# 2ac cp

1. permutation do both

**2. doesn’t solve relations**—lifting the embargo is essential to opening diplomatic challenges—that is our hinderael card says, “By ending the embargo Obama would indicate that he is truly willing to extend his hand once America’s traditional adversaries unclench their fists.”

**3. doesn’t solve human rights—**the counterplan doesn’t come to grips with the Cubans lack of food, electricity, and essential medicine—that’s amash

**4. doesn’t solve hegemony or credibility—**the counterplan would make America look like they are giving up on the war on terror, eviscerating any semblance of credibility that remains in Americas arsenal. Their only solvency evidence only says that it would help Cuban sovereignty NOT human rights

# 2ac disad

#### 1. Case outweighs—none of their impacts reach TOTAL planetary extinction

**2. Plan solves**—lifting the embargo will usher in democracy—that’s amash

#### 3. Cuban democracy is not emerging --- it’s a sham.

Associated Press, 10/20/2012. “Cuba's electoral process: Grassroots democracy or a sham? Lacks hoopla seen in many countries,” http://www.foxnews.com/world/2012/10/20/cuba-electoral-process-grassroots-democracy-or-sham/.

HAVANA –  There are no flashy television ads or campaign signs spiked into front yards. And candidates definitely don't tour the island shaking hands and kissing babies.

Elections in Cuba lack the hoopla they have in other countries, but authorities here say they give people a voice in government and rebut charges that the country is undemocratic. Critics call them a sham since voters can't throw out the Communist Party long led by Fidel and Raul Castro.

A long, complicated and truly unique electoral process is under way on this communist-run island, with more than 8 million Cubans going to the polls this weekend for municipal elections. The process culminates in February, when national assembly legislators vote on who will occupy the presidency, a post held by Raul Castro since 2008.

The latest electoral exercise began in September when Cubans met in common spaces, parks and buildings for neighborhood assemblies to choose the candidates in municipal elections. Those assemblies nominated 32,000 candidates, and each electoral district must have between two and eight names on the ballot.

Sheets of paper with terse biographies and photos of the candidates were then taped up to strategically placed walls and windows in each neighborhood for residents to read. That's just about the only campaigning that's allowed.

On Sunday, Cubans will cast ballots to choose among these candidates for municipal assemblies that administer local governments and relay complaints on issues such as potholes and housing, social and sports programs.

After the local elections, commissions elected by workers, farmers, youth, student and women's groups then choose candidates for the national legislature, which eventually elects Cuba's next president.

Near-complete voter participation is expected. In 2007-2008, voter turnout was 96.8 percent.

The government says perennial high turnouts are a clear sign of support for the revolution. Dissidents say people vote for fear that not doing so could get them in trouble.

Polling places also turn into social gatherings for neighbors. Young students escort the elderly and the disabled to vote, and Cubans are reminded by state television, unions and women's groups that casting a ballot is a patriotic duty.

The entire process is devoid of party slogans, ads or logos, since only one party is legal in Cuba: the Communist Party, and its job is to "guide" society and its politics rather than impose candidates, said Ruben Perez, secretary of the National Electoral Commission.

"Voting is free, not obligatory and secret," he said. "Our system is totally transparent and we defend it like this. We think that it is very democratic.

"It is a different concept: no delegate represents any political interest, only society itself."

While the Communist Party's power and influence are enormous, candidates don't have to be party members.

But those who don't usually come from allied groups such as the Federation of Cuban Women and the neighborhood-watch Committees for the Defense of the Revolution.

The nomination assemblies also see heated debate and criticisms about local problems such as slow police response, poor water supply and garbage pickup or unauthorized vending stands that block sidewalks.

But it is rare, almost unheard of, for a candidate to be nominated against the party's wishes, and there's no real electoral threat to the country's rulers. There are no direct elections for the presidency or for Communist Party leadership posts, which critics say hold real power in the country.

Members of the island's tiny dissident community have not been nominated when they tried in the past, and many boycott a system they consider illegitimate.

"To be truly democratic, besides being free (the elections) should be competitive and the people able to choose among alternative programs and in the case here there is only one program, that of the government," said Elizardo Sanchez, a dissident who runs the non-governmental Cuban Commission for Human Rights and National Reconciliation.

Sanchez said that while multiparty systems have deficiencies, the island's one-party electoral process "doesn't reflect the pluralism of Cuban society."

Cuban authorities say they have no plans to change the system.

"Our adversaries and even some of our sympathizers ... demand of us, as if we were a country living under normal conditions and not under siege, that we reinstall a multiparty model," Raul Castro said at a Communist Party conference in January. But legalizing parties other than the Communist Party would be to "sacrifice the strategic arm of the unity of all Cubans that has made our dreams of independence and social justice a reality."

#### 4. Non unique: their evidence is citing a blogger that holds no political weight. The only warrant for impending democracy is due to increasing internet activity, but that does not mean a democracy is ACTUALLY coming.

**5. No link:** the plan will not *change* the motives of the organic democratic groups. They are invested in the cause to bring a more democratic society to Cuba regardless of the plan. The government would not crack down on the bloggers post plan.

#### 6. Link Turn --- lifting embargo would empower democratic groups.

[Doug Bandow](http://www.cato.org/people/doug-bandow), 12/11/2012. Senior fellow at the Cato Institute and a former special assistant to former US president Ronald Reagan. “Time to End the Cuba Embargo,” National Interest, http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/time-end-cuba-embargo.

Ending the embargo would have obvious economic benefits for both Cubans and Americans. The U.S. International Trade Commission estimates American losses alone from the embargo as much as $1.2 billion annually.

Expanding economic opportunities also might increase pressure within Cuba for further economic reform. So far the regime has taken small steps, but rejected significant change. Moreover, thrusting more Americans into Cuban society could help undermine the ruling system. Despite Fidel Castro’s decline, Cuban politics remains largely static. A few human rights activists have been released, while Raul Castro has used party purges to entrench loyal elites.

Lifting the embargo would be no panacea. Other countries invest in and trade with Cuba to no obvious political impact. And the lack of widespread economic reform makes it easier for the regime rather than the people to collect the benefits of trade, in contrast to China. Still, more U.S. contact would have an impact. Argued trade specialist Dan Griswold, “American tourists would boost the earnings of Cubans who rent rooms, drive taxis, sell art, and operate restaurants in their homes. Those dollars would then find their way to the hundreds of freely priced farmers markets, to carpenters, repairmen, tutors, food venders, and other entrepreneurs.”

The Castro dictatorship ultimately will end up in history’s dustbin. But it will continue to cause much human hardship along the way.

The Heritage Foundation’s John Sweeney complained nearly two decades ago that “the United States must not abandon the Cuban people by relaxing or lifting the trade embargo against the communist regime.” But the dead hand of half a century of failed policy is the worst breach of faith with the Cuban people.

Lifting sanctions would be a victory not for Fidel Castro, but for the power of free people to spread liberty. As Griswold argued, “commercial engagement is the best way to encourage more open societies abroad.” Of course, there are no guarantees. But lifting the embargo would have a greater likelihood of success than continuing a policy which has failed. Some day the Cuban people will be free. Allowing more contact with Americans likely would make that day come sooner.

**7. No internal link:** they do NOT have a card that says other countries would model the Cuban cooperative project. The spansh cooperative should have been a model.

<It says, “No country bears as much promise in this respect than Cuba.” However, this does NOT indicate that other countries would be willing to completely abandon their economic model because Cuba adopts different economic policies. Their evidence does NOT mention the world model whatsoever.>

**8. No impact**: their turnbull impact evidence cites multiple other initiatives that would need to be adopted globally to spur economic democracies worldwide, such as income security for ALL people.

#### 9. Degrowth will fail and environmental management is possible under the current system.

[Jeroen C.J.M. van den Bergh](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921800910004209), 3/15/2011. Institute for Environmental Science and Technology, and Department of Economics and Economic History, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Bellaterra (Cerdanyola), Spain. Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, and Institute for Environmental Studies, VU University Amsterdam, The Netherlands. “Environment versus growth — A criticism of “degrowth” and a plea for “a-growth”,” Ecological Economics 70.5.

Degrowth proponents generally seem to think that we cannot expect too much from public policies aimed at controlling environmental problems, for two reasons: because policies are ineffective, and because their political acceptance is very low ([Schneider et al., 2010](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921800910004209#bb0125)). The first is not convincing: to illustrate, we know from empirical research that people are sensitive to prices which means that price regulation of energy or CO2 definitely would alter consumption (and production) patterns and in turn reduce pollutive emissions (e.g.,[Espey et al., 1997](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921800910004209" \l "bb0050), [Espey, 1998](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921800910004209#bb0040) and [Espey and Espey, 2004](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921800910004209#bb0045)).

The second reason, relating to political acceptance, has two dimensions, namely a national and international one. Environmental agreements between countries at the international level are a prerequisite for the implementation of effective national policies, at least for global, transboundary environmental problems like climate change, acid rain and biodiversity loss. This is so because of two reasons: the necessity to create a level playing field (so as minimize economic costs or damage); and efficient regulation having to take into account the often uneven (internationally) spatial distribution of sensitive ecosystems (e.g., in the context of acid rain) and cost-effective options for abatement. Without a response to global climate change in the form of an effective international agreement we will be unable to stabilize GHG concentrations in the atmosphere at a reasonably safe level. Governments or citizens on their own are very limited. Unilateral extreme action will be either ineffective (if lax) or economically harmful (if stringent) as it deteriorates the international competitive position of a country.

Should we be pessimistic about the process of international environmental agreement making, notably in the area of climate policy? Yes and no. Yes, because climate change seems to outpace institutional change in terms of effective agreement formation. No, because we have made quite some progress in the last two decades on scientific research, information diffusion, citizen and political awareness, and creation of international networks (IPCC, UN frameworks). Some pessimists will point at the failure of the Kyoto Protocol in terms of both effectiveness and efficiency of reducing GHGs, but at the same time Kyoto can be judged as a large step for [hu]mankind and a stepping stone for a more effective subsequent agreement. Institutional changes like international agreements, certainly for such a tough problem like climate policy, take time and require a social and international learning process. Whether we like it or not, democratic support for climate policy needs to develop slowly, which requires information transfer from science to society, education, media involvement and a great deal of public and private debate about climate change. All in all, it is too early to say that agreements and policy do not work and that we need to turn to some degrowth strategy instead (whether focusing on GDP, consumption, work-time or radical degrowth). Anyway, the political acceptability of the latter is likely to be much lower than of environmental agreements and national policies. Worse, I fear that employing the term “degrowth” really comes down to preaching to the choir, rather than enlarging the group of citizens who are genuinely concerned about the environment and critical about pleas for unconditional economic growth (i.e. the growth paradigm).

One argument of degrowth supporters against the social–political acceptability of stringent environmental regulation is that both rich and poor individuals will oppose policies that are seen to threaten their income ([Schneider et al., 2010](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921800910004209#bb0125)). Apart from wondering whether this is entirely true, it raises the question whether a direct (GDP, consumption, work-time or radical) degrowth strategy could really count on more democratic support than well-formulated environmental policies? I doubt it, since a degrowth strategy will make the income losses for everyone only more visible and explicit. Drawing attention to income effects may not be a clever, effective strategy to obtain political support for one's ideas. Instead, convincing society about public policies and strategies on the basis of expected impacts on real welfare or happiness rather than on income would make more sense. Not only does real welfare represent a more adequate (social) evaluation criteria, but also it will convey a less pessimistic message. For example, even if a stringent climate policy may negatively affect (average) income growth this does not necessarily translate into a reduction of real welfare ([van den Bergh, 2010b](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921800910004209#bb0150)).