**Cuba AC**

I affirm. “Ought” implies moral obligation, so the value is morality. Regardless of form, all conceptions of morality have some concern for human suffering. Morality demands that we maximize good outcomes. Eric Rakowski[[1]](#endnote-1) writes,

On one side, it presses toward the consequentialist view that **individuals' status as moral equals requires that the number of people kept alive be maximized. Only in this way**, the thought runs, **can we give due weight to the fundamental equality of persons; to allow more deaths when we can ensure fewer is to treat some people as less valuable than others. Further, killing some to save others**, or letting some die for that purpose, **does not entail that those who are killed or left to their fate are being used merely as means to the well-being of others, as would be true if they were slain or left to drown merely to please people who would live anyway.** They do, of course, in some cases serve as means. But they do not act merely as means. Those who die are no less ends than those who live. **It is because they are also no more ends than others whose lives are in the balance that an impartial decision-maker must choose to save the more numerous group, even if she must kill to do so.**

And, impacts that influence policy considerations shouldn’t be arbitrarily excluded, as all impacts hold at least some moral weight and can be directly weighed. Thus, the standard is minimizing human suffering.

My advocacy is that the United States ought not use economic sanctions against Cuba. I defend only economic sanctions on Cuba, and disadvantages must be Cuba-specific.

As International Relations expert Amichai Cohen[[2]](#endnote-2) writes: “No universally agreed upon definition of economic sanctions exists.” However, under any definition, the U.S. embargo on Cuba constitutes economic sanctions. While commonly used definitions, such as the Pape definition, exclude the vast majority of modern episodes, they include Cuban sanctions. So, Cuba is the only major current sanctions case that we can be sure is topical, and is the most predictable since it’s topical under all definitions. And, even if other cases are clearly topical, Cuba is one of the most commonly mentioned instances of sanctions, so it’s extremely predictable. Extreme predictability proves a lack of abuse because the negative knew this was a likely AFF, and had months before the TOC to write Cuba-specific disads, kritiks, etc. If they can’t answer my position, it’s because they didn’t do enough work – not because my case is unfair. Further, my case preserves negative ground because they get links to all generic and philosophically based positions. And, this gives the negative a specific scenario so they can cut highly specific disads or argue that I have to defend a specific alternative. The fact that sanctions on Cuba have existed for over 40 years and aren’t being removed now proves that there is an abundance of negative ground – if no one was in favor of them, they wouldn’t exist. Moreover, specifying an advocacy creates better clash because instead of the AC discussing some sanctions, the NC discussing other sanctions, and having to weigh disparate impacts without deep internal link clash, we can have a deeply warranted discussion of a single set a sanctions. Attempting to discuss all sanctions ever imposed in 45 minutes creates a shallow debate. Finally, as long as the affirmative interpretation is reasonable, prefer this framework of evaluation to prevent wasting 6 minutes of the round, especially when the AFF is already a victim of time skew. Severing me from 6 minutes of my speech time is greatly more unfair than the negative having to debate under a reasonable interpretation.

**ADVANTAGE 1 IS U.S. SOFT POWER.** The Cuban embargo ruins U.S. soft power in Latin America. Honda[[3]](#endnote-3) on April 13th,

Politically, **now that Latin America stands beside Cuba -- as evidenced by** diplomatic reinstatements with holdouts El Salvador and Costa Rica -- and **the reintegration of Cuba into the Organization for American States and the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States (CLACS)** -- **the U**nited **S**tates **risks ruinous relations with countries who see the blockade as backward. The U**nited **S**tates **is already marginalized: CLACS explicitly bars U.S. participation. The impact of this Latin tack towards insularity is not insignificant.** Consider grandstanding by **Brazil's President** Lula da Silva, who **rebuffed** Secretary of State Hillary Clinton's **efforts to bring Brazil in on Iran sanctions while courting Cuba's leadership.** Lula, capitalizing on Cuba's appetite for growth, proposed investments in industrial, agriculture and infrastructure projects, including ports and hotels, and an agreement with Brazil's oil company. We will see more of this. The Cubans are seeking suitors. **Like the Bank of the South, Latin America's attempt to wean countries off U.S. institutions like the World Bank, the longer we keep Cuba at arm's length, the more likely Brazil and others will take our place.** The longer we keep Cuba listed as a state sponsor of terrorism, an allegation roundly criticized by diplomats, the more we risk the credibility of our national security regime and reputation in the region.

And, sanctions hurt American soft power throughout the world. The U.S. is dead wrong on the Cuba issue – almost every other nation in the world believes the embargo should be lifted. Arya[[4]](#endnote-4) writes,

**In contrast to other sanctions** discussed here, **the UN never endorsed such sanctions, and support for these measures eroded. By 2003 the UN General Assembly voted strongly for an end to the embargo, with only three countries opposing (US, Israel, Marshall Islands)** and in 2005 with a fourth, Palau, also opposing8.

Engaging Cuba will increase U.S. soft power in Latin America and beyond. William Reinsch[[5]](#endnote-5) writes,

Second, **because of its symbolic importance to the U.S., how we deal with Cuba** as it approaches this transition **will affect our standing in the region and beyond. The U.S. should be seen to be working** **constructively toward a peaceful transition to free market democracy in Cuba. By moving now to engage** **Cuba, the U**nited **S**tates **will be able to deploy its most powerful arsenal before we are overtaken** by events. **That arsenal is our "soft power," which goes beyond American affluence to include American values, institutions and traditions** such as the rule of law, tolerance and freedom of expression and association.

Soft power is key to preventing disease, terrorism, and the use of weapons of mass destruction. Joseph Nye[[6]](#endnote-6) writes,

**Soft power co-opts people rather than coerces them. It rests on the ability to set the agenda or shape the**

**preferences of others.** It is a mistake to discount soft power as just a question of image, public relations, and ephemeral popularity. It is a form of power - a means of pursuing national interests. When America discounts the importance of its attractiveness to other countries, it pays a price. **When US policies lose their** **legitimacy and credibility in the eyes of others, attitudes of distrust tend to fester and further reduce its** **leverage.** The manner with which the US went into Iraq undercut American soft power. That did not prevent the success of the four-week military campaign, but it made others less willing to help in the reconstruction of Iraq and made the American occupation more costly in the hard-power resources of blood and treasure. Because of its leading edge in the information revolution and its past investment in military power, the US probably will remain the world's single most powerful country well into the 21st century. But not all the important types of power come from the barrel of a gun. Hard power is relevant to getting desired outcomes, but **transnational issues such as climate change, infectious diseases, international crime, and terrorism cannot be resolved by military force alone. Soft power is particularly important in dealing with these issues, where military power alone simply cannot produce success, and can even be counterproductive. America's success in coping with the new transnational threats of terrorism and weapons of mass destruction will depend on a deeper understanding of the role of soft power** and developing a better balance of hard and soft power in foreign policy.

**ADVANTAGE 2 IS HEALTH.** Sanctions have devastated Cuba’s health system. Hidalgo and Martinez[[7]](#endnote-7) write,

**The human costs due to impact on the health sector are** even more obvious and **dramatic** if we consider that **U.S. companies produce more than 50 percent of important new drugs on the international market and** that **90 percent of patents on new biotechnology products are granted to U.S. firms. Many of these products are vital to saving human lives and have no equivalents made in Cuba.** After Torricelli, fourteen subsidiaries based in Germany, Sweden, Japan, France, Argentina, Italy, Australia, the Netherlands, Canada, Belgium and Switzerland that produce medicines and medical equipment stopped selling to Cuba. **Cuba is forbidden to buy, from U.S. companies or subsidiaries, products such as third-generation antibiotics, medicines and drugs used in postoperative pediatric cardiology and to treat infantile leukemia, modern cancer therapies, and medications for the relief of side effects, for the treatment of AIDS, and others.** Cuba is also denied the ability to purchase equipment and replacement parts for donated equipment, as is the case of Kobe dialysis equipment, used with persons requiring transplants.

The impacts are extreme – they span all areas of health. John Feffer[[8]](#endnote-8) writes,

HIV Infection and AIDS: **The embargo limits access to life-prolonging drugs for Cuban HIV/AIDS patients**, and otherwise impairs prevention, diagnosis, treatment, and research in this field. Women's Health: **The** U.S. **embargo directly contributes to lapses in prevention, diagnosis, therapeutic and surgical treatments of breast cancer**; diminished alternatives for contraception; gaps in availability of in-vitro genetic testing resources; **reduced access to medications associated with pregnancy, labor and delivery; and deficient nutrition during pregnancy**. Children's Health: **Cuba's economic crisis, exacerbated by embargo restrictions, exacts a toll on children's health, particularly in** neonatology, **immunizations, pediatric hospital care, access to medicines, and treatment of acute illnesses.** Hospital Care: **The economic crisis and the U.S. embargo have seriously eroded surgery, radiology, clinical services, and access to medication, hospital nutrition, and hygiene.** Oncology: **The** U.S. **embargo bars Cubans' access to state-of-the-art cancer treatment under U.S. patent, subjects all diagnosis and treatment-related imports to delays due to the shipping ban, and hinders domestic research, development, and production due to the ban on biotech-related exports.** Cardiology: **The** U.S. **embargo constitutes a direct threat to patient care, by denying Cuban heart patients access to lifesaving medications and equipment only available in the U**nited **S**tates. Nephrology: The embargo limits the chance of survival of Cuban patients with chronic renal failure, increases their suffering, and adds significant expense to already costly care.

**ADVANTAGE 3 IS ENDING IMPERIALISM.** Economic sanctions are an imperialist attempt to subjugate Cuba. Salim Lamrani[[9]](#endnote-9) writes,

**The economic sanctions imposed on Cuba by the U**nited **S**tates are unique in view of their longevity and of their complexity but they **are** consistent with the real objectives of the first world power. In order to show this, it is necessary to base this analysis on the following postulate: the blockade is **part of a scheme designed not to promote democratic values, as the administration in Washington would have us believe, but to control the natural resources of Third World nations through subjugation.** And the history of the United States characterized mainly by violent and bloody conquest of new territories ­ proves this unequivocally. As far back as the middle of the 19th century, U.S. expansionist William Gilpin announced: "The destiny of the American people is to subdue the continent." The primary goal of the United States is to make sure that the resources of the countries of the South remain at hand of the capital of the masters of the universe. The case of Cuba is exceptional because it is the only country that has dared to refuse to follow the orders set by their northern neighbor, designing its political, economic and social system, at once sovereign and independent, despite the unilateral constraints imposed by Washington. The enmity Cuba is a victim of reflects a historical continuity whose broad lines must be retraced. And by the way, it would be widely-known if something like a sense of respect for obvious historical truisms existed. This topic would not be controversial if the society we live in was intellectually free. **The** total **blockade** of the island imposed on February, 7, 1962 **violates international conventions** and runs counter to the most basic juridical principles. **Its main objective is to re-establish U.S. neo-colonial domination over Cuba, using starvation as a political weapon against the Cuban people. The arguments justifying this** economic state of **siege varied according to time. During the Cold War, the "communist threat"** that Cuba represented **was the paradigm in use although any serious study would smash this theory to pieces.** Indeed, **in 1959, there was no Soviet presence in Cuba. But Washington stuck to that interpretation:** Cuba represented a threat for U.S. national security and Kennedy urged Mexico to back them up in their policy of hostility towards Cuba. But the answer of a Mexican diplomat was not long in coming: "If we publicly declare that Cuba is a threat to our security, forty million Mexicans will die laughing" . **The Cold War context, used for thirty years as a pretext** legitimizing U.S. animosity towards Cuba, **was actually a fraud** since there are no facts to support this theory. **If there had been any foundations to this thesis, the U**nited **S**tates **would have normalized its relations with Cuba after the collapse of the Soviet bloc**. Instead of that, Washington launched a new and more serious wave of economic sanctions with the Torricelli Act in 1992 and the Helms-Burton Act in 1996. As the ancient paradigm departed this life in 1991, a new one was created. **Now it is no more about containing communism but about "re-establishing democracy" in Cuba, a "democracy" devoted to the interests of Washington.** No matter if it is ruled by a clone of Gerardo Machado or Fulgencio Batista: what's important is that it should make its subordination to the United States its main virtue.

**The only objectives of the U**nited **S**tates **are to send Cuba back to the pangs and torments afflicting Third World nations** and which it has dared to escape; **to plunder its resources; and to destroy its health care system** considered "uniformly as the pre-eminent model for the Third World", according to the American Association for World Health . The aim of the blockade is to fulfill the wishes of Thomas Jefferson and John Quincy Adams to incorporate Cuba into the U.S. sphere of influence and to enable foreign capital to devastate it. The logorrhea putting forward **the argument of human rights problems in Cuba is only a rhetoric motivated by self-interest and designed to conceal a very clear plan: to make the Cuban people toe the line and to send it back to** the **destitute standards of living** they were used to fret over before the triumph of the Revolution.

This imperial mission is an attempt to order the world, which only results in commodification and degrading hierarchical violence. Jayan Nayar[[10]](#endnote-10) writes,

Through "colonialism" was reshaped the material basis of exchange that determined human relationships. Put differently, **the very idea of what is "human" was recast by the imposed value-systems of the "civilizing" process that was colonialism.** To be human, to live, and to relate to others, thus, both lost and gained meaning. **Lost were many pre-colonial and indigenous conceptions of human dignity**, of subsistence, production, consumption, wealth and poverty. **Gained was the advent of the human "self" as an objective "economic" agent and**, with it, the universals of **commodification as the basis for human relations.** Following this transformation of the material political-economy of the colonized, or "ordered," colonialism entrenched the "state" as the symbolic "political" institution of "public" social relations. The effect of this "colonization of the mind" was that the "political-economic" form of social organization--the state--was universalized as common, if not "natural," resulting in a homogenization of "political" imagination and language. Thus, diversity was unified, while at the same time, unity was diversified. The particularities and inconveniences of human diversity--culture and tradition--were subordinated to the "civilized" discourse of secular myths (to which the "rule of law" is central), 16 while concurrently, humanity was formally segregated into artificial "states," enclosures of mythic solidarities and common destinies.This brief remembering of colonialism as an historic process, provides us with the most explicit lessons on the violence of the "ordering" of "worlds." From its history we see that an important feature of ordering prevails. **The world of those who "order" is the destruction of the "worlds" of those ordered. So many ideologies of negation and (re)creation served to justify this "beginning"**--terra nullius, the "savage" native, **the "civilizing mission."** 17 The [\*608] "world," after all, had to be created out of all this "unworldly" miasma, all for the common good of the universal society of humankind. Although historical colonialism as a formal structure of politico-legal ordering of humanity has come and gone, **the violence of colonization is very much a persistent reality. A striking feature of historical world-orderings was the confidence with which the "new world" was projected upon human imagination. Colonialism was not a tentative process.** The "right" of colonization, both as a right of the colonizer and as a right thing to do by the colonizer, was passionately believed and confidently asserted. Thus, for the most part, this "right" was uncontested, this confidence unchallenged. "World-order" today is similarly asserted with confidence and rectitude. **Contemporary world-orderings**, consistent with those of the past, **are implemented using a range of civilizational legitimization. With the advent of an ideology of "humanity," a "post-colonial" concession to human dignity demanded by the previously colonized, new languages of the civilizational project had to be conceived of and projected. "Freed" from the brutalities of the order of historical colonialism, the "ordered" now are subjected to the colonizing force of the "post-colonial,"** and increasingly, globalization-inspired ideologies of development and security. **Visible, still, is the legitimization of "order" as coercive command through the rhetoric of "order" as evolutionary structure.**

**ADVANTAGE 4 IS UNDERMINING REPRESSION.** With sanctions in place in the status quo, the Cuban government is extremely repressive. Rory Carroll[[11]](#endnote-11) writes,

The **Cuban president, Raúl Castro, has crushed dissent and continued repression in the country since taking over from his brother Fidel,** according to a Human Rights Watch report published today. **The government has extended use of an "Orwellian" law that allows the state to punish people before they commit a crime on suspicion they may do so, a tactic designed to cow actual and potential opponents**, it said. The report, New Castro, Same Cuba, paints a near-dystopian image of an island where **those who step out of line risk being beaten and jailed in horrific conditions which verge on torture.** Since taking over from Fidel in July 2006 Raúl has kept up repression and kept scores of political prisoners locked up, it said. "**Raúl Castro's government has used draconian laws and sham trials to incarcerate scores more who have dared to exercise their fundamental freedoms**," said the report.

**Jails were overcrowded, unhygienic and unhealthy, leading to extensive malnutrition and illness**, the report said, and **political prisoners were routinely subjected to extended solitary confinement, beatings, restrictions of visits and the denial of medical care**. "Taken together, **these forms of cruel, inhuman, and degrading treatment may rise to the level of torture." Fear permeated the lives of dissidents**. "Some stop voicing their opinions and abandon their activities altogether; others continue to exercise their rights, but live in constant dread of being punished."

And, lifting sanctions is key to destroying the underdog image that the regime uses to stay in power. Human Rights Watch[[12]](#endnote-12) writes,

“This would be a good time for the US government to revisit its failed embargo policy,” said Vivanco. “**By lifting the embargo, Washington could deprive Raúl Castro of the underdog image that his brother exploited so effectively**.” For more than four decades, **the US government has used Cuba’s dismal rights record to justify a sweeping economic embargo aimed at toppling the Castro regime. Yet the policy did nothing to bring change** to Cuba. On the contrary, **it helped consolidate Castro’s hold on power by providing his government with an excuse for its problems and a justification for its abuses.** Moreover, because the policy was imposed in such a heavy-handed fashion, **it enabled Castro to garner sympathy abroad, neutralizing international pressure rather than increasing it.**

Finally, only ending the embargo will cause a movement towards democracy. Jennifer Windsor[[13]](#endnote-13) writes,

**Cuba remains one of the most repressive countries in the world**," said Jennifer Windsor, executive director of Freedom House. "**It is well past time to reassess a policy that impedes the ability of American citizens to freely interact with Cubans on a large scale and thus expose them to unfettered information about the outside world. We call on the incoming administration of Barack Obama to reexamine the embargo** and to immediately lift the restrictions on remittances and travel to and from the island." The United States first began introducing economic sanctions against Cuba in 1960 following that government's seizure without compensation of U.S. assets on the island. Current U.S. sanctions, which strictly limit trade with Cuba to cash-only sales of U.S. farm products and medical supplies, are unique to all other U.S. sanction policies in that they also prohibit U.S. citizens from traveling to Cuba unless they obtain a U.S. government waiver. "While the Bush administration expanded American support for democracy activists in Cuba, **U.S. policy would be** even **more effective if Americans were allowed to engage more freely with Cuban counterparts**," Windsor continued. "**Those countries that have moved from dictatorship to democracy in recent decades have done so in large part because of the movement of people and ideas across borders**.
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