

Con

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

Contention 1 is food scarcity.

Currently, Cuba has enough food, as The International Food Policy Research Institute finds in 2016 that only .8% of the Cuban population is undernourished.

However, lifting the embargo would increase food scarcity within Cuba for two reasons.

1. Tourism. Mike Stone of Reuters explains in 2015 that although Obama partially relaxed travel restrictions, a full lift of the embargo would remove the remaining restrictions, resulting in the number of American tourists traveling to Cuba per year increasing from 106,000 to 1.5 million. This results in food shortages, as Azam Ahmed at the New York Times explains in 2016 that increased tourism to Cuba causes soaring food prices and scarcity because tourists divert food that would have gone to ordinary Cubans.
2. Buying land. Agroecology professor Miguel Altieri explains in 2016 that lifting the embargo would remove investment barriers, allowing in US agribusinesses to push Cuban farmers off their land by purchasing all the agricultural land. Altieri continues that these US agribusinesses would export the food they grow, increasing food scarcity on the island by decreasing the amount of food that stays in Cuba.

There are two impacts.

1. Governmental collapse. When the Cuban people starve, they take to the streets and revolt to try to secure their own survival because the government can no longer provide food security. Christian Parenti at Salon finds in 2011 that the last global food price spike caused multiple governments to collapse, mass riots, and caused three civil wars over food.
2. Starvation. The Earth Policy Institute explains in 2004 that even modest food price increases quickly become life threatening for people who already spend 70% of their income on food. This is problematic, as Portia Siegelbaum at CBS reports in 2013 that the vast majority of Cuban workers spend 80% of their income on food.

Contention 2 is turning Cuba into a failed state.

Cuba is gradually reforming in the status-quo. 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 three 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. Because of this, Cave finds that removing the embargo would result 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.
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 rapid transition to a Cuban market economy would be inherently destabilizing because it would redefine the relationship between the government and the people.

When the embargo is lifted and creates instability, it causes a civil war because rebels perceive the government as weak. 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 at the University of North Texas quantifies in 2005 that when governments like Cuba are destabilized and become weak, there's an 88% chance of civil war occurring when compared to 1% in 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.

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 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.