought a return to divided government.¶ By mid-2011, Mr. Obama's job approval had slipped well below its initial levels, and Congress was proving increasingly intransigent. In the face of declining public support and rising congressional opposition, Mr. Obama, like his predecessors, looked to the energetic use of executive power. In 2012, the president relied on executive discretion and legal ambiguity to allow homeowners to more easily refinance federally backed mortgages, to help veterans find employment and to make it easier for college graduates to consolidate federal student loan debt. He issued several executive orders effecting change in the nation's enforcement of existing immigration laws. He used an executive order to authorize the Department of Education to grant states waivers from the requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act — though the enacting legislation makes no accommodation for such waivers. Contrary to the outcry from partisan opponents, Mr. Obama's actions were hardly unprecedented or imperial. Rather, they represented a rather typical power assertion from a contemporary president.¶ Many looked to the 2012 election as a means to break present trends. But Barack Obama's narrow re-election victory, coupled with the re-election of a somewhat-diminished Republican majority House and Democratic majority Senate, hardly signals a grand resurgence of his political capital. The president's recent issuance of multiple executive orders to deal with the issue of gun violence is further evidence of his power trap. Faced with the likelihood of legislative defeat in Congress, the president must rely on claims of unilateral power. But such claims are not without limit or cost and will likely further erode his political capital.¶ Only by solving the problem of political capital is a president likely to avoid a power trap. **Presidents** in recent years **have been unable to prevent their political capital from eroding**. When it did, their power assertions often got them into further political trouble. Through leveraging public support, presidents have at times been able to overcome contemporary leadership challenges by adopting as their own issues that the public already supports. Bill Clinton's centrist "triangulation" and George W. Bush's careful issue selection early in his presidency allowed them to secure important policy changes — in Mr. Clinton's case, welfare reform and budget balance, in Mr. Bush's tax cuts and education reform — that at the time received popular approval.¶ However, short-term legislative strategies may win policy success for a president but do not serve as an antidote to declining **p**olitical **c**apital over time, as the difficult final years of both the Bill Clinton and George W. Bush presidencies demonstrate. None of Barack Obama's recent predecessors solved the political capital problem or avoided the power trap. It is the central political challenge confronted by modern presidents and one that will likely weigh heavily on the current president's mind today as he takes his second oath of office.