

Con

Chris and I negate Resolved: The United States should lift its embargo against Cuba.

Contention 1 is destabilizing Latin America.

Lifting the embargo would destroy US-Latin relations for three reasons.

1. Reversing the US's hardline stance. Jose Azel at the University of Miami explains in 2015 that attempts to lift the embargo legitimize the Castro regime in the eyes of Latin America by accepting them as a trade partner, reversing America's support for democracy in the region, with concessions to Cuba weakening US influence in the region instead of improving relations.
2. Emboldening Castro. Peter Brookes at the Davis Institute explains in 2009 that lifting the embargo would legitimize the Castro's struggle against the US, emboldening Cuba to promote anti-Americanism and socialism throughout Latin America with the help of Cuba's existing allies.
3. Diverting investments. Professor of International Studies Jaime Suchlicki explains in 2000 that even if they publicly support lifting the embargo, Latin American countries privately oppose lifting the embargo because it would divert foreign investments and tourism from their countries to Cuba. Thus lifting the embargo would ruin US-Latin American relations because US policy would be blamed for the economic damage.

The impact is destroying democracy. Peter Brookes explains that lifting the embargo would result in communism and anti-Americanism spreading throughout Latin America, menacing US interests throughout Latin America by preventing countries from transitioning towards democratization. This is key to global democracy, as political science professor Richard Hillman explains in 2002 that Latin American experiences with democratization serve as a model for other developing countries for how to transition to democracy.

Contention 2 is turning Cuba into a failed state.

Currently, Cuba is gradually reforming. Joseph Piccone at the Brookings Institute explains in 2013 that currently, the process of reform in Cuba is gradual and highly controlled, with Cubans now being able to buy and sell property and exit the country

However, lifting the embargo will spark rapid change in Cuba, collapsing the government for two reasons.

1. Incentivizing dissent. Damien Cave at the New York Times explains in 2012 that Cuban leaders use the embargo as a scapegoat, blaming it for the lack of freedoms and poor economy. However, removing the embargo would remove this scapegoat, resulting in

political dissidents within Cuba pushing for more rapid changes. Empirically, reporter Elizabeth Llorente finds in 2016 that Obama's attempt to increase diplomatic ties with Cuba emboldened dissidents to challenge the government. Cuban American studies professor Jaime Suchlicki confirms in 2013 that if Cubans see an opportunity, they would demand rapid reform, unraveling political control and creating instability.

2. Opening Cuba's economy. David Perez at the Yale Law Review finds in 2010 that American attempts to promote Cuban free trade will spark instability because US exports destabilize state-run businesses, creating the perception that the government is weak. Jose Azel at the University of Miami confirms in 2008 that a transition from Cuba's current command economy to a market economy with open free trade would be inherently destabilizing because it would require a redefining of the role of the government and the people.

When the embargo is lifted and creates governmental instability, rebels perceive it as their best opportunity to take control. Andrea Ruggeri at the University of Essex finds in 2010 that empirically, when rebels perceive there to be political opportunity to topple the ruling government, it increases the chance of a civil war. Nicholas Rost of the University of North Texas quantifies in 2005 that when governments like Cuba are destabilized and become weak, there's an 88 times higher chance of civil war occurring when compared to a strong state. This is especially the case in Cuba, as professor of political economy Richard Feinberg finds in 2011 that rapid change instead of gradual reforms will spark a bloody Cuban civil war that would collapse the government. Jose Azel concludes that Cuba's existing sociopolitical and economic conditions mean that massive, rapid change would result in Cuba becoming a failed state.

The impact is massive regional instability. Moises Naim at Foreign Policy explains in 2001 that although many assume that a Cuban regime collapse would spawn a democracy, the most probable outcome is that Cuba would become a chaotic failed state, spawning a massive humanitarian crisis and refugee exodus. Tim Gorrell at the Strategic Research Project furthers in 2005 that a Cuban collapse would provide a safe haven for terrorism and create regional instability that would disrupt the economies of Latin American nations and crush budding democracies. Gorrell continues that a Cuban failed state could force the US military to intervene, fueling anti-Americanism and creating the conditions for a future civil war.

Thus, we negate.