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### 1ac Solvency Card – A2 PICS

#### Only full removal of sanctions solves – the current policy is causing anti-americanism, terrorism, and risks a crisis – partial or conditioned removal is worse than the status quo.

Gorrell 05 Lieutenant Colonel, U.S. Army War College [Lieutenant Colonel Tim Gorrell, Cuba: The Next Unanticipated Anticipated Strategic Crisis?, Strategy Research Project, 18 March 2005, U.S. Army War College, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA433074]

RETAIN SANCTIONS AGAINST CUBA, BUT ENFORCE THEM IN VARYING DEGREES DEPENDING ON THE POLITICAL CLIMATE AND THE CUBAN REGIME’S CONDUCT IN REGARD TO AMERICAN INTERESTS

Throughout the past 15 years, the U.S. has experimented with a variable enforcement option. During the Clinton administration, restrictions were occasionally eased. For example, in March 1998, President Clinton announced: 1) the resumption of licensing for direct humanitarian charter flights to Cuba; 2) the resumption of cash remittances up to $300 per quarter for the support of close relatives in Cuba; 3) the development of licensing procedures to streamline and expedite licenses for the commercial sale of medicines and medical supplies and equipment; and 4) a decision to work on a bipartisan basis with Congress on the transfer of food to the Cuban people.33 In January 1999, President Clinton ordered additional measures to assist the Cuban people, which included further easement of cash remittances, expansion of direct passenger charter flights to Cuba, reestablishment of direct mail service, authorization for the commercial sale of food to independent entities in Cuba, and an expansion of people-to-people exchanges (i.e. scientist, students, athletes, etc.)34 This policy ended when the new administration failed to see any reciprocal progress from Castro. Fragmenting the policy process may do more harm than good. It does too little too late and causes hard feelings among Cubans and American businesses. The carrot-stick diplomatic approach will not make Castro yield. Such policy breeds inconsistency as it can vary from administration to administration, as it has between the Clinton and Bush administrations. The rules constantly change and thus have a ripple effect on American businesses and the quality of life of Americans, Cuban-Americans and native Cubans.

Cuban trade has already declined to a trickle since the Bush administration sought to further squeeze the Castro government. Prior to the Bush administration’s trade crack down, 2004 was emerging as a record year for U.S. imports to Cuba. By the end of December 2004 U.S. suppliers and shippers were projected to have earned some $450 million, a 20% increase over 2003 sales.35 Imposing restrictions, as the Bush administration did in June 2004, perplexed American businesses with unpredicted problems. These businesses make adjustments, as do Cuban- American citizens, then must abruptly alter their business strategies because of a Congressional vote or an Executive order. This political tug-of-war does not move the U.S. any closer to realizing its security objectives.

On the Cuban American front there is eroding support for this U.S. policy position. In the 2000 presidential election, President Bush won 81% of south Florida’s Cuban-American vote. A recent poll by the William C. Veleasquez Institute-Mirram Global indicates that his support today has fallen to 66%.36 This decline signals a negative response to policy that limits travel, restricts the amount of goods people can bring to their relatives, and places limitations on sending money to family in Cuba. Cuban-Americans believe that this only hurts their poor relatives in Cuba. According to Jose Basulto, head of Brothers to the Rescue, and Ramon Raul Sanchez, head of the anti-Castro Democracy Movement, the U.S. government is using the Cuban people to harass Castro.37 Applying policy in a give-and-take manner, accomplishes little to facilitate the fall of Castro. The Cuban people enjoy brief periods of limited benefits, only to have these benefits withdrawn should the President or members of Congress wish to take another jab at Castro. American civilian businesses are also negatively affected.

LIFT ALL SANCTIONS AND PURSUE NORMAL DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH CUBA Normalcy is the only policy that the U.S. has not attempted. The present policy misses the security implications, alienates allies and others worldwide, harms U.S. businesses, and is losing support domestically. First, the U.S. must reassess the threat posed by Cuba. There is, in fact, virtually no security threat. Further, policies that were applicable in the past, when there was a threat, should not be applied to the current environment. The U.S. Cuban policy is perplexing because it appears to conflict with the ends, ways and means that the National Security Strategy is applied in other regions of the world. The U.S. has normalized relations with Vietnam and Libya and has certainly opted for an open dialogue with Communist China. Likewise, there is abundant evidence that a new policy toward Cuba could very well achieve the ends that 43 years of embargo have failed to accomplish.

Secondly, Cuba currently trades and has diplomatic ties with much of the world. The goal of U.S. sanctions is to isolate the Cuban regime; however, they have only slowed, not deterred economic growth. On 4 November 2003 the United Nations voted, for the 12th straight year, 173 to 3 (with 4 abstentions) against the four-decade U.S. embargo against Cuba.38 Voting with the U.S. were Israel and the Marshall Islands. The U.S.’ staunchest allies, the 15 members of the European Union, along with Japan, Australia and New Zealand, all object to the “extra-territorial” effect of U.S. legislation that they feel violates their sovereignty. 39 There are two schools of thought regarding trade and democracy. The first is that economic growth will promote democracy. The other questions this notion and argues that democracy must come first.40 There is strong opinion, however, that in Cuba’s case economic engagement will bring about the desired results. Certainly many Cuban-Americans and perhaps some others in the world would not agree with this course of action. However, there is evidence that a significant number of people both within the U.S. and abroad favor a policy change. In 1992 a pastoral letter from Cuba’s Bishops stated that the US embargo “directly affects the people who suffer the consequences in hunger and illness. If what is intended by this approach is to destabilize the government by using hunger and want to pressure civic society to revolt, then the strategy is also cruel.“41

The third consideration is U.S. business. Under the current rules, U.S. businesses are permitted to sell agricultural produce to Cuba.42 Today 27 firms from 12 U.S. states are doing business with Cuba, making Cuba 22nd among U.S. agricultural markets.43 These business activities are greatly influenced by Cuban-Americans and members of Congress. The economic power of the U.S. can be our most powerful weapon. The possibilities of economic engagement offer a myriad of branches and sequels that could promote a rapport between the American people and the Cubans. The aggressive pursuit of these endeavors would go far in ensuring an orderly transition to a post-Castro Cuba. It is an erroneous assumption to believe that Castro’s demise will miraculously trigger reform and all the problems of the last 40 years will vanish. A visionary policy, albeit constrained within the parameters of the Castro regime, will go far in setting agreeable social-economic conditions in Cuba both now and in the future.

Finally, public opinion in the U.S. favors a new policy direction. A 1997 Miami Herald poll found that a majority of Cubans under the age of 45 supported “establishing a national dialogue with Cuba,” whereas for the most part their elders opposed such dialogue.44 Former President Jimmy Carter, writing in the Washington Post after his May 2002 visit to Cuba, reported that he found an unexpected degree of economic freedom. Carter went on to say that if Americans could have maximum contact with Cuban, then Cubans would clearly see the advantages of a truly democratic society and thus be encouraged to bring about orderly changes in their society. 45 Castro himself appears willing to consider greater reform. In 1998 he permitted Pope John Paul II to visit Cuba; Cubans are permitted to own property; he has opened trade; and in 2002 he broadcast former President Jimmy Carter’s address at the University of Havana.46 Additionally, he indicated that the Cuban government would return any of the Guantanamo detainees in the unlikely event that they would escape.47

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

U.S. policy makers need to confront the real Cuba of today in order to build a “free” Cuba of tomorrow that is capable of taking its place in the world community as a responsible, democratic nation. Given the history of the past 100 years, and particularly our Castro centric policy, the U.S. needs to make a bold change toward Cuba. The U.S. has pursued a hard-line approach toward the Castro regime for over 40 years. While this policy was easily justified during the Cold War era and, to a certain degree, during the 1990s, it fails to address the present U.S. national security concerns. The globalization trends of the 21st century are irreversible, Fidel Castro is in the twilight of his life, and a new generation of Cuban-Americans is supportive of new strategies that will ease the transition to a post-Castro Cuba while buttressing economic and social opportunities in the near term. Furthermore, there is a new dimension that U.S. policy strategists must take into account in deciding the course of U.S.- Cuba relations – the GWOT. World-wide asymmetrical threats to U.S. interests, coupled with the Iraqi occupation and the potential for any one of the present hot spots (i.e. Iran, North Korea, Taiwan, etc.) to ignite, should prompt strategic leaders to work harder to mitigate a potential Caribbean crises. The prudent action would then be to develop strategies that can defuse or neutralize these situations before they require the U.S. to divert resources from protecting its interests in the GWOT.

Therefore, the U.S. can best serve its security, the Cuban people, and the Western Hemisphere by abandoning the present draconian policy toward Cuba. The U.S. should implement a new policy designed to achieve its goals through lifting all sanctions and pursuing normalized diplomatic relations; encouraging people-to-people dialogue and trade. The policy should continue to pursue human rights, democracy, and free market ends. However, the ways to realize these objectives should be grounded in full economic engagement, an approach that has not been fully attempted. The present U.S. policy has failed miserably. What does the most powerful nation on earth have to lose by attempting a bold shift in its policy toward Cuba?

# Advantages

## Human Rights

### Sanctions Fail

#### Sanction inherently fail

Spadoni 2010 [Paolo Spadoni 2010 assistant professor in the Department of Political Science at Augusta State Failed sanctions why the US sanctions against cuba could never work page 4-5]

Overall, there is substantial evidence about the declining effectiveness¶ of unilateral economic sanctions as a tool of statecraft and, more generally,¶ about the limited utility of sanctions even when they are imposed¶ multilaterally. The most cited and comprehensive database on the subject¶ is that compiled by Hufbauer, Schott, Elliott, and Oegg (2008), who found¶ sanctions to be at least partially successful in 34 percent of the 204 cases¶ initiated between 1914 and 2000. More specifically, episodes involving¶ modest objectives such as improvements in human rights and religious¶ freedom, among others, succeeded in 51 percent of the cases. At the same¶ time, efforts to destabilize a target government, impair a foreign adversary's¶ military potential, and change a country's policies in a major way¶ reached their objectives in about 30 percent of the cases (disruptions of¶ military adventures only a meager 21 percent of the time), leading Hufbauer¶ et al. (2008, 159) to conclude that "sanctions are of limited utility¶ in achieving foreign policy goals that depend on compelling the target¶ country to take actions it stoutly resists:' It should be emphasized that a¶ previous study by Hufbauer, Schott, and Elliott released at the end of the¶ cold war (another one was published in 1985) had shown similar results,¶ with sanctions being successful in about one-third of the l15 cases initiated¶ between 1914 and 1990 (Hufbauer et al. 1990, 93). The success rate¶ they found and the standards utilized to arrive at such figure have been¶ disputed both as being too lenient (Pape 1997, 1998), and too strict (Van¶ Bergeijk 1997; Baldwin 1985).

## Relations / Soft Power

### Relations Bad Now

#### Cuba-U.S. relations bad – opposing U.S. views on Snowden

Reuters 7/3/13 (“Cuba Denounces US Pressure Over Snowden's Fate”, Reuters, July 3 2013, <http://www.cnbc.com/id/100863116>)//CB

Cuba denounced U.S. efforts to pressure Latin American countries not to provide refuge to fugitive U.S. spy agency contractor Edward Snowden and urged countries to stand up to Washington's bullying.

"Cuba calls on the international community to mobilize against these violations of international law and human rights," said a foreign ministry statement that was issued late Tuesday and carried by state media Wednesday.

The communique termed "inadmissible, unfounded and arbitrary" the decision by a number of European countries to deny flyover rights on Tuesday to a Bolivian plane carrying President Evo Morales and thought to possibly have Snowden aboard.

The plane had departed from Moscow, where Snowden is holed up, and eventually landed in Vienna, where it was searched by Austrian authorities looking for the man who last month revealed details of U.S. surveillance programs.

The statement said the incident, which Bolivia said amounted to a kidnapping of its president orchestrated by Washington, "offended all Latin America and the Caribbean."

### Embargo Key

#### The Embargo on Cuba kills US credibility – symbol of US dominance

Safran 12 (Brian, Master of Science in Global Affairs at NYU, Private Sector: International Business, Economics, and Development, "End the Cuban Embargo," 08/14/12, <http://brian-safran-4.quora.com/End-the-Cuban-Embargo-Brian-Safran>)

The continuance of the embargo has incited widespread international condemnation of the Untied States. The United Nations General Assembly has consistently denounced the imposition of the embargo almost unanimously on the basis of its illegitimacy and violation of internationally accepted humanitarian standards. (Herrera, 2003, 50) The United States has also recently had to relinquish its seats on the human rights commissions both in the United Nations and in the Organization of American States, which many analysts believe to be a form of retribution aimed at the United States in response to its continuation of the Cuban embargo in the midst of its unfathomable and deplorable effects on the Cuban populace. (Weinmann, 2004, 30) Many leaders in the international community have expressed their distain for the U.S. embargo through international organizations based on the fact that the United States attempts to impose the sanctions it places on Cuba via “extraterritoriality,” or against the international community, thus clearly violating internationally-accepted standards of national sovereignty and international law (Herrera, 2003, 51). Global public opinion perceives the United States as engaging in strong economic and political tactics such as the Cuban embargo in an effort to further its own world domination. This sentiment serves to divert attention from the evils of Cuban communism, and instead focus international pressure on the United States; serving to render the existing embargo less effective. Some say that the United States would stand to lose its credibility if it were to put an end to the embargo without its having accomplished its goals in totality. However, the anti-U.S. sentiment on a global scale derived from its continuation is of much greater detriment to U.S. interests than the short-term loss in credibility it may experience by reorganizing its policy. Although in a prior historical era the Cuban embargo and its intended goals might have been seen by the international community as justifiable, the U.S. intervention in Cuba has now come to symbolize the domineering and intolerant methodology that it fosters in many of its international engagements.¶ In addition, U.S. public opinion appears to be shifting in favor of eliminating the embargo. By virtue of its geography, influence in national elections, near even split in terms of ideological composition, and preponderance of Cuban-Americans living within its borders, U.S.-Cuban policy is often procured by considering the views of the now anti-embargo Floridian constituency (Schechner, 7, 1994). Traditionally, Cuban-Americans living in Florida have tended to support the embargo, seeing it as a way to force democracy upon Cuba so as to make the Cuban government more responsive to the demands of the Cuban people, and by extension, their own interests abroad. (Schechner, 1994, 7) In recent years however, many have begun to view the embargo as a failure of foreign policy. In addition, the U.S. government has placed numerous restrictions upon them, prohibiting them from visiting their families in Cuba more than once every three years, and decreasing the amount of remittance that they are entitled to provide for their Cuban relatives. (Lovato, 2004, 23) Based in part upon changing public opinion, the U.S. Congress has enacted numerous measures to decrease the extent of the Cuban embargo, including the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000, which allowed for limited sales of U.S. agricultural products and medical supplies. (Griswold, 2005, 2) In 2003, both the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate passed measures designed to prevent the U.S. treasury from providing the funding necessary to enforce the ban on Cuban travel. (Weinmann, 2004, 28) Even within the Bush administration, many senior officials remain highly divided on how to best confront Cuban politics. (Weinmann, 2004, 25) Thus, many U.S. citizens and politicians believe the Cuban embargo to be unfounded and unnecessary in the contemporary world.

#### Other countries unhappy with U.S. foreign policy – contradictory claims

Karon 1 (Tony, “U.N. Defeat Was a Message from Washington's Allies”, Time World, May 4 2001, <http://www.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,108730,00.html>)//CB

The consensus among U.N. diplomats is that the U.S. appeared to have taken its reelection for granted, and failed to lobby for support to secure one of the three seats on the commission allocated to Western nations (it was ultimately shut out by France, Sweden and Austria). But many traditional U.S. supporters clearly withdrew their votes in order to signal their displeasure at the increasingly go-it-alone stance of the U.S. Their grievances are not confined to Washington's delinquent habits when it comes to paying its dues to the international body — some $580 million in arrears is still tied up in Congress despite an agreement late last year to facilitate payment. The Europeans have been increasingly chagrined by Washington's tendency to ignore the international consensus on issues ranging from the use of land mines to the Kyoto climate change treaty.

They're also critical of what they see as Washington's tendency to politicize the issue of human rights, using annual resolutions at the commission to denounce China or Cuba when that conforms to U.S. foreign policy objectives but for the same reason voting alone in defense of Israel when that country is in the dock over its conduct.

The embargo wastes US influence around the globe

Iglesias 2012(Commander Carlos Iglesias United States Navy, “United States Security Policy Implications of a Post-Fidel Cuba,” 10-3-12, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA560408)

Finally, U.S. international legitimacy and influence have a great deal to gain from ¶ a more inclusive and less unilateral approach. U.S. retort to U.N. anti-embargo ¶ resolutions that bilateral relations are exempt from General Assembly scrutiny have had ¶ longstanding blowback. This rhetoric has historically undercut American’s legitimacy ¶ and wasted political capital on this central world stage. Outside of New York City and ¶ across the globe, decades-long sanctions against the island have netted few if any ¶ national objectives, all the while depleting substantial national soft power. The costbenefit analysis to U.S. national foreign policy will remain exceedingly unfavorable, if not ¶ outright counter-productive.

### Embargo = Anti-Americanism

#### The embargo has backfired – It deflects blame away from the regime and unites Cubans against the US

Seaman 2010 (David Seaman, Research Assistant and Lecturer at the University of Osnabrück – Department of social sciences, “U.S. Democracy Promotion- The Case of Cuba” - 2010)

By far, the greatest source of legitimacy for the Cuban Government is¶ derived from the embargo and hard-line U.S. policy itself (Hoffmann/¶ Whitehead 2006; Sweig 2007; Hawkins 2001). The U.S. policy offers a¶ source of legitimacy to the Cuban regime in two ways. Firstly, the embargo¶ serves to partly deflect system blame arising from the poor economic¶ conditions the Cuban regime helps to create. It is generally understood that¶ the embargo is not solely responsible for the economic difficulties in Cuba,¶ but rather many point to the unsound economic policies of the Cuban¶ Government itself as being partly responsible (Sweig 2007; Griswold 2002;¶ Bond 2003) . The existence of the embargo, however, enables the Cuban¶ regime to continuously blame the U.S. as the cause of Cuba's economic¶ problems. Secondly, Washington's aggressive policy creates a source of¶ legitimacy for the Cuban Government by allowing it to rally the population¶ against an outside enemy (Hawkins 2001, 448). Cuban revolutionary¶ ideology is grounded in the historical factor of U.S. hegemony over prerevolutionary¶ Cuba: from depriving Cubans of their independence in 1898,¶ meddling in the country's political affairs under the Platt Amendment and¶ supporting Batista's repressive dictatorship, to punishing Cubans for the last¶ half-century for supporting the revolution. The U.S. historical factor¶ underscores the revolution's ideological emphasis on the role of Cuban¶ unity in defending the island from this outside threat (Sweig 2007 , 44) .¶ Hoffmann and Whitehead (2006, 8) suggest that the Cuban regime "has¶ made resistance to foreign domination its central claim to . . . legitimacy ."¶ As long as Washington continues to play the role of the menacing enemy¶ seeking to destroy the revolution, the Cuban Government is not subject to¶ economic performance legitimacy alone, but is able to enjoy this second¶ source of performance legitimacy it would not otherwise have - fending off¶ and defying the imperialist aggressor. This phenomenon is particularly highlighted¶ by the festive celebrations in Cuba that accompany the U.N. General¶ Assembly's annual condemnation of the U.S. embargo. Every year Cubans¶ across the island tune in to the live televised U.N. debate and follow the¶ voting (CBS News 2004). As the Cuban Government has noted, Cuban's are¶ "accustomed to celebrating a crushing blow to the US blockade in the¶ United Nations for 14 years" now (Cuba versus Blockade 2006).

#### The embargo hurts US- Latin cooperation – Regime instability

Morley & McGillion 05 associate professor of politics and international relations at Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia & senior lecturer in journalism, Charles Sturt University, Bathurst, Australia. [Morris Morley & Chris McGillion, Cuba, the United States, and the Post-Cold War World: The International Dimensions of the Washington-Havana Relationship, pg 222-223]

In sum, Latin America has concluded that Cuba should be dealt with like any other country. As a result, no U.S. president could ever again hope to forge the consensus in favor of Cuba's isolation from the rest of the hemisphere that Washington managed to achieve in the 1960s and, to a lesser extent, in the 1970s. In May 2003, Brazilian president Luiz Inacio Lula da Silva underscored this reality when he announced that Fidel Castro would be invited, for the first time, to attend the next meeting of the Rio Group of nations in 2004.197 Castro's triumphant visit to Argentina that month also showed he was still a key factor in Latin American domestic politics.198

Given Washington's promotion of a more competitive regional economic environment and a resurgence of political nationalism and populism, the United States could not blame anyone but itself if its Cold War approach toward Cuba was one the rest of Latin America rejected. Indeed, by making an exception of Cuba and frustrating its complete return to the inter-American family of nations, the White House risks inadvertently making the Caribbean island once again a rallying symbol for the popular left in Latin America and those governments intent on pursuing foreign and domestic policies at variance with imperial state interests.

### Economics key to Relations

#### U.S. – Latin American economic ties key to relations

ISN 5/31/13 (“The U.S. Must Re-evaluate its Foreign Policy in Latin America”, International Relations and Security Network, May 31 2013, <http://www.isn.ethz.ch/Digital-Library/Articles/Detail/?lng=en&id=164370>)//CB

Relations between the United States and Latin America have experienced cyclical ups and downs. Geographically, the United States and Latin America are linked and have a natural shared market, so there will always be a relationship of one sort or another. The United States will continue to seek to exert its influence over the region, whether through future plans for the placement of military bases or the promotion of bilateral trade agreements. Leftist governments will have to address challenges such as those caused by social divisions and economic inequality. They will likely continue to focus on implementing their leftist discourse, particularly in the wake of Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez’s death. However, it is important to consider that neoliberal philosophies are also still pervasive in many countries of Latin America. This is an advantage for the United States, giving it an opportunity to push for further privatization, but Latin American leftist movements should evaluate themselves and take actions to if they are to avoid a return of neoliberal policies of the 1990s. All that said, how can the United States improve its foreign policy towards Latin America? There are many problems in the region that should be faced together. Accepting this reality is the beginning to improving relations. Transnational organized crime, drug trafficking, and immigration problems are worth making joint efforts to resolve. The U.S. should encourage the strengthening of political and economic ties in the Americas as well as promoting compliance of international commitments as a sign of willingness to improve relations. There are many hemispheric conventions that provide the legal framework to begin to work together against negative outcomes. An example is the Declaration on Security in the Americas signed by the countries of the hemisphere in 2003. This document describes the new concept of multidimensional security, and incorporates as new threats issues such as terrorism, drug trafficking and organized crime, environmental degradation, natural resource and food scarcity, and uncontrolled population growth and migration.

### Mean to Cuba hurts Cred

#### Refusal to change Cuban policy Hurts US International Standing

Morley & McGillion 05 associate professor of politics and international relations at Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia & senior lecturer in journalism, Charles Sturt University, Bathurst, Australia. [Morris Morley & Chris McGillion, Cuba, the United States, and the Post-Cold War World: The International Dimensions of the Washington-Havana Relationship, pg 10]

The U.S. refusal to consider serious negotiations with Cuba in the absence of regime change has been the hallmark of post-Cold War American policy worldwide. Yet Cuba has not only survived the collapse of the Soviet Union and a resurgent American imperialism, but has also repositioned itself internationally, normalizing ties with key U.S. allies in Europe, Latin America, and Asia and beginning the process of assuming its place in regional and international forums from which it had long been ostracized or excluded.

Today, Washington's uncompromising hostility toward Cuba almost totally isolates it from the rest of the international community, contradicts its professed commitment to free trade principles, undermines international laws, weakens its claim to global leadership, and creates problems for America's overseas investors and traders. The vast majority of countries fail to comprehend the logic of a policy approach still based on the proposition that of all former Cold War socialist bloc nations, only Cuba is immune from engagement as a step toward normalizing bilateral relations. This approach is seen as anachronistic, irrational, and presumptuous. America's allies place a much higher value on encouraging economic ties and political dialogue, on multilateralism and consensus building. This is the approach that they calculate will more likely produce desired changes in Cuba's political economy and limit friction between Havana and other nations over the issue of differing internal policies. The international dimensions of Washington's Cuba policy since the end of the Cold War and across a range of issues, more starkly than any other foreign policy issue, reveal the degree to which U.S. policymakers have exhibited a striking lack of realism about America's capacity to impose its political and economic will in a global environment unsympathetic to its imperial ambitions.

### Embargo Causes Unrest

#### Embargo ruins Cuba – sets the stage for multiple escalation points

Ratliff & Fontaine 2k (Ratliff, William - research fellow at Stanford University, PhD (Chinese/Latin American histories) from U of Washington; Roger Fontaine. Former Director of Latin American Affairs, National Security Council.) "A Strategic Flip-Flop in the Caribbean." Lift the Embargo on Cuba (2000). p13-15

The present study supports a reversal in U.S. policy because the embargo now

1. Polarizes Cubans in Cuba and abroad; thus to the extent that the pressure is signiﬁcant it increases the prospects for an eventual civil war rather than the “peaceful transition” U.S. leaders say they seek, and this in turn raises the prospects of a costly U.S. military intervention in Cuba to prevent Castro from crushing the reformers.33

2. Sets the stage for innumerable small encounters that could escalate. For example, what if the bomber on 1 January 2000 had dropped explosives rather than leaﬂets, or if Castro had shot him down as he did two Cessnas that allegedly overﬂew Cuban territorial waters in 1996? As it was, Castro sent up two MiGs and the United States launched an F-16. The ﬂight was not illegal under U.S. law, and since many in Miami hailed it as a heroic act, the same thing could easily happen again. Also, Cuban American hawks closed down parts of Miami and stoked international tensions, calling the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) decision in early January 2000 to send Elia´n Gonza´lez back to his father in Cuba a sellout to Castro. The abandon with which many advocates of family values cast aside the rights of the boy’s father shows how politicized this matter has become.

3. Encourages determined pressure groups to lobby a constantly compromising U.S. executive and Congress in such a way as to threaten the essential interaction of several branches of the government in the analysis and defense of U.S. interests.

4. Antagonizes our allies around the world, complicating cooperation on other important issues.

5. Sets the stage for new generations of hostility between Cubans and Americans because of the imperialistic demands of the Torricelli Act and especially the Helms-Burton Law.

6. Serves more than it than impedes Castro’s own interests by providing a scapegoat for his hopeless economic policies and continuing domestic repression, making him the target of a U.S. vendetta that is condemned by the rest of the world and thus enables him to maintain at least a vestige of his all-important self-portrayal as a deﬁant warrior against “U.S. imperialism.”

7. Imposes at least some degree of additional hardship on the Cuban people with no evidence that these hardships will improve their living conditions now or in the foreseeable future. Washington claims its policy is on behalf of the Cuban people, though there is no signiﬁcant evidence that the Cuban people support the embargo and many indications that they do not. Even the majority of activists reportedly want it lifted.34

8. Makes critically important cooperation between and among Cubans in Cuba and abroad in the eventual post-Castro period more difﬁcult to achieve.

9. Has at least a better chance of opening up society and the economy than current policy, which does nothing of the sort.

10. Is so cluttered with contradictions and inconsistencies it has become a dishonest, embarrassing, and pernicious policy unworthy of the United States. A few embargo supporters try to defuse criticism by maintaining that sanctions are valuable because they can “weaken a target country” even if they don’t “bring surrender on key issues.” According to an analyst featured in a CANF newsletter, the critics of the embargo have “set the bar too high.”35 But that bar—the proclaimed goals of the embargo—is the one set by the U.S. government and most supporters of the sanctions, not by the critics who simply measure the policy against its stated objectives.

#### Embargo causes civil war, pulls in US

Ratliff & Fontaine 2k (Ratliff, William - research fellow at Stanford University, PhD in Chinese/Latin American histories from U of Washington; Roger Fontaine - Former Director of Latin American Affairs, National Security Council.) "A Strategic Flip-Flop in the Caribbean." Lift the Embargo on Cuba (2000).p38-39

Inciting an Insurrection

The strategy of U.S. policy is to make life evermore difﬁcult in Cuba so that Castro will make reforms or the Cuban people will rise up and throw him out. Many acknowledge that the embargo doesn’t accomplish either of these objectives, but what would happen if it did spark significant protests? Would that truly be desirable? According to a former Interior Ministry ofﬁcial, the protests would be countered by “violent repression by the state apparatus. The situation could degenerate into a massacre and begin a devastating civil war.”78 A poll conducted in 1997 by Florida International University and the Miami Herald showed some 66 percent of Cuban Americans favoring U.S. military action to overthrow Castro and 71 percent supporting military action against Castro by Cubans in exile.79 But, as noted above, a recent Gallop poll showed that only 42 percent of Americans in general support even the embargo, much less a military operation. Our conclusion in talking with many Americans over the past decade is that few have any idea what the issues are and that support would plummet if people knew the facts or thought substantial numbers of Americans might be sent to die in or for Cuba. Nor would the U.S. military want to become involved in a conﬂict in a country that poses no strategic threat to the United States according to its own and other U.S. intelligence analyses. But, even if U.S. domestic opinion opposed intervention, signiﬁcant losses by antiCastro forces during a general uprising or civil war—the reaction we have been encouraging—would result in enormous pressure on Washington to send military support to preserve those who remain and ﬁnally end Castro’s rule. Support for Reformers Some embargo supporters believe that pressures by the United States strengthen reformers within Cuba. Two eminent embargo supporters are concerned that ending the embargo might mean that reformers would be swallowed up by hard-liners, though one also notes that even if the sanction supporters carry out reforms there is nothing to stop Castro from reversing reforms at will even as the sanctions continue.80 In fact Castro sometimes reverses “reforms,” such as they are, or arrests and sentences Cubans, seemingly in direct response to tougher—or milder—U.S. actions. Hufbauer is probably more nearly correct when he concludes that “when sanctions are applied broadside—as against Haiti, Cuba and Iraq—the hardest hit are the most vulnerable. . . . Left unharmed, and often strengthened, are the real targets: the political, military and economic elites.”81 In 1999 Elizabeth Gibbons, head of the UNICEF ofﬁce in Haiti between 1992 and 1996, found a similar consequence of the multilateral embargo on that smaller island.

### Cuban Instability Bad

#### Cuba could be the next major war

Gorrell 05 Lieutenant Colonel, U.S. Army War College [Lieutenant Colonel Tim Gorrell, Cuba: The Next Unanticipated Anticipated Strategic Crisis?, Strategy Research Project, 18 March 2005, U.S. Army War College, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA433074]

The end of the Cold War in 1989 closed the door on one of the most perilous times in the history of mankind. The euphoria felt by the free world as the Soviet Union and the United States dismantled their nuclear arsenals promoted a false sense of security that the world would somehow be safer. This optimism was reinforced by the establishment of emerging democracies in countries throughout the former Warsaw Pact and much of the rest of the Soviet sphere of influence. Unfortunately, during the Cold War and in the time since, each U.S. administration has been surprised by a major unanticipated strategic crisis and Cuba could very well trigger the next unanticipated crisis. Fidel Castro is 78 years old, the current life expectancy of a Cuban male. When Castro dies, anarchy could very well engulf Cuba. A power struggle in Cuba could have significant effects on the Central and South America regions, requiring the U.S. to divert resources from the Global War on Terrorism (GWOT) to stabilize the region. In the meantime the Cuban infrastructure and economy may implode. The U.S. does not have an appropriate policy approach to address such an obvious crisis. When the end of Castro’s rule comes, the U.S. will likely take a “wait and see what happens” approach-and then respond. What is needed is a proactive policy that would promote a favorable post-Castro transition, thereby averting a Cuban and regional crisis. Such a policy is consistent with the preemptive approach of the National Security Strategy. The U.S., the region, and the rest of the world would benefit from such a forward-looking policy.

#### Unstable Cuba risks terrorism and US invasion – destroys democracies throughout the region.

Gorrell 05 Lieutenant Colonel, U.S. Army War College [Lieutenant Colonel Tim Gorrell, Cuba: The Next Unanticipated Anticipated Strategic Crisis?, Strategy Research Project, 18 March 2005, U.S. Army War College, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA433074]

In the midst of an unstable Cuba, the opportunity for radical fundamentalist groups to operate in the region increases. If these groups can export terrorist activity from Cuba to the U.S. or throughout the hemisphere then the war against this extremism gets more complicated. Such activity could increase direct attacks and disrupt the economies, threatening the stability of the fragile democracies that are budding throughout the region. In light of a failed state in the region, the U.S. may be forced to deploy military forces to Cuba, creating the conditions for another insurgency. The ramifications of this action could very well fuel greater anti-American sentiment throughout the Americas. A proactive policy now can mitigate these potential future problems.

### LA turning to Iran

#### Latin America turning to Iran for cooperation – against U.S. influence

FNA 7/1/13 - Fars News Agency (FNA) is Iran's leading independent news agency (Iran, Bolivia Discuss Ways to Develop Bilateral Ties”, FARS News Agency, July 1 2013, <http://english.farsnews.com/newstext.aspx?nn=13920410001250>)//CB

The meeting took place on the sidelines of the 2nd summit of the Gas Exporting Countries forum (GECF) which will begin later today in the Russian capital of Moscow.

Algeria, Bolivia, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Iran, Libya, Nigeria, Qatar, Russia, Trinidad and Tobago and Venezuela are the eleven members of the GECF.

The two presidents discussed the latest world developments and issues of mutual importance and reviewed bilateral relations.

Iran has been seeking to boost its ties with Latin American countries in recent years to the concern of the United States.

Since taking office in 2005, President Ahmadinejad has expanded Iran's cooperation with many Latin American states, including Venezuela, Bolivia, Cuba, Ecuador, Nicaragua and Brazil.

The strong and rapidly growing ties between Iran and Latin America have raised eyebrows in the US and its western allies since Tehran and Latin nations have forged an alliance against the imperialist and colonialist powers and are striving hard to reinvigorate their relations with the other independent countries which pursue a line of policy independent from the US.

### LA key to US heg

#### Latin America is key to United States leadership and solving domestic and foreign problems

Andrés Cala master's in journalism and Michael J. Economides Professor of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering @ Cullen College of Engineering 2012; Americas blind spot Chavez, oil, and US security pages 3-4

Perception is powerful when it comes to policy-making though.¶ Naturally, most US policymakers are fully aware of the reality in Latin¶ American countries, but US citizens are not. This is critical because policy toward the region is driven by domestic issues, not foreign interests. So¶ while the White House and Congress are sufficiently proficient on Latin¶ American issues, reality on the ground is mostly irrelevant. Washington¶ simply is not paying attention.¶ The United States missed the memo on Latin America's evolution into¶ a vital region in global affairs. Policies are still stuck addressing, at best,¶ Hollywood-exacerbated stereotypes, but in reality are mostly driven by¶ outdated and counterproductive Cold War misconception pressed by¶ powerful interest groups.¶ It's understandable that the United States didn't consider Latin¶ America a priority last century. But policymakers-perhaps preoccupied¶ with the Middle East and the worst economic crisis in decades-are¶ increasingly undermining America's security by ignoring significant¶ strategic shifts in Latin America.¶ This is about being able to protect global American interests, about¶ national security, about global terrorism, and above all about the¶ country's economic growth that is vital to address Middle East instability,¶ to contain a resurging Russia, and to preempt a soaring China that is not¶ hesitating to fill the vacuum left by the United States.¶ To be sure, this is about America's future as a world power. And it all¶ starts at home.

## Democracy

### Cuba Key

#### Cuba democracy leads to global democratization

AffairsToday 6/4/13 (Global Student Business Journal, “The Cuban Spring?”, <http://affairstoday.co.uk/the-cuban-spring/>) (JN)

Cuba is one of a handful of countries that still call themselves a communist country. Nonetheless, a black-market was vibrant for years and now the government allows some kind of farmers’ market. In a move that slightly resembles the new economic policy tested by Lenin in the Soviet Union, Cuba is turning towards the advantages of markets. After Fidel had to ‘resign’, the communists lost power every day. But what does the recent development stand for? Is it the undeniable failure of any suppression of a market, is it the result of a new leadership, or a spill-over of global democratization

### Lifting Good

#### The plan solves democracy in Cuba –lifting the embargo spreads democracy through economics & interactions

Seaman 2010 (David Seaman, Research Assistant and Lecturer at the University of Osnabrück – Department of social sciences, “U.S. Democracy Promotion- The Case of Cuba” - 2010)

The failure of the U.S. policy to bring about the collapse of the Cuban¶ Government and its negative counterproductive consequences on promoting¶ democracy in Cuba is clear. Cuban democracy activist Miriam Leiva puts it¶ bluntly: "If it [U.S. Government] wants to help the Cuban people, it should¶ lift the embargo and allow trade, tourism , and academic exchanges, and¶ Cubans should be allowed to travel without restriction to the United States¶ and send money to their families [in Cuba]" (cited in House of Representatives¶ 2007a, H6835). Since the mid-1990s, numerous legislation has been¶ introduced in the U.S. Congress seeking to overturn Washington's failed¶ embargo policy and replace it with a policy better inclined to promote¶ democratic change in Cuba. In 2007, for example, House Representatives¶ Rangel and Lee introduced the "Free Trade With Cuba Act." The proposed¶ bill recognized both the "counterproductive" nature of the· embargo and the¶ hypocrisy of the U.S. Government in "using economic, cultural, academic,¶ and scientific engagement to support its policy of promoting democratic and¶ human rights reforms" in states such as China and Vietnam, while pursuing¶ a strategy of isolation and aggression against Cuba (Ibid., 2007b). The act¶ would repeal both the CDA and Libertad acts and require the U.S. president¶ to conduct negotiations with the Cuban Government on property claims and¶ respect for human rights. Like all other congressional initiatives to reform¶ U.S. policy toward Cuba, however, the legislation was referred to several¶ congressional subcommittees where it died.

### Embargo Hurts

#### Current policy undermines US credibility and empowers the regime

Huddleston 2009(Vicki huddleston, Visiting Fellow The Brookings institution, Carlos pascual, Vice president and Director of Foreign policy The Brookings institution, “CUBA:A New policy of Critical and Constructive Engagement, “ April 2009

http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/reports/2009/4/cuba/0413\_cuba.pdf)

This paper proposes a new goal for U.S. policy toward Cuba: to support the emergence of a Cuban state where the Cuban people determine the political and economic future of their country through democratic means. A great lesson of democracy is that it cannot be imposed; it must come from within; the type of government at the helm of the island’s future will depend on Cubans. Our policy should therefore encompass the political, economic, and diplomatic tools to enable the Cuban people to engage in and direct the politics of their country. This policy will advance the interests of the United States in seeking stable relationships based on common hemispheric values that promote the well-being of each individual and the growth of civil society. To engage the Cuban government and Cuban people effectively, the United States will need to engage with other governments, the private sector, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs). in so doing, U.S. policy toward Cuba would reflect the hemisphere’s and our own desire to encourage the Cuban government to adopt international standards of democracy, human rights, and transparency. Engagement does not mean approval of the Cuban government’s policies, nor should it indicate a wish to control internal developments in Cuba; legitimate changes in Cuba will only come from the actions of Cubans. If the United States is to play a positive role in Cuba’s future, it must not indulge in hostile rhetoric nor obstruct a dialogue on issues that would advance democracy, justice, and human rights as well as our broader national interests. perversely, the policy of seeking to isolate Cuba, rather than achieving its objective, has contributed to undermining the well-being of the Cuban people and to eroding U.S. influence in Cuba and latin America. it has reinforced the Cuban government’s power over its citizens by increasing their dependence on it for every aspect of their livelihood. By slowing the flow of ideas and information, we have unwittingly helped Cuban state security delay Cuba’s political and economic evolution toward a more open and representative government. And, by too tightly embracing Cuba’s brave dissidents, we have provided the Cuban authorities with an excuse to denounce their legitimate efforts to build a more open society.

#### Stops Democracy – Embargo policy fails, legitimizes regime, and scares Cubans away from Democracy

Seaman 2010 (David Seaman, Research Assistant and Lecturer at the University of Osnabrück – Department of social sciences, “U.S. Democracy Promotion- The Case of Cuba” - 2010)

The above analysis of the U.S. top-down approach to democracy promotion¶ in Cuba highlights several factors at work within the economic, social, and¶ political levels in Cuba, which help explain the embargo's ineptness in¶ achieving its stated goal. As a consequence of these factors, the top-down¶ strategy serves more to counteract, rather than promote, moves toward¶ democratization in Cuba.

Firstly, while the embargo does hurt Cuba economically, significantly¶ hindering the degree of economic development the Cuban state would¶ clearly like to achieve , it has failed to create the economic misery that¶ would incite massive revolt against the regime as the U.S has long hoped¶ for. This is due to several reasons. In the absence of international sanctions¶ the Cuban Government has proven itself capable of adapting to changing¶ economic situations and negotiating new trade partners to fill the void¶ created by the collapse of the Soviet Union. The U.S. law allowing for the¶ export of agriculture products to Cuba has itself further weakened the¶ United States' unilateral measures aimed at strangling the Cuban economy.¶ Furthermore, the U.S. Cuba immigration policy serves to deflate both economic¶ and political pressures that weigh on the Cuban Government by¶ allowing Cubans an escape from the poor economic situation the embargo¶ helps create.

Secondly, the restrictions on U.S. tourist travel, educational exchanges,¶ and religious work serve to keep the island further isolated from alternative,¶ international influences and ideas. Moreover, this policy also helps bolster¶ the stability of the Cuban Government by reinforcing the regime's strategy¶ of regulating Cubans' access to information. It should also be noted - and¶ this ties in with the next factor - that even if the U.S. were to move towards¶ a policy of allowing full engagement and exchange between peoples, its¶ success may very well be hampered by those structures existing within the¶ top-down approach that encourage reactionary defense, rather than positive¶ behavioral change on the side of Cubans.

Therefore, thirdly, the adamant push to export a U.S. defined and U.S .¶ guided democratic transition in Cuba serves more to spread negative anxiety¶ and doubt among Cubans concerning a future democratization than to¶ encourage positive alternatives to the revolution and provide incentives for¶ democratic political change. Consequently, this aspect of the U.S. policy has¶ the short-term effect of internally toughening and stabilizing the regime¶ (Hoffmann 2001b, 13). More than just falling short of promoting democratic¶ prospects among political leaders and ordinary Cubans, the U.S. policy¶ serves to empower the Cuban Government. The regime in Havana merely¶ has to point to the harsh policies of Washington to legitimize its rule and¶ promote a nationalist environment against the hostile U.S. enemy. This¶ factor enables the Cuban Government to deflect system blame arising from¶ poor economic performance, and provides it with an extra source of¶ performance legitimacy derived from fending off imperial aggression.

### Sanctions Cause Bad Democracies

#### Sanctions cause bad democracies – They breed defiance and weak nations

Seaman 2010 (David Seaman, Research Assistant and Lecturer at the University of Osnabrück – Department of social sciences, “U.S. Democracy Promotion- The Case of Cuba” - 2010)

At first glance, the logic of the U.S. policy of promoting economic¶ destruction, premised on the belief that it will hasten the collapse of the¶ Cuban regime, may not seem too implausible. Denying Cuba the resources¶ it needs for economic development should lead to sustained economic¶ hardships, thereby increasing popular socioeconomic dissatisfaction among¶ Cubans. While also denying to the Cuban Government financial resources¶ and hard currency, the regime should no longer be in a position to finance¶ the strengthening of its coercion-apparatus in order to repress political dissent,¶ which may eventually force a top-down opening for political change,¶ or even outright transition - albeit even 50 years later. However, there are¶ several drawbacks to this approach as a democracy promotion strategy.

Firstly, undermining economic development as a way of promoting¶ democracy will more than likely have negative economic consequences on¶ any future democratic government that may emerge. As Burnell (2004, 104)¶ points out: "Where an economic wasteland is created so as to bring down a¶ regime, that is a very inauspicious foundation on which to try to build a new¶ democracy." The available evidence analyzing the relationship between economic¶ development and democracy suggests that poor democracies stand¶ more chance of dying than wealthier democracies. A group of scholars¶ using data analysis from a study of 135 countries between the years 1950¶ and 1990 found that, "when poor countries stagnate, whatever democracies¶ happen to spring up tend to die quickly. Poverty breeds poverty and¶ dictatorship" (Przeworski et al. 1997, 305). Almost fifty years ago Seymour¶ Lipset (1959 , 75) proposed that "the more well-to-do a nation , the greater¶ the chances that it will sustain democracy." Since Lipset's seminal article,¶ several studies testing large sets of data have found evidence supporting his¶ premise that a positive relationship between economic prosperity and¶ democracy exists (see Londregan/Poole 1990; Przeworski/Limongi 1997;¶ Biox/Stokes 2003). Thus, while economic failure may indeed undermine the¶ survival of an authoritarian regime and bring about its collapse, the economic¶ success of an authoritarian regime may be more likely to create an¶ encouraging foundation for the survival of an incoming democratic regime¶ (Huntington 1991, 35).

Secondly, It is not so much a country's level of wealth alone that is¶ thought to sustain democracy , but rather the various socioeconomic byproducts¶ of industrialization and successful economic development such as¶ urbanization , increased economic independence and security, rising education¶ levels, and the development of a well-educated, socially organized¶ middle-class. All these factors are thought to modernize the social sphere¶ and facilitate the development and spread of democratic beliefs, norms and¶ values within a society (Lipset 1959, 84). Several scholars, therefore , have¶ emphasized the democratizing aspects of these socioeconomic changes¶ within non-democratic states, thereby arguing that successful economic¶ modernization will generate pressures for democratization (Huntington¶ 1991; Diamond 2003; Biox/Strokes 2003). Accordingly, democracy promotion¶ strategies that seek to undermine a country's economic development¶ would also be undermining the development of these democratizing byproducts.

Democracy promoters wishing to influence political change by supporting¶ successful economic development in non-democracies have several¶ options, such as development aid and trade liberalization attached with¶ conditionality and political dialogue, as well as the encouragement of¶ foreign direct investment (Dauderstadt/Lerch 2005, 7). This is not to say¶ that such a strategy will lead to democratization, nor necessarily to the development¶ of democracy-supporting socioeconomic by-products suggested¶ by the modernization theory . Burnell (2005, 105), for example, warns of the¶ negative side effects of opening up a country to the global economy ,¶ particularly when this leads to growing socioeconomic inequalities within¶ society, which can undermine any positive perceptions of economic¶ liberalization. Furthermore, Bueno de Mesquita and Downs (2005) have¶ highlighted the strategies of several autocratic states, in particular China and¶ Russia, which have found ways to enjoy the benefits of substantial economic¶ development while simultaneously deflecting, or at least postponing,¶ pressure for political liberalization by simply regulating the availability of¶ the key "strategic goods" that are required by opposition groups for the¶ development of "strategic coordination."

Thirdly, the strategy of undermining economic development to promote¶ a transition to democracy may itself be counteracted by the very policy¶ instrument used to achieve this goal: economic sanctions. The use of economic¶ coercion as a policy instrument, as we shall see, is perhaps not as¶ suited as some would like to believe for the ambitious goal of promoting¶ democracy in non-democratic states.

Economic sanctions as a form of statecraft have been increasingly used¶ throughout modern history . In the last several decades economic sanctions¶ have often been imposed both unilaterally and multilaterally with the goal of¶ bringing about the demise of authoritarian leaders. Fidel Castro is not the¶ only autocrat to have successfully defied economic sanctions. United¶ Nations sanctions failed to bring about the collapse of Saddam Hussein 's¶ Ba'ath regime. Kim IL Sung, in the face of long enduring sanctions,¶ continues to hold on to power in North Korea and was not deterred from¶ acquiring nuclear capabilities. Most recently economic sanctions have failed¶ to strangle the military junta in Burma, which continues to survive.

### Embargo Keeps in Power

#### Top Cuban officials ready to remove Castro but deterred by embargo, lifting key

Ratliff & Fontaine 2k (Ratliff, William - research fellow at Stanford University, PhD (Chinese/Latin American histories) from U of Washington; Roger Fontaine. Former Director of Latin American Affairs, National Security Council.) "A Strategic Flip-Flop in the Caribbean." Lift the Embargo on Cuba (2000). p40

If the embargo were lifted, for some time the state apparatus might well beneﬁt more than the average Cuban from expanded tourism, trade, and investment. But in time increasing amounts would go beyond the state, and although economics will not single-handedly liberate Cuba, it may contribute some to that end. This is so, in part, because the repressive Cubans within the state apparatus are subject to inﬂuences that can tilt their allegiances in positive ways. Cuban Interior Ministry (Minint) founding member Rodrı´guez Menier has reported that it was precisely the top levels of the Minint that by the late 1980s were the most receptive to substantial reform. These were the best-informed bureaucrats in Cuba and those most directly charged with protecting and promoting Fidel. Little wonder these Minint ofﬁcials were the largest group purged in 1989–90 when talk of reform ricocheted off walls from Moscow to Havana and came to a head during what was known as the “Ochoa affair,” when Castro executed a prominent Cuban general for alleged dealing in drugs.83 Increased contacts could have this kind of impact again and the next time Castro might not crush it so easily. Indeed, some inside “reports” and media stories indicate that, as in Minint in the late 1980s, some top Cuban leaders today are willing, indeed anxious, to support reform and get rid of Castro but are deterred because they fear a vindictive Washington. As noted earlier, the most prominent dissident in Cuba today has said that even most activist dissidents think the sanctions should be lifted.

### Civil Society Key

#### Civil Society Key – It’s the most effective way to created democracy

Seaman 2010 (David Seaman, Research Assistant and Lecturer at the University of Osnabrück – Department of social sciences, “U.S. Democracy Promotion- The Case of Cuba” - 2010)

Furthermore, scholars have argued that, notwithstanding limitations, a¶ strong civil society plays an essential role in transitions from authoritarianism¶ to democracy (Diamond 1994; Schmitter 1997; Merkel/Lauth 1998;¶ Paxton 2002). In the realm of democracy promotion, Diamond (1995 , Ch. 2)¶ has stated that external "aid to challenging groups in civil society (including¶ groups in exile) is often the most effective way of pressuring for democratic¶ change in a country with an entrenched authoritarian regime ." To be sure,¶ the democracy promotion strategy of aiding civil society within nondemocratic¶ regimes as well as in emerging democracies has increasingly¶ grown in size and scope over the past decades. It is also a strategy to which¶ the U.S. has given much credence as part of its Cuba policy, as displayed¶ most recently by the $45 .7 million the U.S. Congress has set aside for this¶ task. Thus, a second aspect of this study is to inquire into the nature of the¶ relationship between civil society and democratization and how the external¶ promotion of civil society groups may interact within this relationship . Both¶ the considerable degree of state control over civic organizations in Cuba¶ (Bertelsmann Stiftung 2007, 10) and the precarious relations between Washington¶ and Havana raise questions concerning the efficacy and consequence¶ of U.S. assistance to civil society groups in Cuba.

## Trade

### 1ac Internal Link

#### The current Cuban policy undermines US trade credibility and risks a trans-atlantic trade war

Morley & McGillion 05 associate professor of politics and international relations at Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia & senior lecturer in journalism, Charles Sturt University, Bathurst, Australia. [Morris Morley & Chris McGillion, Cuba, the United States, and the Post-Cold War World: The International Dimensions of the Washington-Havana Relationship, pg 9]

Second is the contradiction between America's professed commitment to free trade and its Cuba policy. Since the 1990s, the nation's multinational business community has depended on foreign markets for a growing proportion of its profits. This trend has reinforced Washington's determination to break down barriers to U.S. capital and commerce and to champion this approach in the interests of global economic health and development. The prime ideological instrument in this drive has been the free trade doctrine. For more than a decade, U.S. officials have argued in every regional and global forum that free trade is the cornerstone of American foreign economic policy-and synonymous with American "global leadership" in the post-Cold War era.

Yet this doctrine conflicts with the restrictive trade practices supported by the White House and Congress to obstruct and limit Cuba's economic ties with the rest of the world-a policy inconsistency that has encouraged rivals around the world to view America's embrace of free trade as a self-serving policy to be used only when it serves U.S. political interests. In an era of heightened competition for global market share, economic competitors are not prepared to sacrifice investment or commercial opportunities to satisfy the requirements of American foreign policy. Nor are they willing to be bullied into severing normal economic ties with an internationally recognized and legitimate government in order to accommodate White House domestic imperatives. Consequently, U.S. actions have created tensions and disputes with a number of key allies, even threatening the viability of instruments of global dispute resolution such as the WTO and raising the possibility of a cross-Atlantic trade war.

#### **The Embargo creates multiple scenarios for EU-US conflict – transatlantic trade wars**

Morley & McGillion 05 associate professor of politics and international relations at Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia & senior lecturer in journalism, Charles Sturt University, Bathurst, Australia. [Morris Morley & Chris McGillion, Cuba, the United States, and the Post-Cold War World: The International Dimensions of the Washington-Havana Relationship, pg 6]

The relationship between America and Europe is more pivotal to the success of the global free trade regime than any other and, hence, the division over Cuba has always contained within it a potential for creating bigger and more significant conflicts between historic allies. Chris McGillion provides a thorough assessment of the impact of America's Cuba policy on the broader transatlantic economic debate, centered on the passage and consequences of the 1992 Cuban Democracy Act and the 1996 Helms-Burton legislation. This extraterritorial application of U.S. domestic laws generated major inter-Alliance frictions, reaching a peak after Bill Clinton signed Helms-Burton into law. Individually, European governments condemned this encroachment on their sovereignty and threatened reprisals; collectively, the European Union, outraged by what it viewed as a direct challenge to international law, took its complaint to the World Trade Organization (WTO) and raised the prospect of a transatlantic trade war if it got no satisfaction. Such a dire outcome has failed to eventuate, but the reason that gave rise to it has still not been comprehensively addressed.

While George W. Bush has been no less inclined than his predecessor to lobby Congress to remove the more contentious "global reach" provisions of Helms-Burton, a potential new source of conflict has emerged between the U.S. and its European allies. The latter have developed a significant commercial stake in Cuba, which they show no signs of surrendering to American competitors in the post-Castro era. As well, the Europeans have cultivated extensive ties with those government officials and other political "influentials" in Cuba who are more likely to inherit the reins of political power than Washington's allies among the Miami exile leadership and the island's dissident community. For these reasons, another transatlantic contest over Cuba cannot be ruled out in the future.

### Trade Credbility IL

#### US isolationism of cuba undermines trade credibility -

Sircio 98 (Robert A.,president of the Acton Institute for the Study of Religion and Liberty, Cato Institute Policy Forum, “Free Trade and Human Rights: The Moral Case for Engagement,” 5/27/98, http://www.cato.org/publications/trade-briefing-paper/free-trade-human-rights-moral-case-engagement

The freedom of Americans to trade and invest abroad is being challenged in the name of promoting human rights. Conservative Christian activists and others seek to impose trade sanctions against nations that do not protect human rights. Proposed sanctions include the Freedom from Religious Persecution Act and the revoking of China’s Most Favored Nation status.¶ Three fundamental misunderstandings cloud the current debate over free trade and human rights. First, cutting government aid to target countries is not the same as raising barriers to trade and investment. Ending foreign aid and corporate subsidies actually promotes development by removing market distortions. Blocking trade, in contrast, hurts U.S. consumers and exporters as well as the most economically vulnerable people in the targeted nations.¶ Second, some advocates of free trade in the U.S. business community have weakened their case by failing to acknowledge that human rights abuses exist. U.S. multinational firms further undermine their credibility by supporting government intervention through such agencies as the Export-Import Bank and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation.¶ Third, Christian conservatives who support sanctions betray a lack of understanding of how trade promotes freedom and development. Economic reforms in China have transformed daily life for hundreds of millions of people who now enjoy greater opportunity, freedom of movement, material abundance, and access to Western ideas. Trade with China benefits Americans through lower prices, wider consumer choice, and greater returns on investment.¶ Imposing sanctions against China will disrupt this mutually beneficial relationship while doing nothing to improve human rights. Like the failed embargo against Cuba, trade sanctions isolate the victims while strengthening their persecutors. Sanctions imposed in the name of human rights also serve the interest of domestic protectionists by limiting competition. The best policy for promoting freedom and human rights remains economic and moral engagement.

#### The Embargo prevents effective trade cooperation

Aghazadeh 5 (Gholamreza, Iranian nuclear chief, Representatives to the United Nations, “Agenda item 18¶ Necessity of ending the economic, commercial and financial embargo imposed by the United States of America against Cuba¶ Report of the Secretary-General (A/60/213)¶ Draft resolution (A/60/L.9),” 11/08/05, http://www.undemocracy.com/generalassembly\_60/meeting\_45)

The contents of resolution 59/11, as well as the 179 votes in favour of it, clearly reflect the position of the international community towards the long-standing embargo against Cuba. It is crystal-clear that the blockade is in violation of internationally agreed principles governing relations among States, such as the sovereign equality of States, non-intervention in their internal affairs and freedom of international trade and navigation. As my delegation has pointed out in various statements, such unilateral coercive policies and measures should be regarded as major impediments for the international community in pursuing its common causes and interests. Resorting to an embargo as a tool to achieve political objectives undermines the international environment favourable for economic growth and sustainable development that the United Nations system keeps trying to promote.¶ Paragraph 102 of the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation calls upon States to refrain from any unilateral measure that contravenes international law and the Charter of the United Nations and impedes the full achievement of economic and social development by the population of the affected countries, in particular women and children. The same paragraph further indicates that any such unilateral measure hinders the well-being of the affected people and creates obstacles to the full enjoyment of their human rights, including the right of everyone to a standard of living adequate for their health and well-being and their right to food, medical care and the necessary social services.¶ Paragraph 101 of the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation stipulates that States should cooperate to promote a supportive and open international economic system that will lead to economic growth and sustainable development in all countries. It adds that trade policy measures for environmental purposes should not constitute a means of arbitrary or unjustifiable discrimination in international trade.¶ In reviewing the report of the Cuban Government, which is supported by numerous figures, it is hard to imagine just how devastating the impact of the imposed embargo has been on all walks of life of that nation, including health, economy, education, trade, tourism, civil aviation, cultural activities and even sports. Such policies and measures, which stem merely from intolerance and enmity towards other political, economic and social systems, will continue to add silently to the disparities and gaps among nations and run counter to the policy of protecting human rights and dignity.¶ At the dawn of the twenty-first century, resorting to unjustifiable economic coercive measures against other States on the basis of political observations is not acceptable to the international community. The fact is that the extraterritorial application of such internal laws as the Helms-Burton Act and the D'Amato Act create an antagonistic environment in international relations and adversely affect world peace and security. Such political acts with economic implications continue to restrict investment, trade, employment, technology transfer and the prospects for economic growth not only of the targeted countries, but also of third-party countries dealing with the affected country.¶ It is worth noting that, in the outcome document of the recently held summit, all countries reaffirmed their commitments to efforts designed to ensure that developing countries can participate fully in the world trading system in order to meet the needs of their economic development. Let us observe our new commitments and put an end to all unilateral economic coercive measures.

### US-EU fights IL

#### Current Cuba policy risks future EU conflict

Morley & McGillion 05 associate professor of politics and international relations at Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia & senior lecturer in journalism, Charles Sturt University, Bathurst, Australia. [Morris Morley & Chris McGillion, Cuba, the United States, and the Post-Cold War World: The International Dimensions of the Washington-Havana Relationship, pg 135-136]

The Europeans' willingness to stay the course on improved relations with Cuba contrasts markedly with what has been the overriding purpose of U.S. policy, put into sharp focus by a senior official of the Clinton administration at the end of the 1990s: "To me the point of the various strategies of the embargo was not to change Castro's mind or to change Cuba while Castro was still in power; to gain Castro's acquiescence in democracy in Cuba, or to force him to change. The point of the embargo was to impoverish the government so it could not be adventurous and to make sure that when Castro's end comes there would be insufficient movement to make possible a continuation of that regime. "218 It is precisely this issue on which future conflict between the EU and the U.S. over Cuba policy cannot be ruled out.

#### The Embargo inhibits US – EU relations – different Cuba Approaches

Morley & McGillion 05 associate professor of politics and international relations at Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia & senior lecturer in journalism, Charles Sturt University, Bathurst, Australia. [Morris Morley & Chris McGillion, Cuba, the United States, and the Post-Cold War World: The International Dimensions of the Washington-Havana Relationship, pg 136-137]

Conclusion

The collapse of the Soviet Union removed any potential security threat to Western Europe and in the process downgraded the importance of America's Cold War military "umbrella," thereby making it more difficult for the White House to impose its global priorities on senior Alliance partners. The post-Cold War era also witnessed the rise of the European Union as a powerful economic bloc in its own right and a greater assertiveness on the part of its member nations-individually and collectively-in pursuing their own worldwide interests. The combined result has been to increase tensions across the Atlantic over a range of foreign policy and trade/investment issues. One of the most consistent and, before the war in Iraq, one of the most bitter, disagreements has been over relations with Fidel Castro's government in Cuba. While both the U.S. and its European allies share the ultimate goal of promoting political and economic reform in Cuba, they differ fundamentally over how best to bring this about. The U.S. remains wedded to an unreconstructed Cold War approach based on the politics of hostility and isolation-leading to a regime change-as a precondition for fully normalized relations. The Europeans, on the other hand, have developed a more nuanced approach that values dialogue and engagement with Havana while reserving the right to criticize specific government policies.

These contrasting approaches, of themselves, would not have triggered a series of major disputes were it not for Washington's continuing attempt to bludgeon allies into accepting its solution to the "problem of Cuba"-most strikingly via the extraterritorial provisions in the 1992 Cuban Democracy Act and the even more punitive 1996 Helms-Burton law. The European response has combined selective accommodations with a refusal to capitulate entirely to these U.S. policy initiatives. That Cuba-a relatively minor issue in post-Cold War transatlantic ties-has become a source of friction also reflects European concerns about Washington's propensity to jettison free trade principles and agreements when they clash with what it defines as "overriding foreign policy interests."

The dispute over Cuba, then, speaks to a larger issue. The U.S. is still the dominant hegemon-based largely on its continuing military and ideological superiority-but its economic and, to a lesser extent, political power is no longer uncontested. The Cold War coalition to confront communism has been transformed into a world of proliferating rivalries and challenges as Washington's European allies in particular seek more aggressively to defend and pursue their own interests. Clearly signaling this new global rivalry, Swedish prime minister Goeran Persson told the June 2001 U.S.-EU summit in Gothenburg that Europe's mission was to serve "as a balance to U.S. domination. " 219 In the new world of global economic competition, U.S. diktats on the conditions of international trade and capital flows are more likely to be resisted than in the past. While the U.S. appears able to get its way on most occasions, Europe's resistance to its Cuba policy indicates that the White House does so with increasing difficulty; and that it is, nonetheless, willing to pursue a unilateralist foreign policy even if it means placing at risk the transatlantic relationship.

### ILAW IL

#### The Embargo’s violation of International Law undermines US credibility – Costly Double Standards

Charbonneau 12 (Louis, Reuters' United Nations bureau chief, “U.N. urges end to U.S. Cuba embargo for 21st year,”11/13/12, http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/11/13/us-cuba-embargo-un-idUSBRE8AC11820121113

For the 21st year, the assembly's vote was overwhelming, with 188 nations - including most of Washington's closest allies - supporting the embargo resolution, a result virtually unchanged from last year.¶ Israel, heavily dependent on U.S. backing in the Middle East, and the tiny Pacific state of Palau were the only two countries that supported the United States in opposing the non-binding resolution in the 193-nation assembly. The Pacific states of the Marshall Islands and Micronesia abstained.¶ President Barack Obama further loosened curbs last year on U.S. travel and remittances to Cuba. He had said he was ready to change Cuba policy but was still waiting for signals from Havana, such as the release of political prisoners and guarantees of basic human rights.¶ But Obama has not lifted the five-decade-old trade embargo, and the imprisonment of a U.S. contractor in Cuba has halted the thaw in Cuban-U.S. relations.¶ Havana's Foreign Minister Bruno Rodriguez told the assembly that Cuba had high hopes for Obama when he was first elected in 2008 and welcomed his calls for change. But he said the result had been disappointing.¶ "The reality is that the last four years have been characterized by the persistent tightening of ... the embargo," he said.¶ 'EXTERNAL SCAPEGOAT'¶ Rodriguez said the "extraterritoriality" of the blockade measures - the fact that Washington pressures other countries to adhere to the U.S. embargo - violates international law. He added that the blockade is not in U.S. interests and harms its credibility.¶ "It leads the U.S. to adopt costly double standards," he said, adding that the embargo has failed to achieve its objectives of pressuring the government to introduce economic and political freedoms and comply with international human rights standards.¶ "There is no legitimate or moral reason to maintain this embargo that is anchored in the Cold War," he said.¶ He said it qualified as a "act of genocide" against Cuba and was a "massive, flagrant and systematic violation of the human rights of an entire people."

### Protectionist

#### Sanctions against Cuba leads to a protectionist model

Sircio 98 (Robert A.,president of the Acton Institute for the Study of Religion and Liberty, Cato Institute Policy Forum, “Free Trade and Human Rights: The Moral Case for Engagement,” 5/27/98, <http://www.cato.org/publications/trade-briefing-paper/free-trade-human-rights-moral-case-engagement>

That is a huge error. Sanctions against Cuba have done little to encourage freedom of expression there. But the influx of outside influence that came with the pope’s visit in January 1998 did succeed in opening up Cuban society somewhat. I was fortunate enough to be there during that time. Not once did I hear an average Cuban, struggling to make ends meet under extraordinarily difficult circumstances, call for the extension of U.S. sanctions, a good indication of how unsuccessful sanctions have been.¶ Most of the countries likely to be hit by the Wolf-Specter bill on religious persecution are prime markets for future exports. But the export of goods also means the export of influence, both on the people and on the regimes in question. We shouldn’t embrace bills that would limit our influence; we should embrace strategies that strengthen our influence, while at the same time fostering the development of private networks that can circumvent official channels. In addition, advocates of sanctions seem unaware of the role they unwittingly play in the protectionist cause. Leaders of some industries in this country would like to use the power of the U.S. government to gain an unfair advantage in trade. They are protectionists who seek profits, not by serving the consumer, but by shutting others out of the market with import quotas, tariffs, and lawsuits against importers. Since the Industrial Revolution, protectionists have brought about high prices, economic inefficiencies, recessions, depressions, and wars, all of which consolidate the central power of the state.¶ Protectionist interests sell out free enterprise principles and seek special protection from the government at the expense of consumers. Keeping the protectionists at bay has always been a high priority of all believers in human liberty and human rights.¶ Whether they know it or not, conservative religious activists who call for trade sanctions and favor cutting off commerce with foreign nations are playing directly into the hands of the protectionist lobbies. They are tools of the worst of the American corporate class—a class that enriches itself at everyone else’s expense. Protectionism and sanctions are not only bad economics, they are also the politics of business and corporate corruption.

### Credibility Key to Trade

#### The United States needs to restore regional credibility to promote Free Trade

Noriega 12 ( Roger, Former US Ambassador to OAS, former assistant secretary of state for Western Hemisphere affairs, “An action plan for US policy in the Americas,” 12/05/12, <http://www.aei.org/outlook/foreign-and-defense-policy/regional/latin-america/an-action-plan-for-us-policy-in-the-americas/>

America’s economic crisis and threats to US security have undermined its traditional global-leadership role and weakened its connections to Latin American nations that continue to modernize their economies.¶ The United States must recover its regional credibility by taking bold initiatives to restore its fiscal solvency, while aggressively promoting trade, energy interdependence, technology transfer, and economic growth. ¶ The United States must then retool its strategy for its partners in the Americas by working with them to combat threats such as cross-border criminality and radical populism, encouraging dialogue with regional leaders, and ensuring law enforcement cooperation to develop a mutually beneficial relationship. ¶ ¶ A stable and prosperous Americas is indispensable to US economic success and security. The region is home to three of the top four foreign sources of energy to the United States, as well as the fastest-growing destinations for US exports and investment. Clearly, geography and shared values predetermine a united destiny for the United States and its neighbors in the Americas. How positive and fruitful that destiny will be depends on whether US policymakers, private businesses, and civil society move with a greater sense of purpose toward seizing promising opportunities and meeting critical challenges.¶ Times have changed. The US fiscal crisis and preoccupation with two distant wars have distracted policymakers in Washington and undermined US leadership in the Americas. Although access to the US market, investment, technology, and other economic benefits are highly valued by most countries in the Western Hemisphere, today, the United States is no longer the only major partner to choose from. Asia (principally China) and Europe are making important inroads. So, as US policymakers retool their strategy for the Americas, they must shelve the paternalism of the past and be much more energetic in forming meaningful partnerships with willing neighbors.¶ Of course, the United States must recover its credibility by making bold decisions to restore its own fiscal solvency, while aggressively promoting trade, energy interdependence, technology transfer, and economic growth. Then, Washington will be better positioned to cultivate greater economic and political cooperation among its neighbors, beginning with an open and candid dialogue with the region’s leaders about their vision, their challenges, and their priorities. Partnerships can thus be built on common ground.

### Trade Violations Snowball

#### Trade violations snowball – other countries will ratchet up protectionism in response.

Watson et al. 13 (K. William and Sallie James, analysts at the Cato Institute’s Herbert A. Stiefel Center, “Regulatory Protectionism A Hidden Threat to Free Trade for Trade Policy Studies,” 4/9/13, http://www.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/pubs/pdf/pa723.pdf)

There is a potential consequence for violating international trade law. If the United States maintains a policy inconsistent with international rules despite an adverse ruling from the WTO’s dispute settlement mechanism, complaining members will be permitted to suspend their own obligations toward the United States in equal measure. A suspension of concessions in this manner, usually through raising tariffs on politically sensitive products, has a remarkable impact on the make up and quantity of domestic political forces aligned against the impugned policy

### Regional Trade key to Global Trade

#### Regional Cooperation is key to Global Success – Export policy

Noriega 12 ( Roger, Former US Ambassador to OAS, former assistant secretary of state for Western Hemisphere affairs, “An action plan for US policy in the Americas,” 12/05/12, <http://www.aei.org/outlook/foreign-and-defense-policy/regional/latin-america/an-action-plan-for-us-policy-in-the-americas/>

Expanding regional economic cooperation is crucial to US economic growth. An aggressive trade promotion and investment strategy in today’s hypercompetitive, globalized economy is not a policy option; it is an imperative. Clearly, prosperity at home depends on success abroad. The economic opportunities in the Western Hemisphere are enormous, and US policy-makers and the private sector must recognize them as critical to US economic growth.¶ In 2011, US exports reached a record $2.1 trillion in total value, despite the fact that only 1 percent of US businesses export their products to foreign markets. The United States must expand on these opportunities. Exports benefit the US economy by offering companies opportunities to tap new markets, expand their production, and earn more consumer dollars. Today, 95 percent of the world’s consumers live outside the United States, and the International Monetary Fund predicts that, through 2015, some 80 percent of economic growth will take place beyond US shores.¶ It is indisputable that an aggressive US trade policy—meaning selling US goods and services in as many markets as possible—is essential for the US economy to hone its competitive edge in the 21st century. In this sense, America’s future is inextricably linked to the future of its neighbors in its own hemisphere. A prosperous hemisphere means a more prosperous United States.

#### Trade is good in all forms – pushing for more is good

Istrate et al 10 (Emilia, Senior research analyst at the Metropolitan Infrastructure Initiative, "Export Nation: How U.S. Metros Lead National Export Growth and Boost Competitiveness", 2010,<http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/reports/2010/7/26%20mountain%20exports%20muro/0726_exports_istrate_rothwell_katz.pdf> )

The federal government is the only entity able to carry out currency and trade policies. In its efforts to double exports, the U.S. government should more actively pursue negotiations around exchange rates and trade liberalization. The previous surge periods of U.S. exports show that the exchange rate of the dollar is an important variable in this process, but not the only one. Setting policy effects aside, the rapid increase of U.S. exports during 1987-1992 was caused mainly by the dollar’s depreciation and the relatively stronger growth in America’s export markets.86 With the dollar estimated to be overvalued currently, there is plenty of room for the dollar to depreciate.87 A fair market exchange rate of the dollar with the main U.S. trading partners’ currencies could contribute to the expansion of U.S. exports.88 Given the benefits to all the parties involved in trade, bilateral and multilateral discussions should move forward, and the United States should advocate appropriate changes to international trade law to address exchange rates.89 The U.S. government should push for better access to more sectors especially in export markets that are growing rapidly. For example, while the United States economy is projected to grow by 2.9 percent in 2011, the emerging economies in Asia are estimated to grow at 8.5 percent next year.90 The focus should be on industries in which the United States is competitive internationally and could capture a niche market. However, mere access is not sufficient; U.S. companies have to be assured that their intellectual property rights are protected in these countries. Over the medium term, the federal government should push to open new markets to U.S. companies. While the existing export markets will be the source of any export growth over a five year horizon, new markets are essential for export growth over a longer time frame. For example, between 1993 and 2003, U.S. firms that accessed new markets or sold new products comprised 42 percent of the export growth.91 More bilateral trade agreements and especially multilateral trade agreements will deliver new foreign demand for U.S. goods and services. Besides moving the Doha agenda forward, more attention should be paid to the other free trade agreements (FTAs). There is evidence that FTAs boost overall trade, which despite harming some U.S. businesses and their workers (who should be compensated for their loss) tends to enrich the country.92 As to exports in particular, FTAs do not guarantee that exports will increase relative to imports, but most American FTAs did result in an improvement in the trade balance in goods.93 The United States has been slow in reaching free trade deals with the rapidly growing Asian countries. For example, while the United States is at the beginning of negotiations to join the Trans-Pacific Partnership, the European Union is on its last leg of negotiations with India on a free trade agreement and China has a new free trade area with the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) starting this year.94 This new China- ASEAN free trade area is the largest free trade in the world, with a market of 1.9 billion people.

### Free Trade Good

#### Free trade is good

Panitchpakdi 4( Dg Panitchpakdi, Secretary-General of the UN Conference on Trade and Development, Director-General of the World Trade Organization, "American Leadership and the World Trade Organization: What is the Alternative?", World trade organization, 02/26/04, http://www.wto.org/english/news\_e/spsp\_e/spsp22\_e.htm)

I can sum up my message today in three sentences: The United States, more than any single country, created the world trading system. The US has never had more riding on the strength of that system. And US leadership — especially in the current Doha trade talks — is indispensable to the system's success. It is true that as the WTO's importance to the world economy increases, so too does the challenge of making it work: there are more countries, more issues, trade is in the spot light as never before. But the fiction that there is an alternative to the WTO — or to US leadership — is both naïve and dangerous. Naïve because it fails to recognize that multilateralism has become more — not less — important to advancing US interests. Dangerous because it risks undermining the very objectives the US seeks — freer trade, stronger rules, a more open and secure world economy. The Doha Round is a crucial test. The core issues — services, agriculture, and industrial tariffs — are obviously directly relevant to the US. America is highly competitive in services — the fastest growing sector of the world economy, and where the scope for liberalization is greatest. In agriculture too the US is competitive across many commodities — but sky-high global barriers and subsidies impede and distort agricultural trade. Industrial tariffs also offer scope for further liberalization — especially in certain markets and sectors. But what is at stake in these talks is more than the economic benefits that would flow from a successful deal. The real issue is the relevance of the multilateral trading system. Its expanded rules, broader membership, and binding dispute mechanism means that the new WTO — created less than ten years ago — is pivotal to international economic relations. But this means that the costs of failure are also higher — with ramifications that can be felt more widely. Advancing the Doha agenda would confirm the WTO as the focal point for global trade negotiations, and as the key forum for international economic cooperation. The credibility of the institution would be greatly enhanced. But if the Doha negotiations stumble, doubts may grow, not just about the WTO's effectiveness, but about the future of multilateralism in trade. This should be a major concern to the US for two reasons: First, the US is now integrated with the world economy as never before. A quarter of US GDP is tied to international trade, up from 10 per cent in 1970 — the largest such increase of any developed economy over this period. A third of US growth since 1990 has been generated by trade. And America's trade is increasingly global in scope — 37 per cent with Canada and Mexico, 23 per cent with Europe, 27 per cent with Asia. Last year alone, exports to China rose by almost 30 per cent. The US has also grown more reliant on the rules of the multilateral system to keep world markets open. Not only has it initiated more WTO dispute proceedings than any other country — some 75 since 1995 — according to USTR it has also won or successfully settled most of the cases it has brought. The point is this: even the US cannot achieve prosperity on its own; it is increasingly dependent on international trade, and the rules-based economic order that underpins it. As the biggest economy, largest trader and one of the most open markets in the world, it is axiomatic that the US has the greatest interest in widening and deepening the multilateral system. Furthermore, expanding international trade through the WTO generates increased global prosperity, in turn creating yet more opportunities for the US economy. The second point is that strengthening the world trading system is essential to America's wider global objectives. Fighting terrorism, reducing poverty, improving health, integrating China and other countries in the global economy — all of these issues are linked, in one way or another, to world trade. This is not to say that trade is the answer to all America's economic concerns; only that meaningful solutions are inconceivable without it. The world trading system is the linchpin of today's global order — underpinning its security as well as its prosperity. A successful WTO is an example of how multilateralism can work. Conversely, if it weakens or fails, much else could fail with it. This is something which the US — at the epicentre of a more interdependent world — cannot afford to ignore. These priorities must continue to guide US policy — as they have done since the Second World War. America has been the main driving force behind eight rounds of multilateral trade negotiations, including the successful conclusion of the Uruguay Round and the creation of the WTO. The US — together with the EU — was instrumental in launching the latest Doha Round two years ago. Likewise, the recent initiative, spearheaded by Ambassador Zoellick, to re-energize the negotiations and move them towards a successful conclusion is yet another example of how essential the US is to the multilateral process — signalling that the US remains committed to further liberalization, that the Round is moving, and that other countries have a tangible reason to get on board. The reality is this: when the US leads the system can move forward; when it withdraws, the system drifts. The fact that US leadership is essential, does not mean it is easy. As WTO rules have expanded, so too has as the complexity of the issues the WTO deals with — everything from agriculture and accounting, to tariffs and telecommunication. The WTO is also exerting huge gravitational pull on countries to join — and participate actively — in the system. The WTO now has 146 Members — up from just 23 in 1947 — and this could easily rise to 170 or more within a decade. Emerging powers like China, Brazil, and India rightly demand a greater say in an institution in which they have a growing stake. So too do a rising number of voices outside the system as well. More and more people recognize that the WTO matters. More non-state actors — businesses, unions, environmentalists, development NGOs — want the multilateral system to reflect their causes and concerns. A decade ago, few people had even heard of the GATT. Today the WTO is front page news. A more visible WTO has inevitably become a more politicized WTO. The sound and fury surrounding the WTO's recent Ministerial Meeting in Cancun — let alone Seattle — underline how challenging managing the WTO can be. But these challenges can be exaggerated. They exist precisely because so many countries have embraced a common vision. Countries the world over have turned to open trade — and a rules-based system — as the key to their growth and development. They agreed to the Doha Round because they believed their interests lay in freer trade, stronger rules, a more effective WTO. Even in Cancun the great debate was whether the multilateral trading system was moving fast and far enough — not whether it should be rolled back. Indeed, it is critically important that we draw the right conclusions from Cancun — which are only now becoming clearer. The disappointment was that ministers were unable to reach agreement. The achievement was that they exposed the risks of failure, highlighted the need for North-South collaboration, and — after a period of introspection — acknowledged the inescapable logic of negotiation. Cancun showed that, if the challenges have increased, it is because the stakes are higher. The bigger challenge to American leadership comes from inside — not outside — the United States. In America's current debate about trade, jobs and globalization we have heard a lot about the costs of liberalization. We need to hear more about the opportunities. We need to be reminded of the advantages of America's openness and its trade with the world — about the economic growth tied to exports; the inflation-fighting role of imports, the innovative stimulus of global competition. We need to explain that freer trade works precisely because it involves positive change — better products, better job opportunities, better ways of doing things, better standards of living. While it is true that change can be threatening for people and societies, it is equally true that the vulnerable are not helped by resisting change — by putting up barriers and shutting out competition. They are helped by training, education, new and better opportunities that — with the right support policies — can flow from a globalized economy. The fact is that for every job in the US threatened by imports there is a growing number of high-paid, high skill jobs created by exports. Exports supported 7 million workers a decade ago; that number is approaching around 12 million today. And these new jobs — in aerospace, finance, information technology — pay 10 per cent more than the average American wage. We especially need to inject some clarity — and facts — into the current debate over the outsourcing of services jobs. Over the next decade, the US is projected to create an average of more than 2 million new services jobs a year — compared to roughly 200,000 services jobs that will be outsourced. I am well aware that this issue is the source of much anxiety in America today. Many Americans worry about the potential job losses that might arise from foreign competition in services sectors. But it’s worth remembering that concerns about the impact of foreign competition are not new. Many of the reservations people are expressing today are echoes of what we heard in the 1970s and 1980s. But people at that time didn’t fully appreciate the power of American ingenuity. Remarkable advances in technology and productivity laid the foundation for unprecedented job creation in the 1990s and there is no reason to doubt that this country, which has shown time and again such remarkable potential for competing in the global economy, will not soon embark again on such a burst of job-creation. America's openness to service-sector trade — combined with the high skills of its workforce — will lead to more growth, stronger industries, and a shift towards higher value-added, higher-paying employment. Conversely, closing the door to service trade is a strategy for killing jobs, not saving them. Americans have never run from a challenge and have never been defeatist in the face of strong competition. Part of this challenge is to create the conditions for global growth and job creation here and around the world. I believe Americans realize what is at stake. The process of opening to global trade can be disruptive, but they recognize that the US economy cannot grow and prosper any other way. They recognize the importance of finding global solutions to shared global problems. Besides, what is the alternative to the WTO? Some argue that the world's only superpower need not be tied down by the constraints of the multilateral system. They claim that US sovereignty is compromised by international rules, and that multilateral institutions limit rather than expand US influence. Americans should be deeply skeptical about these claims. Almost none of the trade issues facing the US today are any easier to solve unilaterally, bilaterally or regionally. The reality is probably just the opposite. What sense does it make — for example — to negotiate e-commerce rules bilaterally? Who would be interested in disciplining agricultural subsidies in a regional agreement but not globally? How can bilateral deals — even dozens of them — come close to matching the economic impact of agreeing to global free trade among 146 countries? Bilateral and regional deals can sometimes be a complement to the multilateral system, but they can never be a substitute. There is a bigger danger. By treating some countries preferentially, bilateral and regional deals exclude others — fragmenting global trade and distorting the world economy. Instead of liberalizing trade — and widening growth — they carve it up. Worse, they have a domino effect: bilateral deals inevitably beget more bilateral deals, as countries left outside are forced to seek their own preferential arrangements, or risk further marginalization. This is precisely what we see happening today. There are already over two hundred bilateral and regional agreements in existence, and each month we hear of a new or expanded deal. There is a basic contradiction in the assumption that bilateral approaches serve to strengthen the multilateral, rules-based system. Even when intended to spur free trade, they can ultimately risk undermining it. This is in no one's interest, least of all the United States. America led in the creation of the multilateral system after 1945 precisely to avoid a return to hostile blocs — blocs that had done so much to fuel interwar instability and conflict. America's vision, in the words of Cordell Hull, was that “enduring peace and the welfare of nations was indissolubly connected with the friendliness, fairness and freedom of world trade”. Trade would bind nations together, making another war unthinkable. Non-discriminatory rules would prevent a return to preferential deals and closed alliances. A network of multilateral initiatives and organizations — the Marshal Plan, the IMF, the World Bank, and the GATT, now the WTO — would provide the institutional bedrock for the international rule of law, not power. Underpinning all this was the idea that freedom — free trade, free democracies, the free exchange of ideas — was essential to peace and prosperity, a more just world. It is a vision that has emerged pre-eminent a half century later. Trade has expanded twenty-fold since 1950. Millions in Asia, Latin America, and Africa are being lifted out of poverty, and millions more have new hope for the future. All the great powers — the US, Europe, Japan, India, China and soon Russia — are part of a rules-based multilateral trading system, greatly increasing the chances for world prosperity and peace. There is a growing realization that — in our interdependent world — sovereignty is constrained, not by multilateral rules, but by the absence of rules. All of these were America’s objectives. The US needs to be both clearer about the magnitude of what it has achieved, and more realistic about what it is trying to — and can — accomplish. Multilateralism can be slow, messy, and tortuous. But it is also indispensable to managing an increasingly integrated global economy. Multilateralism is based on the belief that all countries — even powerful countries like the United States — are made stronger and more secure through international co-operation and rules, and by working to strengthen one another from within a system, not outside of it. Multilateralism's greatest ideal is the ideal of negotiation, compromise, consensus, not coercion. As Churchill said of democracy, it is the worst possible system except for all the others.

#### Trade prevents ANY conflict escalation

Griswold 10 (Daniel, Center for Trade Policy Studies- Cato Institute, “Why Populists Are Wrong About Impact of Free Trade,” 1/05/10, <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/why-populists-are-wrong-about-impact-free-trade>)

As a global middle class has emerged, so too have more democratic forms of government. Trade has spread tools of communication and spurred the growth of civil society as an alternative to authoritarian government. As a result, the share of the world’s population living in countries that respect civil liberties and the right to vote has climbed from 35 percent in 1973 to 46 percent today, according to Freedom House.¶ Fewer people are dying in wars today than in past decades, in large part because commerce has replaced military competition. Global commerce has allowed nations to gain access to resources through trade rather than conquest, while deeper economic integration has brought former enemies together and raised the cost of war. Even with the ongoing conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan, young American adults living today are far less likely to fight and die in wars than their counterparts in the 1940s, ’50s and ’60s.¶ America and the world face daunting tasks today, as in generations past, but expanding trade is part of the solution, not part of the problem. Americans should have the same warm feelings toward free trade and globalization as they do toward iPods, e-mail, online shopping, a well-fed child going off to school and peace on Earth.

#### Free trade prevents all forms of war and conflict

Griswold 11( Daniel Griswold, aniel Griswold is Director of the Herbert A. Stiefel Center for Trade Policy Studies at the Cato Institute in Washington, D.C., and an alumnus of the London School of Economics (’97 M.Sc. Politics of the World Economy), "Free Trade and the Global Middle Class", hayek society journal, 2011, http://www.hayeksocietyjournal.com/free-trade-and-the-global-middle-class.html)

Consistent with those theories, our more globalized world has also become a more democratic world. According to the think tank Freedom House based in New York, the past three decades of expanding global trade have also witnessed a dramatic expansion of political and civil freedom around the world. Freedom House rates nearly 200 countries every year according to freedom of speech, assembly, worship and other civil freedoms and the freedom to participate in open, competitive elections. In 1973, when its surveys began, Freedom House found that 35 percent of the world’s population lived in countries that were classified as “Free,” where citizens enjoyed the full range of political and civil freedoms. Today that share has grown to 46 percent. In that same time frame, the share living in countries classified as “Partly Free” has slipped from 18 to 17 percent and the share living in countries classified as “Not Free,” where political and civil freedoms are denied, has dropped from 47 percent to 37 percent. v If the percentages were the same today as in 1973, there would be roughly 700 million fewer people living in the full sunlight of democracy and civil liberty, and 700 million more living in the darkness of tyranny. Expanding trade and globalization deserve a share of the credit. Economic freedom and development have spread the tools of communication. Hundreds of millions of people in developing countries now have access to cell phones, the Internet and satellite TV. Increased foreign travel and foreign investment have exposed them to a world of new friendships, ideas, and lifestyles. A more open and less controlled economy fosters the growth of “civil society”—including new businesses, independent labor unions, professional associations, and clubs—what the great 18 th century British statesman Edmund Burke called society’s “little platoons.” People in a free and open market tend to see people outside their ethnic and religious group not as threats but as potential customers and business partners. People learn to practice tolerance and compromise in their everyday lives, essential public traits for a democracy. vi Growth has also created a rising global middle class that is economically independent and politically aware. Freed from the daily shackles of subsistence, these middle class families have turned their attention to such causes as securing property rights, improving the environment, and getting their kids through college. As people embrace the daily freedom of the marketplace 3 and property ownership, they come to expect more freedom in the political sphere. Nations open to the global economy are significantly more likely to enjoy greater political and civil freedoms than those countries that are relatively closed. Governments that grant their citizens a large measure of freedom to engage in international commerce find it increasingly difficult to deprive them of political and civil liberties, while governments that “protect” their citizens behind tariff walls and other barriers to international commerce find it much easier to deny those same liberties. A special panel commissioned by the World Trade Organization to survey the state of the world trading system on the WTO’s 10 th anniversary rightly observed, “Generally, the marks of closed economies are lack of democracy and a free media, political repression, and the absence of opportunity for individuals to improve their lives through education, innovation, honest hard work and commitment.” vii The spread of economic freedom, trade, globalization, and middle-class incomes has helped to lay the foundation for the flowering of democracy in formerly authoritarian countries as South Korea, Taiwan, and Chile. It is not a coincidence that within a decade after the passage of NAFTA, one-party rule in Mexico was broken with the election of Vicente Fox in 2000. NAFTA helped to break the grip of the long-ruling PRI over the economic life of the country. Now Mexico has become a vigorous multiparty democracy. In contrast, countries where political freedom and civil freedoms are in retreat, such as Venezuela and Zimbabwe, are also countries where governments are busy curtailing economic freedom. The connection between economic freedom, growth, and political and civil freedom should encourage those favor human progress and strike a note of fear in the heart of oppressive governments around the world. If the experience of other countries offers a pattern, the communist rulers in Beijing will find it increasingly difficult to suppress the legitimate desires of their citizens to enjoy political rights and civil liberties commensurate with their citizens’ expanding economic freedoms and middle-class incomes. The recent economic downturn and rising unemployment in China may provide a spark. Another potential catalyst for political change in China could be environmental and land-use concerns. Chinese citizens have become more willing to challenge the government to provide cleaner air and water and to protect their homes from unjust takings by the government. During a visit to Shanghai in 2006 I read in the local English-language press that homeowners had successfully halted development of a second leg of a highspeed magnetic levitation train. In a scenario familiar to American homeowners, Chinese families feared the presence of the train would reduce the value of the homes they can now buy and own. More recently, the International Herald Tribune reported in January 2008, “Demonstrations against the maglev in downtown Shanghai over the weekend, the city's largest public protest since thousands took part in sometimes violent antiJapanese demonstrations in 2005, present authorities with a new challenge: a growing middle class that wants a say in major decisions about development in the city.” viii . The line connecting globalization to human rights and democracy is not always straight. The world is too complex a place. Culture and history influence the political order along with economic arrangements. The city-state of Singapore has one of the most open economies and highest standards of living in the world, but the civil and political freedoms of its citizens remain partly curtailed. Despite its economic reforms and rapid growth, the Chinese communist government refuses to allow much non-economic freedom. Many oil producing states in the Middle East have achieved relatively high incomes and have selectively opened their economies, but most of them remain stubbornly “Not Free.” But these outliers do not disprove the dominant positive correlation between economic development and political and civil freedom. The global advancement of freedom has not followed a straight upward slope, either. For reasons as varied as the countries, the past three years have witnessed a stall in the rising share of countries and people enjoying political and civil freedom. Arch Puddington, the head of Freedom House, noted in the most recent report that one fifth of the world’s countries have suffered major or incremental reversals of freedom in the past two years. But the world remains a far more hospitable place for basic civil liberties and representative government than it was 30, 20, or even 10 years ago, and expanding trade and globalization are a major part of this story. Free Trade’s “Peace Dividend” Our more globalized world has also yielded a “peace dividend.” It may not be obvious when our daily news cycles are dominated by horrific images from the Gaza Strip, Afghanistan and Libya, but our more globalized world has somehow become a more peaceful world. The number of civil and international wars has dropped sharply in the past 15 years, along with battle deaths. The reasons behind the retreat of war are complex, but again the spread of trade and globalization have played a key role. Trade has been seen as a friend of peace for centuries. In the 19th century, British statesman Richard Cobden pursued free trade as a way not only to bring more affordable bread to English workers but also to promote peace with Britain’s neighbors. He negotiated the Cobden- Chevalier free trade agreement with France in 1860 that helped to cement an enduring alliance between two countries that had been bitter enemies for centuries. In the 20th century, President Franklin Roosevelt’s secretary of state, Cordell Hull, championed lower trade barriers as a way to promote peaceful commerce and reduce international tensions. Hull had witnessed first-hand the economic nationalism and retribution after World War I. Hull believed that “unhampered trade dovetail[s] with peace; high tariffs, trade barriers and unfair economic competition, with war.” ix Hull was awarded the 1945 Nobel Prize for Peace, in part because of his work to promote global trade. Free trade and globalization have promoted peace in three main ways. First, trade and globalization have reinforced the trend towards democracy, and democracies tend not to pick fights with each other. A second and even more potent way that trade has promoted peace is by raising the cost of war. As national economies become more intertwined, those nations have more to lose should war break out. War in a globalized world not only means the loss of human lives and tax dollars, but also ruptured trade and investment ties that impose lasting damage on the economy. Trade and economic integration has helped to keep the peace in Europe for more than 60 years. More recently, deepening economic ties between Mainland China and Taiwan are drawing those two governments closer together and helping to keep the peace. Leaders on both sides of the Taiwan Straight seem to understand that reckless nationalism would jeopardize the dramatic economic progress that region has enjoyed. A third reason why free trade promotes peace is because it has reduced the spoils of war. Trade allows nations to acquire wealth through production and exchange rather than conquest of territory and resources. As economies develop, wealth is increasingly measured in terms of intellectual property, financial assets, and human capital. Such assets cannot be easily seized by armies. In contrast, hard assets such as minerals and farmland are becoming relatively less important in high-tech, service economies. If people need resources outside their national borders, say oil or timber or farm products, they can acquire them peacefully by freely trading what they can produce best at home. The world today is harvesting the peaceful fruit of expanding trade. The first half of the 20th century was marred by two devastating wars among the great powers of Europe. In the ashes of World War II, the United States helped found the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade in 1947, the precursor to the WTO that helped to spur trade between the United States and its major trading partners. As a condition to Marshall Plan aid, the U.S. government also insisted that the continental European powers, France, Germany, and Italy, eliminate trade barriers between themselves in what was to become the European Common Market. One purpose of the common market was to spur economic development, of course, but just as importantly, it was meant to tie the Europeans together economically. With six decades of hindsight, the plan must be considered a spectacular success. The notion of another major war between France, Germany and other Western European powers is unimaginable. Compared to past eras, our time is one of relative world peace. According to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, the number of armed conflicts around the world has dropped sharply in the past two decades. Virtually all the conflicts today are civil and guerrilla wars. The spectacle of two governments sending armies off to fight in the battlefield has become rare. In the decade from 1998 through 2007, only three actual wars were fought between states: EritreaEthiopia in 1998-2000, India-Pakistan in 1998-2003, and the United StatesIraq in 2003. x From 2004 through 2007, no two nations were at war with one another. Civil wars have ended or at least ebbed in Aceh (in Indonesia), Angola, Burundi, Congo, Liberia, Nepal, Timor-Leste and Sierra Leone. xi Coming to the same conclusion is the Human Security Centre at the University of British Colombia in Canada. In a 2005 report, it documented a sharp decline in the number of armed conflicts, genocides and refugee numbers in the past 20 years. The average number of deaths per conflict has fallen from 38,000 in 1950 to 600 in 2002. Most armed conflicts in the world now take place in Sub-Saharan Africa, and the only form of political violence that has worsened in recent years is international terrorism. xii Many causes lie behind the good news—the end of the Cold War, the spread of democracy, and peacekeeping efforts by the major powers among them—but expanding trade and globalization appear to be playing a major role in promoting world peace. In a chapter in the 2005 Economic Freedom of the World Report, Dr. Erik Gartzke of Columbia University compared the propensity of countries to engage in wars to their level of economic freedom. He came to the conclusion that economic freedom, including the freedom to trade, significantly decreases the probability that a country will experience a military dispute with another country. Through econometric analysis, he found that, “Making economies freer translates into making countries more peaceful. At the extremes, the least free states are about 14 times as conflict prone as the most free.” xiii A 2006 study for the Institute for the Study of Labor in Bonn, Germany, found the same pacific effect of trade and globalization. Authors Solomon Polachek and Carlos Seiglie found that “trading nations cooperate more and fight less.” xiv In fact, a doubling of trade reduces the probability that a country will be involved in a conflict by 20 percent. Trade was the most important channel for peace, they found, but investment flows also had a positive effect. A democratic form of government also proved to be a force for peace, but primarily because democracies trade more. xv All this helps explain why the world’s two most conflict-prone regions—the Arab Middle East and Sub-Saharan Africa—are also the world’s two least globally and economically integrated regions. Terrorism does not spring from poverty but from ideological fervor and political and economic frustration. If we want to blunt the appeal of radical ideology to the next generation of Muslim children coming of age, we can help create more economic opportunity in those societies by encouraging more trade and investment ties with the West. The U.S. initiative to enact free trade agreements with certain Muslim countries, such as Morocco, Jordan, Bahrain and Oman, represent small steps in the right direction. An even more effective policy would be to unilaterally open Western markets to products made and grown in Muslim countries. A young man or woman with a real job at an export-oriented factory making overcoats in Jordan or shorts in Egypt is less vulnerable to the appeal of an Al-Qaida recruiter. Of course, free trade and globalization do not guarantee peace or inoculation against terrorism, anymore than they guarantee democracy and civil liberty. Hotblooded nationalism and ideological fervor can overwhelm cold economic calculations. Any relationship involving human beings will be messy and nonlinear. There will always be exceptions and outliers in such complex relationships involving economies and governments. But deeper trade and investment ties among nations have made it more likely that democracy and civil liberties will take root, and less likely those gains will be destroyed by civil conflict and war.

## Economy

### US key to Cuban Econ

#### **US key to Cuba economy-Helms-Burton limits out investors**

Spadoni 2010 [Paolo Spadoni 2010 assistant professor in the Department of Political Science at Augusta State Failed sanctions why the US sanctions against cuba could never work page 105]

The Helms-Burton law created a more uncertain and riskier business¶ environment, resulting in foreign lenders providing credits to the island at¶ higher rates. Even before March 1996, Cuba ranked among the most risky¶ countries for investment due to its economic indicators (especially trade¶ deficit), high foreign debt, government intervention in the economy, and¶ the U.S. embargo (Perez Villanueva 2001). But the passage of Helms-Burton¶ drove interest rates for bank loans and other financing for investment¶ projects to as high as 20 percent or more (Confidential Report 1999, 24).¶ A Cuban official report submitted to the United Nations in September¶ 1996 clearly stated, "It is estimated that in 1995 financing accounted, on¶ average, for 13 per cent of the value of the loans, rising on occasion to 20¶ per cent, with the rate increasing as the blockade was tightened" (United¶ Nations 1996, 19). The final cost offoreign credits is therefore particularly¶ burdensome for Cuba, which was already obtaining short-term loans at¶ high interest rates and had virtually no access to medium- and long-term¶ financing from banks and financial institutions.

### Hurts US economy

#### Embargo hurts U.S. economy – loss in sales and jobs

**Chamber of Commerce 12** (“Oppose Unilateral Economic Sanctions”, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, December 19 2012, <http://www.uschamber.com/international/agenda/oppose-unilateral-economic-sanctions)//CB>

While the current isolation of Cuba has far outlasted its original purpose, U.S. policies impose real costs. For American businesses, the U.S. International Trade Commission estimated in 2001 that the Cuba embargo cost U.S. exporters up to $1.2 billion annually in lost sales. A March 2010 study by Texas A&M University indicates that easing restrictions on agricultural exports and lifting the travel ban as proposed in recent bills could result in up to $365 million in additional sales of U.S. goods and create 6,000 new jobs in the United States. A comprehensive review of U.S. unilateral economic sanctions is overdue. From the five-decade old embargo on Cuba to proposals for extraterritorial sanctions on other countries, unilateral sanctions bring a host of unintended and unhelpful consequences. It’s time to put an end to these damaging policies.

### A2 Fill-In Inevitable

#### **Sanctions create a Negative Spillover effect – third party countries avoid interacting with the country**

Peksen 06 (Dursun, Department of Political Science at the University of Missouri-Columbia, “Bilateral Trade and the Third Party Effect of US Sanctions,” 2006, http://isa-m.missouri.edu/Awards/Peksen.pdf)

Although, in principle, third countries are expected to engage in more trade relations with the target, there is no clear-cut evidence supporting this expectation. On the contrary, the research on the efficacy of economic sanctions shows that sanction busting attempts, especially in the form of the “black knight effect,” does not have any substantial impact on the target’s resistance to or compliance with the sender’s demands (Drury 1998; Noouriddin 2001). In other words, it is suggested that third countries tend to intentionally avoid undermining economic coercion by not engaging in new trade relations with the targets or may largely fail in their efforts to spoil unilateral sanctions. The failure in sanctions-busting could be explained by the “negative spillover” argument. According to the “negative spillover” perspective, third parties will not bust economic sanctions; on the contrary, they will suffer from unilateral sanctions for two particular reasons. First, sanctions are used by sender countries as a means of communicating disapproval and signaling resolve to targets and other countries (Galtung 1967, 411-412; Barber 1979; Lindsay 1986; Drezner 2000; Schwebach 2000; Fisk 2000; Ang and Peksen 2007). In other words, unilateral sanctions are a good indicator of the high salience that the sender state attributes to the issue under dispute. More specifically, initiation of sanctions by a sender demonstrates the sender’s decisiveness and also signals 8 to other countries the disapproval of the target country. Therefore, third countries are largely aware of the possible repercussions from sanction busting and thus will better judge the risks of opening their markets to the target. Consequently, because any sanction-busting attempt will result in harming the economic ties with the sanctioning country, third countries will likely avoid developing any economic relations with the targets undergoing unilateral sanctions. In practice, the sanction-busting by third countries appears to be a serious concern for the US especially under the cases where the US completely cuts the economic interaction with the targets. The Helms-Burton Act and the Iran/Libya Sanctions Act are two examples of how the US tried to enforce third party loyalty and reduce sanction busting. In both acts, the US government threatened private and public actors of third countries with economic restrictions on the US or with the US companies abroad, if they developed economic ties with hostile targets like Cuba, Iran, and Libya (Drezner 2000; Fisk 2000; Caruso 2003). Although the US or other countries may not take official steps as in the cases of Cuba, Iran, and Libya during less salient sanction cases, it is likely that sender countries will closely watch how the third countries react in response to the imposition of unilateral sanctions and use diplomatic channels to convey their displeasure of sanction-busting attempts.2 To sum up, unilateral US economic sanctions will likely make a similar point in their game theoretical model that addresses the sender countries’ efforts to create and enforce laws as part of the sanctions process to effectively interrupt the economic transactions between their national firms and the target countries. They do not, however, consider the efforts by the sender countries that are specifically directed at the economic agents of third countries. 9 deter risk-free third party private and public actors from expanding economic ties with the sanctioned countries in order to avoid harming their economic and diplomatic relations with the sender. The second reason of why third countries will have less economic interactions with the targets following sanctions is related to the economic damage of sanctions on the targets. Economic sanctions are imposed to weaken target states economically so as to make them comply with the sender’s demands (Barber 1979; Hufbauer, Schott, and Elliott 1990). Because the US is a global economic power and a major trading country, the domestic economy of target states will suffer considerably from US sanctions due to the embargoes, boycotts, and financial restrictions imposed on them (Gibbons 1999; Weiss et al. 1997; Weiss 1999; Lektzian 2003). The immediate economic impact of sanctions such as imposing an embargo on the target’s products or withholding its financial assets will, in turn, reduce the target’s economic and financial ability to pay for imports from third countries. Therefore, since the target’s economic capacity is diminished by the sanctions, a negative spillover on the target’s economic transactions with third countries is likely. Thus, the general hypothesis resulting from the above discussion is that US sanctions will likely disrupt economic relations and thus lead to lower trade volumes between the target and third countries.

### Biotech & Pharm

#### Cuba opens up new markets like pharmaceutical and biotechnology to the United States

Spadoni 2010 [Paolo Spadoni 2010 assistant professor in the Department of Political Science at Augusta State Failed sanctions why the US sanctions against cuba could never work page 72-73]

Yet, more recent information shows that, with the exception of tourism¶ activities in Mexico and China, Cuba's most important investment operations¶ abroad have focused on biotechnology and pharmaceuticals joint¶ venture projects in East Asia (China, Malaysia, and India), the Middle¶ East (Iran), and Africa (Algeria and Namibia) (Perez Villanueva 2006).¶ Given the island's huge potential in these sectors,27 the Castro government¶ has begun to realize that investments overseas in knowledge-intensive¶ industries and the penetration of new markets may generate good profits and provide alternative hard currency resources for the development¶ of the Cuban economy. Washington's embargo does have an impact¶ on Cuba's internationalization strategy not only because Cuban products¶ cannot be exported to the United States but also because U.S.-based transnational¶ corporations dominate the global pharmaceutical market and¶ especially the higher-value first world markets. Even so, Havana's authorities¶ are stepping up efforts to tap developing and emerging market countries¶ where barriers to entry are relatively low and Cuban pharmaceutical¶ and biotechnology products face less severe licensing and registration¶ hurdles.

### No Medical Sales

#### No medical sales

Dominguez 2008 (Esteban Morales Dominguez: member of the Cuban Academy of Sciences, awarded three times by both the Cuban Academy of Sciences and the Ministry of Higher Education, and Gary Prevost: Professor of Political Science at St. John’s University and the College of St. Benedict in Minnesota, “United States- Cuban Relations A Critical History” 2008)

However, in the medical arena the restrictive provisions of the law have¶ been more successful in preventing meaningful trade. U.S. medical products¶ companies interested in selling to Cuba still face the 1992 Cuban Democracy¶ Act's insurmountable licensing hurdles. The small to midsize medical companies¶ most interested in such sales do not have the legal counsel necessary to¶ overcome these hurdles. The end result has been few Cuban purchases of U.S.¶ medicines and no progress on gaining a U.S. market for Cuban bio-medical¶ products, such as the Hepatitis B vaccine.

### Economic Decline Risks War

#### U.S. economic decline leads to war – economic growth controls the internal link into every scenario.

Andrés Cala master's in journalism and Michael J. Economides Professor of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering @ Cullen College of Engineering 2012; Americas blind spot Chavez, oil, and US security pages xix-xx

The MENA region though is a distraction from a rising China and an increasingly assertive Russia, indisputably America's two top priorities.The two are the only countries that could eventually be in a position to challenge the United States militarily and economically. Terrorism will remain a constant threat consuming massive resources and the hotspots in Afghanistan, nuclear-armed Pakistan, Yemen, and Somalia will not quiet down anytime soon. Stakes are also high between nuclear-armed¶ rivals Pakistan and India, the other rising power. Throw in nuclear¶ proliferations concerns from North Korea to the Middle East, and dozens of apparently less pressing concerns around the world, whether it's the¶ drug war or genocide in Africa, and the powder quake is complete. And yet this plate-full of trouble is not the worst that America has¶ faced. After all, nuclear wars have been averted, not to mention winning¶ two World Wars and one Cold War.¶ What makes the current challenges different though, more threatening¶ in fact, is the juncture. America's number one priority-at least this¶ decade-is the economy. Everything else depends on it. A weakened¶ economy simply makes America more vulnerable.¶ Economic growth in the United States is still stubbornly slow, while¶ Europe is in recession, even now into the fifth year of a global economic¶ crisis unprecedented since the Great Depression. While the world's¶ richest countries struggle, the developing world is leading growth, from¶ China and the former Soviet Union, to Latin America. The world order is¶ reshuffling, as it has many times, but arguably this is the biggest change¶ since World War II. America's national security now and for the next few¶ decades will be defined by its ability to weather this storm. That will entail¶ imposing its military supremacy in some quarters, but fundamentally¶ recovering its economic clout quickly, especially as regional powers¶ like Russia, China, India, Iran, Brazil, and others fill the power vacuum¶ increasingly left behind by the United States.¶ That doesn't mean that the United States is in decline, but rather that¶ many other countries are in ascent, including some that are not exactly¶ friendly. Considering the magnitude of the ongoing economic stagnation,¶ retrenchment is only natural. America will remain the single most¶ powerful country for some time. Western civilization led by the United¶ States is evolving to fix its model in crisis. It will regroup, no doubt, and¶ come back, but when it does it will meet a new multipolar world.¶ Restoring America's economic prowess is vital in this juncture, even¶ while the country continues to evolve amid an increasingly intertwined world. "Three years ago, we confronted the worst financial crisis in eight¶ decades. That crisis proved a fact that has become clearer with each¶ passing year-our fate is interconnected; in a global economy, nations¶ will rise, or fall, together:' President Barack Obama told the United¶ Nations General Assembly in September 2011.¶ To be sure, America's ability to assert itself globally will grow more¶ daunting for three reasons: its future is more tied to global affairs than¶ it has ever been; the United States is facing multiple short-, middle-, and¶ long-term threats that have forced the country to stretch its resources,¶ and a stagnant economy is weakening its ability to deal simultaneously¶ with multiple domestic and international issues. That is just the reality.¶ There is a lot going on now, even more expected in the future, and simply¶ not enough to go around.

## Telecommunications

### Inherency

#### 2009 directive didn’t solve – no sale of hardware/private sector response

**COA ’13** (Americas Society/Council of the Americas executive summary, “Seven Steps the U.S. President Can Take to Promote Change in Cuba by Adapting the Embargo”, <http://www.as-coa.org/articles/seven-steps-us-president-can-take-promote-change-cuba-adapting-embargo>) (JN)

On April 13, 2009, the President issued a memorandum containing directives designed to increase the free flow of information to the Cuban people and expand communications links between the United States and Cuba by, among other things, allowing for U.S. telecom providers to enter into agreements to establish fiber-optic cable and satellite telecommunications facilities linking the United States and Cuba, allow U.S. service providers to enter into roaming service agreements with Cuban providers, and for allow for the donation of consumer communications devices (CCDs) such as mobile phone systems, computers and satellite receivers. What they did not do was allow for the sale of hardware (handsets, cell towers, etc.) that would make many of these activities feasible or sufficiently profitable. As a result, the private sector response has been minimal.

#### President’s directive non-uniques your DA’s

**Piccone et al. 10** (Theodore J. Piccone, Christopher Sabatani, Carlos Saladrigas, study US-Cuba relations at the Brookings Institute, “Bridging Cuba’s Communication

Divide: How U.S. Policy Can Help”, <http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/events/2010/7/15%20cuba%20communications/07_cuba_telecommunications_piccone>) (JN)

On April 13, 2009, the President issued a directive to revise the scope of licensing policy regarding telecommunications in order to increase the flow of information between the United States and Cuba.

The memo contained directives to:

• Authorize U.S. telecom providers to enter into agreements to establish fiber-optic cable and satellite telecommunications facilities linking the United States and Cuba.

• License U.S. service providers to enter into roaming service agreements with Cuban providers.

• License U.S. satellite radio and satellite television providers to engage in transactions necessary to provide services to customers in Cuba.

• License persons subject to U.S. jurisdiction to pay for telecommunications, satellite radio, and satellite television services provided to individuals in Cuba.

• Authorize the export or re-export to Cuba of donated personal communications devices such as mobile phone systems, computers and satellite receivers.

#### Embargo increases regime’s control over communications

**Dodge ’10** (Katie Dodge, Bachelor of Arts (B.A.), Communications and English

University of Michigan, “The United States Embargo on Cuba”, <http://sitemaker.umich.edu/infosurgentscuba/u.s._embargo_>) (JN)

The embargo completely hinders Cubans from accessing the technology that would allow a free-flow of information with the rest of the world.  Citizens are cut off from the world around them, and even when they are able to access Internet cafés, the Internet is so slow and heavily monitored that it is virtually impossible to do more that send an email or two.  Dissidents are heavily persecuted, and it is common for journalists to be imprisoned for subverting the Cuban law.  Because of the embargo imposed by the United States, the Cuban government is given more power over its citizens and their abilities to communicate with the rest of the world. In addition, the restrictions on traveling into and out of the country make it difficult for information to spread in the absence of Internet access.

#### 2009 didn’t go far enough – Cuba looking for foreign help, lifting the embargo entirely is key

**Hartley ’09** (Darleen Hartley, staff writer, “US loosens Cuban embargo on technology”, <http://www.geek.com/chips/us-loosens-cuban-embargo-on-technology-741142/>) (JN)

The door swings both ways, though. Just because the US says companies can set up fiber optic and satellite links to Cuba, that doesn’t mean their citizens will be able to take advantage of those means of communicating with the outside world. A spokesman for a Florida-based international telecommunications company didn’t think open communications were something the Cuban government would encourage. The Miami Herald quoted Enrique Lopez as saying, ”Anything that attempts to bypass government control will be politely rejected.”

The US embargo that has been in place forced Cuba to settle for slow and expensive satellite links for Internet connectivity. To circumvent the US restrictions, [Wikileaks](http://wikileaks.org/wiki/Cuba_to_work_around_US_embargo_via_undersea_cable_to_Venezuela) reported that Cuba and Venezuela had quietly signed an agreement back in 2006 to cooperate on an undersea fiber-optic cable. The [Cuban News Agency](http://www.cubanews.ain.cu/2008/0609avanzaproyecto.htm)reported that two pairs of fiber-optics cables would connect the Venezuelan state of Vargas to the province of Santiago de Cuba, with the goal of increasing Cuba’s international communications. The cable was supposed to be in place by 2010. The current move by the US just might make that effort redundant.

### Access Restricted

#### Government restricting Cubans access now - access in the hands of the elite

**Piccone et al. 10** (Theodore J. Piccone, Christopher Sabatani, Carlos Saladrigas, study US-Cuba relations at the Brookings Institute, “Bridging Cuba’s Communication Divide: How U.S. Policy Can Help”, <http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/events/2010/7/15%20cuba%20communications/07_cuba_telecommunications_piccone>) (JN)

Cuba has the lowest level of internet penetration in the hemisphere and one of the lowest in the

world. By the Cuban government’s own estimates, 1.8 million users, or 13 percent of the population, have access to the internet, though international accounts place it substantially lower at about 2.6% penetration. Part of the reason for the discrepancy is that official statistics may include access both to the worldwide web as well as to Cuba’s internal network

or intranet. This is compared to internet penetration in Haiti of 23 percent. Ownership of personal

computers is considerably lower: 723,000, or 6.2 percent of the population.

In Cuba, the internet is primarily accessible to academics, government officials, foreigners, and tourists. Lack of access is the primary blocking tool used by the Cuban government to restrict the technology to the population at large. A censored version of the internet (more of an intranet) is offered through universities, secondary schools, post offices and government youth computer clubs, in line with a decree that the internet cannot be used in violation of the country’s moral principles or laws or jeopardize national security. To obtain access to the internet, users have to be approved by Etecsa, the state-owned telecommunications company, and a commission linked to the Committee for the Defense of the Revolution Act

### Boosts Cuban Econ

#### Allowing access to telecommunications is key to Cuba’s economy – 4 reasons

**Piccone et al. 10** (Theodore J. Piccone, Christopher Sabatani, Carlos Saladrigas, study US-Cuba relations at the Brookings Institute, “Bridging Cuba’s Communication Divide: How U.S. Policy Can Help”, <http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/events/2010/7/15%20cuba%20communications/07_cuba_telecommunications_piccone>) (JN)

Evidence has demonstrated a relationship between teledensity and quality of life indicators—even controlling for GDP—such as life expectancy, lower infant mortality rates, and the rate of formation and growth of new enterprises.2 The following are some of the positive benefits that access to modern ICT services could offer Cuban citizens today:

1) Improving the flow of economic and market information: Throughout the world connectivity has had a critical leveling effect for small producers—from fishermen to small manufacturers—cutting out middle men and allowing them to seek the best prices for their products. This information is also important for linking to global markets. A World Bank survey of 56 developed and developing countries found “a significant link between Internet access and trade growth—

with the greatest benefits accruing to developing countries with the weakest trade links.”3

2) Expanding access to finances and credit: Vodaphone and other mobile phone companies have

developed an array of applications that have expanded banking access through mobile banking.

Such innovations are particularly powerful for Cubans who could conceivably receive remittances and other financial transactions through mobile phones if the proper technology and infrastructure were in place.

3) Directly and indirectly generating a modernday workforce that can compete in today’s information-driven economy: Broad-based access to ICT is essential to competing in today’s global

information and knowledge-based economy by allowing communities and private individuals—

independent of the state—to gain skills, channels and capacity. The low barriers to entry ensure

that even the poor and rural sectors of the population can gain easy access.

4) Providing channels of communication to avert humanitarian disasters and assist in reconstruction efforts: The International Committee of the Red Cross has developed an effective

strategy using mobile phones not only to warn citizens of impending natural disasters, but also

to help guide them to safety and raise and deliver funds and humanitarian assistance after the tragedy passes.4

This is particularly relevant in hurricane-prone Cuba, where such systems could help

avert human loss if ICT services were placed in the hands of citizens. The long-term economic potential of the internet was forcefully articulated by Secretary of State Hillary Clinton last January: “…we know from long experience that promoting social and economic development in countries where people lack access to knowledge, markets, capital, and opportunity can

be frustrating and sometimes futile work. In this context, the internet can serve as a great equalizer. By providing people with access to knowledge and potential markets, networks can create opportunities where none exist.” Even incremental changes in expanding connectivity and access to ICT could go a long way toward alleviating the economic struggles and health and

human risks inherent in living under a closed, authoritarian regime. Ironically, however, current U.S. regulations restrict the very access necessary to make this happen. Expanding the opportunity for U.S. telecoms investors and companies to provide cell phone and

internet service to the island will help ensure that Cuban citizens possess the tools to become productive economic citizens once the shackles of political and economic state control are removed. To say this is not to deny or minimize the very real controls that the Cuban government places on its own citizens’ access to the internet. But expanding citizens’ access to even the most rudimentary technology in Cuba would be a giant step forward in economically empowering a new, independent generation of Cuban citizens.

#### Spreading ICT is key to Cuban economic growth – lifting the embargo allows it to spread

**Piccone et al. 10** (Theodore J. Piccone, Christopher Sabatani, Carlos Saladrigas, study US-Cuba relations at the Brookings Institute, “Bridging Cuba’s Communication

Divide: How U.S. Policy Can Help”, <http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/events/2010/7/15%20cuba%20communications/07_cuba_telecommunications_piccone>) (JN)

We know there is a strong correlation between access to ICT and economic growth and development. Conversely, the large investments required for ICT infrastructure will only take place when there is a revenue model to support the investment and provide investors with market-based rates of return. In the case of Cuba, this became clear with cellular phones. As little as five years ago, there were just a few thousand mobile phones in Cuba, almost all of them in the hands of government officials, foreigners and members of the elite. Since 2008, when President Raul Castro announced the lifting of the ban on cell phones, the number of cell phones is rapidly approaching one million. The reason is simple—cell phone revenues have become an important source of hard currency. The economic model outweighed political concerns.

It is unreasonable to hope for the development of other ICTs, such as the internet and social media, without economic models to make them work. Thus, the challenge for U.S. policymakers consists not only in effecting targeted reforms to its 50-year old embargo, but in broadly lifting all restrictions that hinder the development of an economic model capable of sustaining the requisite investments in ICT in Cuba, and the corresponding consumer demand for the services.

A piecemeal approach will simply not do the job. Laying this knowledge and infrastructure foundation is essential for the long-term economic prospects of the Cuban people. Getting there requires three steps: 1) more explicit and flexible U.S. regulations governing the export and investments in ICT infrastructure in Cuba; 2) more flexible U.S. regulations to allow for the development of an ICT consumer market in Cuba; and 3) the development of distance-learning programs on the technology, experiences and applications of ICT to economic and humanitarian activity.

#### Lack of access is preventing economic development in Cuba – no self-employment, no entrepreneurship

**Kalathil & Boas 01** (Shanthi Kalathil and Taylor C. Boas, writers for peer-reviewed journal for the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, “The Internet and state control in authoritarian regimes: China, Cuba, and the counterrevolution”, <http://firstmonday.org/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/876/785#k2>)

The implication of Internet use in the domestic economy poses a third potential challenge to the regime. While Cuba has been forced to implement some market reforms during the economic difficulties of the 1990s, it has generally contained them to the dollar–denominated, export–oriented sector of the economy. The regime has been quite reluctant to take steps that could generate class divisions between Cubans, and it looks disapprovingly upon the nouveau riche who have emerged from gains in tourism or the informal economy. Although the obstacles may be significant, the Internet could present another lucrative opportunity for enterprising Cubans to make money, potentially exacerbating social tensions. Indeed, Cubans have been allowed to pursue self–employment for several years, and a few have begun doing freelance Web design for international clients. These clients benefit from cheap labor costs, yet still pay more than Cubans typically earn through most other pursuits[[72](http://firstmonday.org/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/876/785" \l "72)]. But the government still controls Internet access for this handful of budding entrepreneurs, and as long as access does not become a freely available commodity, it would be impossible for such activity to grow faster than the government desires. As such, it is highly unlikely that any sort of “Internet class” will emerge in Cuba in the short to medium term

#### Lifting the telecommunications part of the embargo is key to economic growth – prepares the people

**CSG ’10** (Cuban Study Group, a non-partisan, not-for-profit organization whose executive director holds a B.A. in International Studies from American University in Washington, DC and an M.B.A. from the Kellogg School of Management at Northwestern University, “EMPOWERING THE CUBAN PEOPLE THROUGH ACCESS TO TECHNOLOGY”, <http://www.ascecuba.org/publications/proceedings/volume20/pdfs/cubastudygroupit.pdf>) (JN)

The power of information technology and social media to fuel economic growth, enhance communications and expand educational opportunities is one of the legacies of the last quarter century. Access to ICT is strongly correlated with economic growth and development throughout the world. As described in this report, there are several obstacles to the development of information technology in Cuba, including the impact of economic sanctions by the United

States. However, the primary reasons for Cuba’s underdevelopment in ICT stem from the Cuban government’s own policies, which aim to prioritize political control over economic development and information infrastructure. Broad reforms to U.S. sanctions against Cuba—as they relate to technology and telecommunications—along with expanded efforts to increase private donations and knowledge transfer from U.S. citizens to Cuban citizens, can go a long way toward preparing

the Cuban people for participation in broad-based, modern economic development under a more open political system

### Democracy IL

#### Democratic movements are ineffective due to a lack of communications tech and economic opportunities

**Utset 08** (Xavier Utset, independent consultant, “The Cuban Democracy Movement: An Analytical Overview”, <http://cri.fiu.edu/research/commissioned-reports/cuban-demo-utset.pdf>) (JN)

Cuban democracy groups generally possess weak organizational structures that increase their vulnerability to repression. Many are loosely organized while others, interestingly, possess countless position titles and departments with little practical utility given the small size of organizations. Roles and responsibilities are often vaguely or informally defined only informally and the leadership style in some groups is excessively personalistic.

The harsh environment is obviously a deterrent to the neat set up of organizations. In Cuba it is impossible to have office spaces, membership recruitment is dangerous, open advocacy is illegal, and constant harassment makes the coordination of tasks extremely challenging. Resources that are taken for granted in other places (such as paper, pens, laptops, phones, and other ordinary office devices) are unavailable, illegal, or extremely expensive. A factor that is virtually impossible to address by the groups is sustainability. Hardly surprising, the authorities routinely cut activists off economic opportunities and force them to depend on the assistance of external actors such as family, friends, and international NGOs.

In general terms, organizations are caught up in the grind of daily survival and, consequently, spend little to no time on strategic planning, analyzing their own strengths and weaknesses or those of the State, understanding what makes their target constituencies tick, or designing initiatives that appeal said target constituencies. Coalition-building capacity is weak. While groups may be able to align around common goals, they are rarely able to coordinate common action. Activist recruitment appears to depend excessively on strong links of interpersonal trust, which minimizes the risk of infiltration but also reduces the capacity to reach larger and diversified pools of people. 15 Translation: “assault force.” Page 9 of 13

Communications continue to be a serious challenge for democracy groups. E-mail, phone, and fax are either insecure or unreliable, and transportation is either unavailable or excessively expensive. Certain disconnect between activists in Havana and those in the rural areas continues to exist, as the latter often feel orphan from and forgotten by the more visible activists in the capital city.

#### No access to communications prevents reform

**Mohr 07** (LaKindra Mohr, part of the SAIS review of International Affairs which publishes essays that straddle the boundary between scholarly inquiry and practical experience in its search to bring a fresh and policy-focused perspective to global political, economic, and security questions, “State Control of the Internet Reins in Cuba's Future”, <http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/sais_review/v027/27.2mohr.html>) (JN)

The Internet is considered an important tool in democratic development, supplying the masses with a powerful and far reaching means of communication. With unrestricted access, it can bolster democratic ideals and pluralism by providing a forum for the freedom of expression, the sharing of ideas, and access to independent sources of information. As Shanthi Kalathil and Taylor Boas note, advocates for change in civil society "may use the Internet to support their activities in a variety of ways, including logistical organization and the public dissemination of information," to challenge the stronghold of a regime in power.[1](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/sais_review/v027/27.2mohr.html" \l "FOOT1) However, restrictions on this communication channel can not only hinder but also eliminate the role of the Internet in stirring a social undercurrent for political change. As a prime example, the Cuban government's virtual monopoly over Internet access and its use remains a serious impediment to mobilizing a pro-democracy opposition movement.

Internet control in Cuba has involved a combination of proactive and reactive strategies, all serving to consolidate the power of the regime. These strategies range from using the Internet to distribute government propaganda, to censoring content and limiting connectivity.[2](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/sais_review/v027/27.2mohr.html" \l "FOOT2) While the government has allowed some Internet access, particularly for intra-governmental communications, limited international correspondence, and select academic institutions and business enterprises, it continues to dictate permissible content, and monitor and restrict Internet use.[3](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/sais_review/v027/27.2mohr.html" \l "FOOT3) It has also made it [End Page 151] increasingly difficult or prohibitively expensive for ordinary Cuban citizens to acquire Internet service.[4](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/sais_review/v027/27.2mohr.html" \l "FOOT4) In fact, most Cubans are unable to afford even the basic hardware, software, and connectivity fees that would gain them access.[5](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/sais_review/v027/27.2mohr.html" \l "FOOT5)Consequently, the use of the Internet as a tool for political organization is severely limited, adding to the obstacles that activist groups in civil society face in promoting regime change.

One of the components that Juan López identifies as missing in Cuban civil society is the ability of a large proportion of the Cuban population to regularly access independent channels of communication.[6](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/sais_review/v027/27.2mohr.html" \l "FOOT6) In Cuba, this vital element is lacking in part because of the government's control of the Internet, and other forms of media in general. Without this channel, López argues, civil society activists struggle to disseminate information, educate citizens, and mobilize more of the population—activities that could ultimately challenge the regime and empower the Cuban people.[7](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/sais_review/v027/27.2mohr.html" \l "FOOT7) By restricting the use of the Internet, which functions as a fairly reliable, independent line of communication in open societies, the government has eliminated an effective means of interaction and dialogue for civil society. While underground Internet activity exists, the government has thus far prevented it from becoming a meaningful threat, and its use is unlikely to be widespread enough to cultivate and support a prolonged, broad based opposition movement anytime soon.

Overall, although there are many factors that have impeded the voices of opposition in Cuba, the inability of activist groups to utilize the Internet has been detrimental to their efforts to foster pluralism and confront the status quo. The government's domination over the flow of information through the Internet, as well as through the media in general, has restricted free expression, the flow of ideas, and regular access to independent channels of communication. This reality will continue to be a major barrier in civil society's attempts to reach out to Cubans across the island and mobilize pressure for a regime change in the short term. While the inevitable departure of Fidel Castro raises many questions about Cuba's future, one relative certainty is that the government has sufficient control over the content and use of the Internet to minimize any destabilizing effect it may have in the near future.

#### Removing the embargo is key to combat totalitarianism – communications generate ideological and political autonomy

**CSG ’10** (Cuban Study Group, a non-partisan, not-for-profit organization whose executive director holds a B.A. in International Studies from American University in Washington, DC and an M.B.A. from the Kellogg School of Management at Northwestern University, “EMPOWERING THE CUBAN PEOPLE THROUGH ACCESS TO TECHNOLOGY”, <http://www.ascecuba.org/publications/proceedings/volume20/pdfs/cubastudygroupit.pdf>) (JN)

Given the statutory prohibition against the export to Cuba—even by donation—of equipment

that contributes to Cuba’s domestic infrastructure, the issuance of this license exception indicates that, in the USG’s judgment, these items do not constitute items that comprise infrastructure. Also clear, however, is that the regulatory agencies chose to stop short of issuing a license exception for the commercial export of these same items by U.S. companies. It is time to revisit the sanctions regime imposed before communications played the vital role in U.S. foreign policy deliberations that it does today.

There is no question that U.S. investments could bring hard currency to the Cuban regime. After all, the regime owns all telecommunications infrastructure; even some of the money spent in the black market eventually ends up in the regime’s coffers. However, it is also clear that totalitarianism thrives on isolation. The Cuban government controls access to currency, information and people, precisely because these provide something dangerous to everyday citizens: empowerment. Acclaimed Cuban blogger Yoani Sánchez argues that access to “resources and money” from Americans, like access to the Internet, would benefit Cuban citizens: “For our part, [we] would benefit from the injection of money that these tourists from the north would spend in alternative services networks...without a doubt, economic autonomy would result in ideological and political autonomy, in real empowerment.”

#### Access to tech key to democracy – empowers and unifies Cubans

**Henken 6/24/13** (Ted A. Henken, resident, Association for the Study of the Cuban Economy, Associate Professor, Sociology and Anthropology, “Internet lets Cubans transcend geography and speech curbs, dissident tells” <http://www.demdigest.net/blog/2013/05/internet-lets-cubans-transcend-geography-and-speech-curbs-dissident-tells-forum/>) (JN)

New technologies are allowing Cuba’s independent voices “to narrate and to try to change our reality,” says a leading dissident.

“Here in Stockholm it has felt rather like Cuba, though certainly not because of the weather,” Yoani Sanchez writes from the Swedish capital’s Internet Forum, referring to the presence of the young attorney Laritza Diversent, the director of Estado de SATS, Antonio Rodiles, the blogger Miriam Celaya, the information engineer Eliecer Avila, and the independent reporter Roberto Guerra.

“The Internet Forum has allowed us to feel like citizens of the world, to share experiences with those who live in different situations but, in essence, surprisingly similar ones,” she notes. “It’s enough to chat with another attendee for a little while, or to listen to a talk, to realize that in every word spoken here is the eternal human quest for knowledge, information… freedom.”

The Center for Latin American and Caribbean Studies (CLACS) of New York University and the Association for the Study of the Cuban Economy (ASCE) invite you to join a Panel Discussion on the “Internet and Society in Today’s Cuba.”

The event will take place at noon, on Wednesday, June 5, 2013 in the King Juan Carlos Center, 53 Washington Square South, New York.

#### Access overcomes digital divide and leapfrogs a reform movement

**Henken ’10** (Ted Henken, Doctorate in Latin American Studies from Tulane University. He is an Associate Professor and Chair of the Black and Hispanic Studies Department at Baruch College, City University of New York. Henken also holds a joint appointment in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology.“THE INTERNET AND EMERGENT BLOGOSPHERE IN CUBA:

DOWNLOADING DEMOCRACY, BOOTING UP DEVELOPMENT,

OR PLANTING THE VIRUS OF DISSIDENCE AND

DESTABILIZATION?”,<http://www.ascecuba.org/publications/proceedings/volume20/pdfs/henken.pdf>) (JN)

For many governments, especially those like the Cuban government that struggle against underdevelopment and the “digital divide” that continues to separate wealthy from poor countries in terms of Internet cost and connectivity, new ICT has the potential to

be harnessed as a veritable “economic miracle” allowing a country to “leapfrog” into the modern era. At the same time, citizen journalists and blogger-activists often understand the web (and especially the potentialities offered in many web 2.0 applications and

the cutting edge mobile technologies made widely accessible by the new generation of smart phones) as a kind of revolutionary “Roman senate” where they

can open up a closed system carrying out a “netroots” reform movement they like to call “blogostroika.”

Relations IL

### Relations IL

#### Telecommunications are a first step to good relations with Cuba – government and people are motivated

**Gonzalez ’09** (Marco A. Gonzalez, Jr., past President and the current General Counsel of the Hispanic Bar Association of New Jersey, “"Can You Hear Me Now? Sí?": Is There a U.S.-Cuba Telecommunications Revolution on the Horizon?”, <http://www.duanemorris.com/articles/article3261.html>) (JN)

After 47 years of a stalemate in United States-Cuba relations as a result of the Castro regime and the trade embargo, the state of communications between Americans and the 12 million inhabitants of Cuba may be changing. Many have criticized President Obama's April 13 announcement that he is lifting some of the restrictions as not going far enough. However, a closer look at the Obama administration's decision to allow telecommunications service between the two countries demonstrates that this is a significant first step toward reestablishing social, economic and, eventually, political ties between the people of the United States and Cuba.

Many Americans have an incomplete and inaccurate view of the people, natural resources and economy of the largest island in the Caribbean. Most of what they know about Cuba relates to its former head of state, Fidel Castro. To fully understand Cuba's potential for economic, social and political change under an embargo-free relationship with America, one must look at the state of Cuba in 2009.

Undoubtedly, Cubans have suffered under almost 50 years of rule by the Castro brothers, the U.S. embargo and the termination of the billions of dollars in aid that had been provided by the former Soviet Union before its collapse in 1990. Despite the plight of the Cuban people, what many Americans do not realize is that Cuba is rich in natural and human resources, with the potential to transform the country into a market economy along the lines of China and Vietnam. Vietnam's experimentation with a capitalist economy has not been lost on the Cubans. Cuba has been sending scores of government and military officials to Hanoi to learn Vietnam's lessons. With a literacy rate of 97 percent, and a reputation for persistence and hard work, Cubans will make an effective and productive workforce. The country's 3,700 miles of beautiful coastline will continue to attract vacationers and perhaps ecotourists. Its valuable deposits of cobalt, nickel, iron, chromium, copper, gold, salt, timber, silica and petroleum as well as its arable land can develop a foundation for sustained economic growth. Because of its past relationship and proximity to the continental United States, should the United States completely lift the embargo, Cuba has the potential to become America's most significant trading partner in the Caribbean.

In addition, many Americans do not realize that, in many ways, Cuba has taken its own steps forward into the 21st Century. American businesses will have to be prepared psychologically to perceive Cuba as a market that is already fairly developed and sophisticated. The Cubans are tough negotiators. However, they can – and want to – become loyal business partners with the United States. American businesses will have an important future role in a post-embargo Cuban economy, but they will have to work hard to secure a position in light of competition from Europe and from the rest of Latin America.

Vestiges of the Revolution

The United States and Cuba will have to address many difficult issues before they can become full trading partners. An impediment to expanded trade with Cuba involves the 5,900 claims made against the Cuban government by Americans and Cubans who had their property and assets nationalized by Castro following the revolution. These claimants must work with Congress and the Obama administration in seeking a practical framework with the Cuban government to resolve existing claims. Other key issues that must be addressed to establish greater engagement between the countries include human rights and expanded political and economic freedom for ordinary Cubans. The shift of power from Fidel Castro to Raul Castro also indicates that there will not be an overnight or "big bang" transition to a multi-party political democracy or a market economy after the Castro era. Still, if the United States was able to reconcile and establish political and economic ties with former adversary Vietnam - history shows that America often finds the way to heal relationships with former adversaries - there is little doubt that it could do the same with Cuba. With President Obama's campaign promise to move away from the embargo, now is the time for American business interests to start formulating a strategy for doing business with Cuba.

First Step - Telecommunications

The first step toward full engagement with Cuba is through communications, specifically telecommunications. This is why the Obama administration's partial lifting of the embargo with respect to telecommunications makes sense and is a significant move for many reasons.

When two countries have had such limited and sensitive ties for almost two generations, it is difficult to conceive how reengagement – the exchange of ideas, knowledge and culture and the realization of dormant economic potential – can ensue and progress without a connected, modern telecommunications infrastructure. President Obama's recent Cuba policy directive to the U.S. Departments of Commerce and the Treasury serves to reestablish and foster social and family communications between Americans and Cubans. This is also a huge benefit to American business, which can rely on new fiber optic and satellite connections with the island for future, post-embargo economic activity. Expanded telephone, cell phone, Internet and satellite connectivity with Cuba will lay the foundation for short- and long-term promotion of liberal economic and political dialogue with generations of Cubans (including the millions born after the revolution). These Cubans will welcome the Internet and 21st-century technological advances that include Facebook, MySpace, Twitter, Google and YouTube. What better way to sow the seeds of change in Cuba than to offer ordinary Cubans reliable and inexpensive cell phone and Internet access? While it is likely that, at least initially, the Cuban government may censor or filter many websites and content that it deems a threat – as the Chinese people know all too well from their experience with government censorship of the Web – it is hard to return to the "dark ages" once you go online. Once online, people find a way to stay connected, circumvent restrictions and communicate.

Many have criticized the Cuban government's recent lifting of the ban prohibiting ordinary Cubans from purchasing cell phone service because the price of the equipment and service is out of reach for a majority of Cubans. Despite the cost, at the close of 2008 – only months after the new policy went into effect – almost 500,000 new cell phone accounts were registered in Cuba. Some of the new cell phone accounts are commercial, but the majority are Alternative Fixed Telephone accounts (Teléfonos Fijos Alternativos), which offer cell phone access for a fixed amount of minutes.

In a recent online article in Cibercuba News, Lena Campos reported that "more frequently every day, one can see more Cubans in the street carrying and talking on cell phones." Notwithstanding the significant cost involved in securing mobile phone technology, Cubans are finding a way to obtain it. Should U.S. companies set up expanded, affordable telecommunications and satellite capabilities with the island, Cubans will determine a method – indeed, they may even pressure Cuban authorities – to expand Internet and cell phone connectivity.

In great part because of the U.S. embargo, Cuba's access to the Internet is via a costly satellite connection with limited bandwidth. Therefore, public access to the Internet is limited, and when access is available, download speeds can be quite slow (taking hours in some cases to download large multimedia files). Accordingly, in 2008, Cuba announced a costly plan to lay a 1,500-kilometer (950 mile) undersea fiber optic cable between Cuba and Venezuela. However, in a recent interview with a local youth publication, an official from the Cuban Ministry of Computer Science and Communication stated that while there is a desire for "larger numbers of [Cubans] to have Internet access," the government believes that the "most responsible policy is to privilege collective access," that is, to limit access for the "collective" benefit of the island. In spite of the added bandwidth that the Cuba-Venezuela undersea connection will bring to the island, most Cubans will likely be denied access to this new connectivity in the short term.

This development is important because President Obama's recent change in policy may apply some pressure on the Cuban government to reach a deal resulting in expanded, fast and affordable Internet access for ordinary Cubans with a direct fiber optic connection between the United States and Cuba. Perhaps just as important is President Obama's lifting of restrictions to allow U.S. telecommunications service providers to enter into and operate under roaming service agreements with their Cuban counterparts. Right now, aside from the larger cities and municipalities, cell phone coverage is limited in Cuba. Should the U.S. government write new telecommunications rules to allow U.S. service providers to set up roaming cell points to areas not yet covered in Cuba, that will allow for expanded communications with the Cuban people and, of course, would establish the framework for modern business and personal telecommunications with isolated but strategically important sectors of the island. Entering into such roaming agreements with American telecoms also will allow ETECSA1 and other Cuban telecom entities to provide cheaper mobile access to Cubans.

Conclusion

The Cuban government and the Cuban people have long wanted to reengage in trade with the United States. With the economic downturn now affecting foreign investment in the island from Latin America and Europe, and the massive losses and damages to property and infrastructure that Cuba has suffered from recent hurricane seasons, increased motivation exists for the Cuban government to realize the benefits of reestablishing economic ties with the United States, creating the economy of a future New Cuba. By executing a modern, affordable and efficient telecommunications foundation with the United States, Cuba can leverage the new technology and its human capital to expand its knowledge-based industries, such as information technology and biotechnology.

While Cuba initially may rebuff attempts from U.S. telecommunications companies to enter into agreements pursuant to the Obama administration's new policy, failure to establish fiber optic cable and satellite telecommunications facilities linking the two countries would likely place the Cuban government in an awkward, defensive position in the eyes of many Cubans. It would not be surprising if the new regulations authorizing U.S. companies to negotiate telecommunications deals with Cuba require U.S. companies and Cuban telecoms to include a guarantee or good-faith commitment from ETECSA to provide greater access to ordinary Cubans. With the government-controlled press in Cuba liberally publicizing President Obama's recent policy change, most Cubans fully support and welcome the opportunity for greater ties with the American people.

### Helps US industry

#### Lifting the communications embargo is critical to US communication sector

**Simpkins ’09** (Jason Simpkins, managing editor for Money Morning, “Will Obama Lift the Trade Embargo Against Cuba?”, <http://moneymorning.com/2009/04/22/obama-cuba-embargo/>) (JN)

It's too early to assess the impact of these measures on businesses, but analysts anticipate that airline carriers, Internet and telephone service providers, and bank services companies will benefit from new business opportunities.

"This is a big deal; it's a significant change in U.S. policy," former Ambassador David A. Gross, the U.S. coordinator for international communications and information policy and a partner at the law firm Wiley Rein, told the Los Angeles Times.

Telecommunications carriers will now potentially be able to establish roaming agreements with Cuban carriers, Gross said. That would make it possible for Cuban Americans to buy cell phones and payment plans in the United States and send them to Cuba for their relatives to use.

The government said Monday that it would allow U.S. telecom providers to establish fiber-optic cable services linking the United States to Cuba. Access to thousands of potential new customers would benefit any number of U.S. communications companies and Internet service providers. Television and radio companies, such as Sirius XM Radio Inc. (SIRI), could also potentially provide service to Cuba.

The Obama administration will also allow computers, software and phones to be donated to Cuba without a government license.

#### Telecommunications key to the US economy – part of every sector EW ’10 (Economy Watch, “U.S Telecom Industry”, <http://www.economywatch.com/world-industries/telecommunications/us-telecom-industry.html>) (JN)

Telecommunication industry is the key force of American economy. U.S. telecommunication industry extends it's activities in almost every sector, from education to health care or banking and finance. U.S. telecom industry enables an overall of 75% U.S. labor productivity gains.

Prime objectives of U.S. telecommunication industry

U.S. telecommunication industry designed to achieve the target of creating more than 212,000 jobs in it's telecommunication industry. Besides creating new job opportunities, some other objectives of U.S. telecommunication industry include adding customer value by providing them innovative services like VoIP (Voice over Internet Protocol), creating an overall of $58 billion capital investment opportunities and generating $113 billion new revenues in it's telecom industry.

#### Cuba is the goldmine for telecommunications, but sanctions give regime control over access

**Devereux and Schmidt ’11** (Charlie Devereux and Blake Schmidt, staff writers for Bloomberg, “Chavez Beats AT&T to Cuban Telecom `Gold Mine' as Dispute on Pricing Bites”, <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2011-01-26/chavez-beats-at-t-to-cuba-telecom-market-as-price-dispute-bites.html>) (JN)

Cuba is the gold mine everyone is after in Latin America,” Jose Magana, a senior analyst at Pyramid, said in a phone interview. “Pressure will build on the U.S. government to let U.S. companies participate in the opening of Cuba’s market.”

Bandwidth in Cuba can reach a maximum of about 2 megabytes per second, compared with a U.S. average of 5 megabytes and more than 12 megabytes in [South Korea](http://topics.bloomberg.com/south-korea/), Magana said.

Cuban state phone company Empresa de Telecomunicaciones de Cuba S.A., or Etecsa, has a monopoly on all fixed-line and mobile services. Milan-based [Telecom Italia SpA](http://www.bloomberg.com/quote/TIT:IM) has a 27 percent stake in the Havana-based company.

The 56-year-old Chavez calls former President [Fidel Castro](http://topics.bloomberg.com/fidel-castro/), 84, a father figure and sends about 100,000 barrels of oil a day to Cuba. On Jan. 15 he said that the new link will bring the countries even closer and benefit private Venezuelan companies.

Chavez in 2007 paid investors including Verizon, which owned a 28.5 percent stake, $1.3 billion to nationalize Compania Anonima Nacional Telefonos de Venezuela, or Cantv.

Restrictions Eased

Obama’s easing of telecommunications restrictions toward Cuba ”did not go far enough” and contains ”contradictory” elements, said Tomas Bilbao, executive director of the Cuba Study Group.

“No U.S. company has found it attractive to try to make that type of investment,” Bilbao said in a phone interview, adding that improvements in connectivity will make it more difficult for the Cuban government to justify restrictions on Internet freedom. “The void left by U.S. sanctions has provided a perfect opportunity for [Hugo Chavez](http://topics.bloomberg.com/hugo-chavez/) to save the day.”

### A2 Regime Blocks It

#### Regime welcomes it – their evidence in context of 2009 – not lifting the entire embargo

**Frank ’10** (Marc Frank, Freelance journalist in Havana working for Reuters, the Financial Times and ABC News, “Cuba reports little Internet and telecom progress”, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2010/06/18/us-cuba-telecom-idUSTRE65H3H320100618>) (JN)

There is no broadband in Cuba and the relatively few Internet users in the country suffer through agonizingly long waits to open an e-mail, let alone view a photo or video. This also hampers government and business operations.

Cuba blames the United States embargo, saying it must use a satellite system and is limited in the space it can buy.

Last year, in a move easing some aspects of Washington's 48-year-old embargo against Cuba, President Barack Obama allowed U.S. telecommunications firms to offer services in Cuba as part of a strategy to increase "people to people" contact.

While Cuba's leaders welcomed the move, they reiterated their demand that Washington completely lift the embargo and to date there has been no progress, business sources said.

# A2 Off Case Positions

## A2 CPs

### Only Full Lifting Solves

#### Unilateral lifting key – ANY quid pro quo shifts the blame back to the U.S.

Ratliff & Fontaine 2k (Ratliff, William - research fellow at Stanford University, PhD (Chinese/Latin American histories) from U of Washington; Roger Fontaine. Former Director of Latin American Affairs, National Security Council.) "A Strategic Flip-Flop in the Caribbean." Lift the Embargo on Cuba (2000).p61-62

In l999, the United States even struck a deal to lift the embargo on Stalinist North Korea and the discussions in Northern Ireland are serious if incomplete. Is Castro really more intractable than Mao and Arafat and Kim? There are two basic ways to lift the embargo however intractable Castro proves to be: all at once or piecemeal. Lifting it unilaterally and all at once would be the better way to go. The act should be accompanied by clear statements that Castro has been dropped from America’s “Most Wanted” to its “Least Relevant” list. The point is not that declaring a one-sided truce with Castro—by lifting the embargo—will necessarily bring democracy to and improved human rights in Cuba but rather that the embargo has not brought these either, shows no signs whatsoever of being able to do so in the future, and has many actual and potential bad side effects. In fact, past experiences suggest that lifting the embargo, like earlier conciliatory gestures, may even spark a negative reaction from Castro.128 If so, so be it. It is time for Washington politicians to make policy on behalf of this nation as a whole irrespective of the pressures of interested constituencies here or abroad. Unilateral lifting of the sanctions is less practical, however, than a gradualism that doesn’t force members of Congress to stand tall on an issue of little importance to most Americans but of passionate concern to a small, politically aggressive minority. It would be better to lift the embargo piecemeal than not at all if we do so on our own rationally decided timetable, irrespective of what outrageous actions Fidel Castro may undertake. Many embargo supporters will not even contemplate lifting the sanctions while the Castro brothers are in power. This is by deﬁnition a nonstarter. Seemingly more realistic sanctions supporters speak of an essential quid pro quo and say that the United States needs genuine reform in Cuba—or at the very least an “excuse” or cover—to lift the embargo. But this argument is equally problematical. A quid pro quo or indirect negotiation path gives Castro the opportunity to shift the focus of discussion from his own domestic failures and repression, and what would increasingly be his own international irrelevance, to U.S. interference in Cuban affairs. In effect it gives him a veto over U.S. policy. Therefore the path of giving U.S. politicians a “way out” won’t in fact work because Castro will twist it to his interests. Better to just do it unilaterally on our own timetable. For the time being it appears U.S. policy will remain reactive—to Castro and to Cuban American pressure groups—irrespective of the interests of Americans and Cubans as a whole. Like parrots, all presidential hopefuls in the 2000 presidential elections propose varying versions of the current failed policy. We have made much here of the negative role of the Cuba lobby, but we close by reiterating that their advocacy has not usually been different in kind from that of other pressure groups, simply much more effective. The buck falls on the politicians who cannot see the need for, or are afraid to support, a new policy for the post–cold war world.

### PICs fail

#### The Embargo fails – cuba will just get support for excluded products elsewhere

Seaman 2010 (David Seaman, Research Assistant and Lecturer at the University of Osnabrück – Department of social sciences, “U.S. Democracy Promotion- The Case of Cuba” - 2010)

While the U.S. embargo creates an extremely difficult economic situation¶ in Cuba, the island is able to find relief from much of the economic¶ pressure in several ways. Firstly, the lack of international support for the¶ embargo has made it possible for Cuba to continuously find substitute¶ trading partners and adapt to new and changing circumstances, helping fill¶ the void created by the end of the massive Soviet subsidies and aid. Cuba¶ enjoys trade with several Western capitalist states, foremost Canada, Spain,¶ and the Netherlands, Cuba's three largest Western trading partners. Most¶ recently, the country has developed close trade relations with Venezuela and¶ China, which together now make up more than 50% off all trade for Cuba¶ (Mesa/Lago 2007, 10). As Cuba's largest trading partners, the various trade¶ agreements, investments, and generous credit lines extended to Cuba by¶ these two countries have done much to keep the Cuban economy intact and¶ help bolster economic growth- reported at an exceptional rate of 9.5% for¶ the year 2007 (Bertelsmann Stiftung 2007, 16). Both countries serve as¶ Cuba's main source of imports and provide large markets for Cuba's¶ exports. In particular, Venezuela under the government of Hugo Chavez has¶ emerged as Cuba's key trading partner. The close cooperation between the¶ two countries allows for subsidized Venezuelan oil to Cuba while also¶ providing a large export market for Cuba's surplus of highly trained medical¶ and educational labor force. In fact, the export of medical and educational¶ services to many developing countries has become a major foreign currency¶ earner for the Cuban Government (Ibid., 13).

A second factor, which helps relieve pressure from the embargo, is the¶ inconsistency of the U.S. policy itself, by allowing for agriculture trade in¶ accordance with the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act.¶ While the law stipulates that Cuba must provide cash payments in advance,¶ it has not hindered a modest growth in U.S. agriculture exports to Cuba.¶ Cuban officials report the amount of these agriculture purchases to have¶ reached roughly $500 million annually (McKinley 2007). Other sources,¶ however, put this figure at only slightly over $400 million (U .S.-Cuba Trade¶ and Economic Council 2008, 2). In any case, these purchases have the¶ minor effect of lowering overall costs of food importation due to the close¶ vicinity of the two countries, which translates into lower transportation costs¶ paid by the Cuban purchaser.

Thirdly, Cuban emigration to the United States serves the function of a¶ "safety valve," helping to relieve economic and political pressures created¶ by the embargo (Hoffmann/Whitehead 2006, 18). Under the migration¶ accords negotiated during the Clinton Administration, the United States¶ takes 20,000 Cuban emigrants annually. This number is even larger due to¶ the United States' "wet foot-dry foot" policy, whereby any Cuban who¶ reaches the U.S. is granted asylum and those who are picked up in the¶ waters are sent back to Cuba (U.S. Congressional Research Service 2005,¶ 31; hereafter USCRS). Thus, while the U.S. sanctions ultimately seek to¶ raise the specter of antigovernment activity on the island, many Cubans,¶ encouraged by the U.S. immigration policy, choose to express their economic¶ disaffection by voting with their feet, not their voice.

### Gitmo CP links to Politics

#### Gitmo will stay closed- House vote

**McAuliff 6-14-13** (Michael McAuliff Washington correspondent for the New York Daily News, national and metro desk editor for Huffington Post, he was the national editor of ABCNews.com. national editor of crime-news site APB News.com. He went to Brooklyn College) ( “Guantanamo Bay To Stay Open As House Blocks Bill To Close Infamous Prison” Huffington Post June 14, 2013 <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/06/14/guantanamo-bay-close_n_3438347.html> //BLOV)

WASHINGTON -- A worsening [hunger strike](http://www.salon.com/2013/06/13/top_doctors_gitmo_is_a_medical_ethics_free_zone/) and a **fresh plea by President Barack Obama to** [**close the Guantanamo Bay prison**](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/05/23/obama-drones_n_3327094.html) **fell on deaf ears in Congress Friday**, as the House of Representatives voted to keep the increasingly infamous jail open. **The House voted to make it harder for Obama to begin shifting inmates,** [**adding a restriction**](http://amendments-rules.house.gov/amendments/01461013152600260.pdf) **to the** [**National Defense Authorization Act of 2014**](http://thomas.loc.gov/home/gpoxmlc113/h1960_ih.xml)that bars any of the roughly 56 prisoners who have been cleared by military and intelligence officials to be sent to Yemen from being transferred there for one year. Some 30 other Gitmo inmates of the 166 kept there have also been cleared for release. "**The Defense Department should not transfer detainees to Yemen because they represent some of the most dangerous terrorists known in the world,**" said Rep. Jackie Walorski (R-Ind.), who sponsored the fresh ban on shipping anyone out of Gitmo. **Rep**. **Adam Smith (D-Wash.), who offered a competing amendment to create** [**a plan to close Gitmo**](http://amendments-rules.house.gov/amendments/AS2612130956185618.pdf), found the new restriction especially ironic, noting that federal authorities believe the Yemeni detainees are safe enough to be set free. "Not everybody that we rounded up and took to Guantanamo, unfortunately, turned out to be the very dangerous terrorists that we thought they were," Smith said, adding that continuing to hold them -- at a facility costing $1.6 million a year for each inmate -- was not sensible. "Determining that if there is any minimimal threat whatsoever we're simply going to hold them forever is, well, quite frankly, un-American. That is contrary to our values to say we're going to hold somebody indefinitely -- I gather forever -- because we think there might possibly be some risk," Smith said. "That's not the way the Constitution is supposed to work." **Walorski's amendment passed, 236 to 188. Smith's, also backed by Reps. Jim Moran (D-Va.) and Jerry Nadler (D-N.Y.), failed 174 to 249 after Republicans argued that it was simply too dangerous to send terrorsim suspects to the United States.**

## A2 Ks

### Neolib Inevitable

#### **Corporations find ways around sanctions – Cuba isn’t protected from economic systems – just US companies**

Spadoni 2010 [Paolo Spadoni 2010 assistant professor in the Department of Political Science at Augusta State Failed sanctions why the US sanctions against cuba could never work page xxi-xxiii]

Globalization and greater economic openness make target countries¶ more vulnerable to comprehensive and fully enforced multilateral sanctions.¶ Today, this kind of foreign pressure is potentially more harmful¶ than it was a few decades ago as the world's economies are growingly connected¶ through international trade in goods and services, transnational¶ capital flows (foreign direct and portfolio investment, loans, and aid), and¶ cross-border remittances by migrant entrepreneurs (Van Bergeijk 1995, 448). However, the same transnational linkages that enhance the impact¶ of multilateral coercion on a target country also make the latter less vulnerable¶ to unilateral sanctions with little or no international cooperation.¶ With the declining dominance in the world economy of the United States,¶ most U.S. unilateral sanctions simply transfer business from U.S. firms to¶ foreign competitors in the same market. Interestingly, Hufbauer, Schott,¶ and Elliott revealed that in several episodes either provoked or derived¶ from East-West rivalry during the cold war, adversaries of the sender¶ country (referred to as "black knights") assisted the target, thus eroding¶ the chances of the sanctions' success. They predicted that, with the end¶ of the cold war, "black knights may in the future be less likely to appear¶ on the sanctions scene to rescue target countries" (Hufbauer et al. 1990,¶ 96-97). But in the late 1990s, Schott (1998) warned: "Too often the economic¶ impact of our (U.S.) sanctions is offset by alternative suppliers of¶ goods and capitals whose governments agree with our goals but not the¶ tactics to achieve them."¶ In other words, transnational actors such as multinational corporations¶ and international migrants, often based in countries that share the¶ same objectives of most U.S. sanctions, could be the black knights in today's¶ global marketplace as their activities sustain huge flows of capital¶ across national borders, including those of target nations. And in some¶ cases, as the importance of Cuban-American remittances in the Cuban¶ economy suggests, rescuers might be located in the same country that has¶ placed economic coercion at the center of its foreign policy. Although the¶ fundamental assumption of most research on sanctions is that they are¶ an activity between states (Morgan and Bapat 2003, 65), transnational actors'¶ practices and their economic impact on target nations should receive¶ greater attention in an increasingly interconnected global economy. 1¶ While many scholars evaluate the utility of economic coercion by¶ analyzing the behavior of the target government, this study focuses on¶ transnational or non-state players such as multinational corporations, migrants,¶ international travelers, indirect investors, and food exporters. A¶ twofold question will be addressed. If transnational linkages sustain flows¶ of capital and finance across borders, mainly in the form of foreign investment¶ and remittances, is it possible that economic sanctions (especially ·¶ unilateral ones) do not work because of activities carried out by overseas¶ Introduction ¶ investors and migrants? And even more important, what is the role played¶ by transnational actors located in the same country that has devised sanctions¶ as an effective tool to achieve major foreign policy objectives?¶ This is exactly the area where my project, which is based upon extensive¶ field research conducted in Cuba between 2000 and 2009, attempts¶ to make its most important contribution. Although one of the reasons for¶ the tightening of the embargo during the 1990s was to stimulate democratic¶ reforms in Cuba, the prime objective of U.S. policy was to exert¶ economic pressure on the Castro government (and eventually hasten its¶ demise) by reducing the flow of hard currency to the island. I hypothesize¶ that, in spite of stiffened sanctions, the United States has not only been¶ unable to stifle the flow of foreign investment into Cuba but has actually¶ contributed in a significant way to the recovery of the Cuban economy¶ from the deep recession following the demise of the former Soviet Union.¶ Furthermore, formal and informal activities by Cuban Americans, above¶ all those who left Cuba in the 1980s and 1990s and retained strong bonds¶ with relatives on the island, have been a major factor in mitigating the¶ overall impact of U.S. sanctions against Cuba. The most vocal and influential¶ groups within the Cuban-American community in favor of the¶ embargo are instead composed to a great extent of older exiles who emigrated¶ in the early 1960s or their children (Eckstein 2004, 330-33).

#### Sanctions fail due to inevitable economic investment

Spadoni 2010 [Paolo Spadoni 2010 assistant professor in the Department of Political Science at Augusta State Failed sanctions why the US sanctions against cuba could never work page xxv-xxvi]

Overall, there is sufficient evidence to argue that U.S extraterritorial measures¶ against Cuba's foreign business partners have had little success. Moreover, U.S.-based financial flows supplied the Castro government with sizable foreign exchange at a time when Havana was struggling so hard to find sources of external support. The aforementioned activities by transnational actors are emblematic examples of gaping holes in Washington's effort to economically isolate Cuba and provide a solid explanation of why the embargo has failed to achieve its main goal. My study,¶ therefore, promises to make two significant contributions to the scholarship¶ on economic sanctions.¶ First, it challenges the idea on the utility of unilateral economic coercion¶ as an instrument of foreign policy and enriches the debate on whether¶ sanctions are effective by analyzing the impact on the Cuban economy of¶ activities carried out by transnational players. While some scholars have¶ focused on the effects of the embargo on U.S. entities in terms of forfeited¶ businesses with the Cuban government, very few have examined¶ the possibility that foreign investors and U.S.-based transnational actors¶ bear major responsibility for the failure of sanctions to achieve ambitious¶ foreign policy goals with respect to Cuba. In the post-cold war context of¶ economic globalization and transnational linkages, these actors deserve¶ more attention from the academic community than they have received so¶ far.¶ Second, this study provides conceptual tools that can be used not only¶ to examine the U.S. embargo against Cuba but also other sanctions situations.¶ Indeed, activities carried out by multinational corporations and¶ other transnational actors (including individuals and entities of the coercer¶ state) might have had a positive impact on the economies of various¶ countries that, like Cuba, are subject to U.S. economic sanctions. In¶ particular, foreign direct investment, remittances sent from exiles, and¶ secondary or indirect investment operations may undermine the ability¶ of sanctions to squeeze economically these target countries. Mainly as a¶ result of increasing migration flows, recorded remittances have become¶ the second largest source of external financing for developing countries¶ after foreign direct investment (Ratha 2008). Money transfer and investment¶ operations are also facilitated by the rapid growth of Internet and other electronic transactions. In short, the flow of hard currency reaching¶ Cuba from abroad, especially from the United States, exhibits patterns¶ that suggest a potential path for further research on the role and usefulness¶ of economic sanctions.

#### Helms-Burton limited out investors in Cuba.

Spadoni 2010 [Paolo Spadoni 2010 assistant professor in the Department of Political Science at Augusta State Failed sanctions why the US sanctions against cuba could never work page 18-19]

Like in other cases of U.S. unilateral sanctions, the absence of U.S. direct investors in Cuba was filled by transnational corporations that were¶ not based in the United States. Despite serious hurdles created by the¶ extraterritorial provisions of the Helms-Burton law of 1996, Cuba was¶ able to attract FDI in virtually all key economic sectors? In order to avoid¶ potential penalties under Helms-Burton, quite a few foreign investors¶ have developed roundabout methods to operate in Cuba, using offshore¶ companies registered in fiscal paradises in the Caribbean and Central¶ America to keep anonymity, reduce personal liability, and obtain easier¶ access to capital funding. Other corporations simply decided to create¶ legally distinct entities that are associated exclusively with their Cuban¶ assets or reorganize their activities on the island in such a way as to escape¶ the reach of the U.S. legislation

### A2 K’s of Foreign Policy

#### Foreign Policy isn’t about altruistic values – that would be just as bad – they are always pragmatic – there is no root cause.

Andrés Cala master's in journalism and Michael J. Economides Professor of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering @ Cullen College of Engineering 2012; Americas blind spot Chavez, oil, and US security pages 4-5]

The debate over how much the United States should intervene in global¶ affairs dates back to the founding fathers, through the continent's march¶ to independence, the age of imperialism, the World Wars I and II, and the Cold War. There are two core sides, the realist and idealist visions of foreign policy. The divide transcends party lines and the middle ground¶ is in constant flux.¶ In December 2009, when Obama received the Nobel Peace Prize in¶ Oslo, he laid out the debate: "Within America, there has long been a¶ tension between those who describe themselves as realists or idealists-a¶ tension that suggests a stark choice between the narrow pursuit of interests¶ or an endless campaign to impose our values around the world:'¶ Realists believe American intervention in foreign affairs should be¶ driven by a pragmatic defense of American interests. Idealists believe that what's best for America is best for the world and that the country's foreign¶ policy should literally be designed to defend democracy, human rights,¶ and basic freedoms on a global scale. Realists prioritize the defense of¶ American interests, even if at times that means disregarding some idealist¶ values. Idealists condition foreign policy to moral imperatives, even if¶ America's interests are not best served. Realists can deal with all sorts of¶ shades of gray as long as it's in America's interest and that basic lineslike¶ genocide-are not crossed. The moral bar is significantly higher for¶ idealists who, for example, want to sanction China over its Tibet policies.¶ Idealists are not homogenous either and different groups often defend¶ contradictory things.¶ It's not an either/or choice between heartless calculations or sobbing¶ duties. Nor is it any different from the decisions made by every person¶ every day. As corny as it may sound, America's foreign policy is boiled¶ down to the age-old question over how much "we should think with our¶ hearts:'¶ In practice though, foreign policy is a combination of both realism¶ and idealism. Each circumstance is different and there is no formula,¶ although public opinion is a decisive factor. That explains why the¶ United States intervened in Kosovo, but not in the dozens of devastating¶ African civil wars, and why some dictatorships are tolerated and others¶ aren't. It's not hypocrisy, as many simplistically conclude. It's common¶ sense. How much are American interests at stake? Is it strategically¶ important? Do we have enough power to project? How much will it¶ cost? Will it accomplish anything? Who are the victims and what is the¶ target? The answers often fall prey to demagoguery and interests groups¶ that compete to influence policies. Very rarely is the decision clear-cut,¶ like in Kosovo. Serbs were once again ethnically cleansing its territory¶ even after the wars in the former Yugoslavia killed at least 130,000¶ people. NATO's (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) intervention to¶ stop the massacre was idealist-driven, but the fact that it was Europe¶ and geopolitically strategic undoubtedly weighed heavily in the decision¶ to attack. If it were all altruism, all values, this world would be a giant¶ moral battleground.¶ Ronald Reagan's foreign policy, portrayed as idealist for a domestic¶ audience, was ultimately realist, to the point that it accomplished its goal¶ of defeating the Soviet Union. His successor George Bush "the first" took¶ realism to its highest levels. Bill Clinton and George W Bush "the second"¶ were more idealists, albeit with often different visions.¶

## A2 Politics

### Plan Popular

#### Plan is politically popular-Even pro-embargo forces don’t support sanctions on Cuba

Spadoni 2010 [Paolo Spadoni 2010 assistant professor in the Department of Political Science at Augusta State Failed sanctions why the US sanctions against cuba could never work page 58]

In sum, all of the necessary conditions for a change of policy vis-a-vis¶ Cuba are in place. In the United States, a Congress with larger Democratic¶ majorities is in favor of easing sanctions, a vigorous business lobby wants¶ to sell food, prospect for oil, and expand U.S.-based travel to the island,¶ and public opinion supports rapprochement. In Cuba, Fidel Castro is¶ mostly out of power, the economy is struggling but continues to receive¶ much needed financial help from Venezuela, China, and other countries,¶ a stable succession government has made public overtures to the United¶ States, and citizens are calmly going along with their new circumstances¶ while hoping for a better life. In the exile community, younger Cuban¶ Americans and recent exiles have a more conciliatory approach than the¶ older hard-liners who are, themselves, as old and infirmed as the Castro¶ brothers. Moreover, pro-embargo exile politicians will have a harder time¶ supporting unilateral sanctions against Cuba while Washington is seeking¶ international cooperation to deal effectively with North Korea, the¶ quintessential rogue state. Finally, in Latin America, Cuba is being woven¶ back into the regional political and trade agenda with crucial help from¶ several left-leaning governments.

**No link- Cuban voters don’t support the embargo anymore**

**Brush 1-22-13** (Michael Brush studied at Columbia Business School in the Knight-Bagehot Fellowship program.) ( “Time to invest in Cuba?” MSN Money, January 22, 2013 <http://money.msn.com/investing/time-to-invest-in-cuba?page=0> //BLOV)

**2. Political support for the embargo is eroding.**

Another problem for embargo aficionados is that **younger Cuban Americans in Florida**, the all-important **next generation of voters**, just **aren't as passionate about it as their parents and grandparent**s were. "When I lecture down there, they couldn't care less about Castro and the embargo," says Roett.

A recent **poll by Florida International University** **in Miami** bears this out. It found that **just 50% of Cuban-Americans still support the embargo, and 80% think it has failed**. It's also worth noting that **Obama got a lot more of the Cuban-American vote in Florida in the 2012 election**, **despite the awareness that he is more willing to lift the embargo, says Hidalgo.**

With their constituents defecting on the issue, **congressional** **backers** of the embargo **may be losing ground**. "The **Cuban vote in Florida is changing**, thus sticking with the embargo doesn't makes sense," believes Hidalgo.

### Pro Business

#### Plan popular – Business lobby supports it

Dominguez 2008 (Esteban Morales Dominguez: member of the Cuban Academy of Sciences, awarded three times by both the Cuban Academy of Sciences and the Ministry of Higher Education, and Gary Prevost: Professor of Political Science at St. John’s University and the College of St. Benedict in Minnesota, “United States- Cuban Relations A Critical History” 2008)

It is now clear, nine years after the launching of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce¶ campaign against the Cuban embargo, that the U.S. business community¶ is now a crucial part of the political coalition that is seeking to change U.S.¶ policy toward Cuba. Without their involvement, it would have been highly unlikely¶ that key Republican members of Congress would have joined the anti-embargo¶ coalition. Of course, the long-standing forces in the religious and labor¶ movement remain a key element, but the clout and funding of the business¶ community made the difference.

## A2 Agriculture Disads

### US dominates the Cuban Ag Market

#### The US sells agriculture products to Cuba now

Gorrell 05 Lieutenant Colonel, U.S. Army War College [Lieutenant Colonel Tim Gorrell, Cuba: The Next Unanticipated Anticipated Strategic Crisis?, Strategy Research Project, 18 March 2005, U.S. Army War College, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA433074]

The third consideration is U.S. business. Under the current rules, U.S. businesses are permitted to sell agricultural produce to Cuba.42 Today 27 firms from 12 U.S. states are doing business with Cuba, making Cuba 22nd among U.S. agricultural markets.43 These business activities are greatly influenced by Cuban-Americans and members of Congress. The economic power of the U.S. can be our most powerful weapon. The possibilities of economic engagement offer a myriad of branches and sequels that could promote a rapport between the American people and the Cubans. The aggressive pursuit of these endeavors would go far in ensuring an orderly transition to a post-Castro Cuba. It is an erroneous assumption to believe that Castro’s demise will miraculously trigger reform and all the problems of the last 40 years will vanish. A visionary policy, albeit constrained within the parameters of the Castro regime, will go far in setting agreeable social-economic conditions in Cuba both now and in the future.

### Ag Sales Now

#### Cuba already trades with US – It’s among the top 30 nations receiving food from the US

Dominguez 2008 (Esteban Morales Dominguez: member of the Cuban Academy of Sciences, awarded three times by both the Cuban Academy of Sciences and the Ministry of Higher Education, and Gary Prevost: Professor of Political Science at St. John’s University and the College of St. Benedict in Minnesota, “United States- Cuban Relations A Critical History” 2008)

One aspect of United States-Cuban relations that needs a separate analysis is the¶ growing interest during the past ten years, for U.S. companies to do business¶ with Cuba. Political relations between the two governments have changed very¶ little during the past ten years and this unchanging aspect of the relationship is¶ well documented elsewhere in the book. However, during that same period, a¶ significant one-way trade of U.S. medical and agricultural products to Cuba has¶ begun. In 2006, Cuba bought close to $400 million in goods from the United¶ States and the country now ranks in the top thirty nations receiving U.S. agriculture¶ products. This chapter will explain how this development occurred, with¶ particular attention to the congressionally mandated U.S. law change from 2000¶ that permitted certain U.S. companies to do business with Cuba.

## A2 BioDiversity DA

### Embargo kills Enviornment co-op

#### Lifting embargo key to Cuban biodiversity – cooperation needed

Collymore 97 – IPS Correspondent (Yvette, “ENVIRONMENT-CUBA: U.S. Embargo Cramping Environmental Prospects”, Inter Press Service, March 7 1997, <http://www.ipsnews.net/1997/03/environment-cuba-us-embargo-cramping-environmental-prospects/>)//CB

WASHINGTON, Mar 7 1997 (IPS) - From woodpeckers to sea turtles, some animal species facing extinction in the United States have taken up permanent residence in Cuba, the original winter home for many a fish and fowl in North America.

But as the U.S. economic embargo against Havana hacks away at Cuba’s prospects, the Caribbean island is struggling to keep up key work in protecting its natural resources, including species that are disappearing in other parts of the Americas.

In one word, Cuba needs help, say policy analysts and environmentalists.

They argue that it’s time for Washington and Havana to drop their political dog fight and attend to shared environmental concerns. And cooperation could be truly mutual in view of Cuba’s significant advances in science, they add.

“There is more scientific research in Cuba relative to the environment than in many countries, including Mexico and Chile,” says Jorge Dominguez of the Washington-based Inter-American Dialogue.

This research — the budget for which is swiftly eroding — is uncovering plant and animal species previously unknown to the scientific community. According to the World Resources Institute (WRI) here, 40 percent of the species currently being found on the island is new to science.

Cuba has 40 times as many bird species per hectare as is found in North America and 30 times as many reptile and amphibian species, says WRI.

“The island is a quarter the size of California, which is one of the most species-rich areas in the United States; yet Cuba has more species and plants than California,” says Walt Reid of WRI, noting the island’s 6,700 plant types. “It’s a bit like the Galapagos of the Caribbean.”

Researchers say Cuba has the world’s smallest lizard — the gecko or sphaerodactylus schwarzi — which measures less than 25 mm from its nose to the tip of its tail. And a recent discovery places Cuba in a category with Brazil as having the smallest frog at one centimetre long.

Of the island’s 350 species of birds, 60 percent are known to be North American migrants. One bird which recently became extinct in the United States — the Ivory Billed woodpecker — was last seen in Cuba. At the same time, as many as six sea turtles on the ‘endangered’ list in the United States could be threatened by fishing pressures in Cuba, says WRI. They include the Green turtle, the Hawksbill, Kemp’s Ridley, Leatherback, Loggerhead, and Pacific Ridley turtles.

Cuba’s economic woes are bad news for the birds and plant life.

### Tourism Good

#### Tourism increases biodiversity – reputation and product quality

Drumm 10 - Sustainable Tourism Specialist, Senior Ecotourism Specialist at The Nature Conservancy (Andy, “Tourism”, UNDP [United Nations Development Programme], 2010, <http://web.undp.org/latinamerica/biodiversity-superpower/Report/Tourism_(chapter_9)_ENG.pdf>)//CB

However, some major travel companies recognize the importance of managing their businesses to minimize negative impacts and to ﬁnd ways to help promote conservation and sustainable development.31 These companies realize that by helping to maintain the cultural and biological integrity of the places their tourists visit, they can both enhance the quality of the product they are selling and improve their business reputation, thus improving prospective longterm earnings. A signiﬁcant development in the last few years is the establishment of voluntary environmental initiatives by hotel chains, tour operators, and ground handlers, including green certiﬁcation systems (see Section II.4), conservation awards, and eco-labels. Many such initiatives are supported by NGOs and governments; but all voluntary performance standard-setting depends on private sector commitment ¶ and consumer awareness. NGOs such as the International Ecotourism Society, Tourism Concern, Center for Responsible Tourism, and others focus on consumer awareness. Online portals such as Planeta. com, Ecoclub, and others have built awareness of the relation between conservation and tourism. Tourism enterprises — in particular, nature-focused ones — can be an important tool to generate employment and income in under-developed, biodiversity-rich areas where few non-extractive options exist. This can be achieved with comparatively small investments (Wunder 2000). Moreover, many more people participate in tourism through micro, small and medium-size enterprises, such as selling crafts, food, or drink; via provision of cultural services such as displays, dancing, or traditional village visits; or by supplying inputs from locally-produced food to accommodation facilities, or transport services to visiting groups (Roe et al. 2002). Poor people also receive other beneﬁts related to tourism, including enhanced infrastructure and services in the form of health facilities, water systems, local security and communications, increased community income, and organizational skills to promote local change (Roe et al. 2002).

### A2 Corals Mpx

#### No impact – reefs declining now

Alevizon 12 - Professional biologist, educator, and writer, took guitar lessons from Dick Dale (William, “Caribbean Coral Reefs”, Coral Reef Info, 2011-2012, <http://www.coral-reef-info.com/caribbean-coral-reefs.html>)//CB

Over the last 30 years, Caribbean coral reefs have suffered enormous declines both in terms of overall coral reef ecosystem "health" and the productivity of reef fisheries. Overdevelopment of coastal areas, overfishing, direct tourism impacts such as overuse of particular reefs for recreational diving and snorkeling, and declines in water quality have in many cases led to dire consequences for coral reefs, leaving devastated underwater seascapes where thriving hard coral colonies once stood (see photo, above).

#### No impact – Caribbean reefs declining now

AFP 1/30/13 - AFP is a global news agency delivering fast, in-depth coverage of the events shaping our world from wars and conflicts to politics, sports, entertainment and the latest breakthroughs in health, science and technology (“'Alarming' decline in Caribbean coral reefs”, GoodPlanet, January 30 2013, <http://www.goodplanet.info/eng/Contenu/News/Alarming-decline-in-Caribbean-coral-reefs/(theme)/303>)//CB

PARIS - (AFP) - Coral reefs in the Caribbean are producing less than half of the key ingredient that makes their calcium skeleton compared to pre-industrial times, scientists said on Tuesday, describing the findings as "extremely alarming."

The amount of new calcium carbonate being added by coral reefs is at least half, and in some places 70 percent lower, than it was thousands of years ago.

Biologists have long sounded the alarm for reef-building corals, on which nearly half a billion people depend for their livelihood from fishing and tourism.

Previous research has estimated that coral cover is declining by as much as two percent per year in parts of the Indian Ocean and the Pacific. In the Caribbean, cover has shrunk by around 80 percent on average since the mid-1970s.

According to a June 2012 update of the "Red List" compiled by the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), 33 percent of reef-building corals are at risk of extinction.

Habitat destruction, pollution and more recently global warming are the factors blamed in the decline.

But data which compares today's trends with the pre-industrial past is sketchy.

Calcium carbonate is secreted by polyps, the tiny animals that live symbiotically with coral. Patiently accumulated, it provides the structure that enables coral to grow vertically.

A multinational team led by Exeter University in southwestern England measured ancient corals at 19 sites in the Bahamas; Belize; Grand Cayman, which is part of the Cayman Islands; and Bonaire, a Dutch territory in the Leeward Antilles islands.

Their study, published in the journal Nature Communications, found that in shallow waters of around five metres (16.25 feet) in depth, reef growth rates today were between 60 and 70 percent lower compared to the regional averages of the distant past.

The fall was smaller -- around 25 percent -- in deeper waters of around 10 metres (32.5 feet).

Many reefs may have lost their ability to produce enough carbonate to grow vertically, according to the study. Some are already below the threshold by which enough carbonate is produced to maintain the skeletal reef structure, and thus are at risk of erosion.

The estimates "are extremely alarming," said Chris Petty, an Exeter University professor.

"Our findings clearly show that recent ecological declines are now suppressing the growth potential of reefs in the region, and that this will have major implications for their ability to respond positively to future sea-level rises."

### Losing Species Now

#### Biodiversity loss now – Caribbean eusocial shrimp

Duffy et al 2/13/13 - Virginia Institute of Marine Science (J. Emmett, MacDonald [Department of Fish, Wildlife and Conservation Ecology], Hultgren [Department of Biology, Seattle University], Rubenstein [Department of Ecology, Evolution and Environmental Biology, Columbia University], “Decline and Local Extinction of Caribbean Eusocial Shrimp”, PLOS, February 13 2013, <http://www.plosone.org/article/info%3Adoi%2F10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0054637)//CB>

The tropical shrimp genus Synalpheus includes the only eusocial marine animals. In much of the Caribbean, eusocial species have dominated the diverse fauna of sponge-dwelling shrimp in coral rubble for at least the past two decades. Here we document a recent, dramatic decline and apparent local extinction of eusocial shrimp species on the Belize Barrier Reef. Our collections from shallow reefs in central Belize in 2012 failed to locate three of the four eusocial species formerly abundant in the area, and showed steep declines in colony size and increases in frequency of queenless colonies prior to their disappearance. Concordant with these declines, several nonsocial, pair-forming Synalpheus species increased in frequency. The decline in eusocial shrimp is explained in part by disappearance of two sponge species on which they specialize. Eusocial shrimp collections from Jamaica in 2012 showed similar patterns of decline in colony size and increased queenlessness compared with prior Jamaican collections. The decline and local extinction of eusocial shrimp happened against a backdrop of changes in coral assemblages during recent decades, and may reflect changes in abundance and quality of dead coral substratum and succession of the diverse cryptic organisms living within it. These changes document potentially worrisome declines in a unique taxon of eusocial marine animals.

## A2 China DA

### US still Dominates

#### US is still preeminent - new government system and import growth

Ben Ami 6/5 (Shlomo, Israeli foreign minister, vice president of the Toledo International Center for Peace,“Is the US Losing Latin America” <http://www.guatemala-times.com/opinion/syndicated-2/3681--is-the-us-losing-latin-america-.html>)

It is also true that Latin American countries have pursued a massive expansion of economic ties beyond America’s sway. China is now Latin America’s second-largest trading partner and rapidly closing the gap with the US. India is showing keen interest in the region’s energy industry, and has signed export agreements in the defense sector. Iran has strengthened its economic and military ties, especially in Venezuela.¶ Similarly, in 2008, Russia’s then-President Dmitri Medvedev identified the US war on terror as an opportunity to create strategic partnerships with rising powers such as Brazil, and with the Bolivarian Alliance for the Americas (ALBA), a Venezuelan-inspired bloc opposed to US designs in the region. The energy giant Gazprom and the country’s military industries have spearheaded the Kremlin’s effort to demonstrate Russia’s ability to influence America’s neighborhood – a direct response to perceived American meddling in Russia’s own “near abroad,” particularly Georgia and Ukraine.¶ Yet it would be a mistake to regard Latin America’s broadening international relations as marking the end of US preeminence. Unlike in the bygone era of superpowers and captive nations, American influence can no longer be defined by the ability to install and depose leaders from the US embassy. To believe otherwise is to ignore how international politics has changed over the last quarter-century.¶ A continent once afflicted by military takeovers has slowly but surely implanted stable democracies. Responsible economic management, poverty-reduction programs, structural reforms, and greater openness to foreign investment have all helped to generate years of low-inflation growth. As a result, the region was able to withstand the ravages of the global financial crisis.¶ The US not only encouraged these changes, but has benefited hugely from them. More than [40% of US exports now go to Mexico and Central and South America](http://www.guatemala-times.com/opinion/syndicated-2/3681--is-the-us-losing-latin-america-.html#axzz2VHsFP7dk), the US’s fastest-growing export destination. Mexico is America’s second-largest foreign market ([valued at $215 billion in 2012](http://www.census.gov/foreign-trade/balance/c2010.html)). US exports to Central America have risen by 94% over the past six years; imports from the region have risen by 87%. And the US continues to be the largest foreign investor on the continent. American interests are evidently well served by having democratic, stable, and increasingly prosperous neighbors.