

Con

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

Contention 1 is appeasement of authoritarian regimes.

Lifting the embargo sends a global signal of American weakness and creates a perception that America will appease hostile nations. Tony Karon at Time explains in 2010 that because Cuba continues to violate human rights and oppress its people, lifting the embargo would be perceived as the US rewarding defiance. Jennifer Rubin at the Washington Post confirms in 2011 that lifting the Cuban embargo would send the message to other rogue regimes that the US will not punish wrongdoing.

There are two impacts.

1. Increased aggression. Political science professor Chris Fettweis explains in 2004 that when the US appeases an enemies, other countries become more aggressive because they believe the US won't respond. Victor Hanson at the Hoover Institute adds in 2009 that even the perception of a submissive America would prompt Iran to resume their pursuit of nuclear weapons, increased Russian aggression in Eastern Europe, and increase the chances of North Korea invading South Korea, China seizing Taiwan, and India and Pakistan beginning a conflict.
2. Inviting challenges to the US. Thomas Henriksen at the Hoover Institute explains in 1999 that US policy towards rogue states like Cuba is uniquely important to international perceptions of the strength of US dominance because appeasing small states indicates that the US will also submit to major powers. Henriksen continues that if the US is seen as weak, potential challenger to the US, such as Russia and China, perceive the US as vulnerable and lash out.

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.

