

Pro

Chris and I affirm resolved: The United States should lift its embargo against Cuba.

Contention 1 is improving Latin American Relations.

Currently, the embargo is damaging relations between the US and Latin America. Julia Sweig at the Council on Foreign Relations explains in 2013 that Latin American nations unanimously disapprove of the US attempt to isolate Cuba, viewing it as an act of US imperialism. In fact, the Inter-American Dialogue explains in 2012 that the US embargo is viewed as a failed and punitive policy which obstructs effective US-Latin American engagement.

Ending the embargo would solve for two reasons.

1. Improving US legitimacy. David Perez at the Yale Law School explains in 2010 that because Cuba has dominated the US agenda in Latin America for the last 50 years, the US policy towards Cuba defines Latin American relations. Perez continues that lifting the embargo would improve legitimacy in the region, creating a reverberating effect throughout Latin America that would create greater incentives for cooperation.
2. Delegitimizing anti-American leaders. Former Senator Richard Lugar explains in 2009 that ending the embargo would undermine the political support of Latin American leaders who build a campaign around opposing the US because lifting the embargo shows that the US respects the opinion of Latin American people.

Therefore, Sweig concludes that lifting the embargo is the only way that the US can repair its Latin American relations.

There are two impacts.

1. Improving diplomacy. Journalist Nick Miroff explains in 2012 that Latin American countries have refused to attend future Conferences of the Americas because the embargo forces Latin American countries to choose between supporting the US and Cuba. These conferences are key to democracy, as political economy professor Richard Feinberg explains in 2010 that conferences create international consensus and diplomatic engagement, ultimately strengthening democratic norms and spurring collective action towards democratization.
2. Preventing drug crime. Carlos Pascaul of the Brookings Institute explains in 2010 that cooperation between the US and Latin America is necessary to prevent drug crime because any weakness in the supply chain provides a safe-haven for criminals. Addressing organized crime is key to political stability as Professor of Political Science Miguel Carreras finds in 2013 that drug violence increases political distrust since citizens no longer believe the government can protect them, ultimately undermining rule of law.

Contention 2 is embracing political diversity.

The US policy of unilateralism undermines our strategic interests. Kevin Fujimoto of the Strategic Studies Institute explains in 2012 that US attempts to aggressively and unilaterally impose democracy worldwide alienates countries that don't share the same values, ultimately undermining US interests and global stability as countries band together to oppose the United States. The Cuban embargo has prevented the US from shifting away from unilateralism as Jake Colvin at the National Foreign Trade Council explains in 2008 that the reluctance to address the Cuban embargo as the last relic of Cold War Policy has prevented politicians from adopting multilateral policies.

However, ending the Cuba embargo would signal a shift towards a more inclusive international order that embraces political diversity. Because the embargo is a prime example of the US attempting to unilaterally promote democracy, Klaas Hinderdael at the SAIS Journal for Global Affairs explains in 2011 lifting the embargo would signal that the US is willing to cooperate with non-democratic governments to address local and global issues. Jake Colvin furthers that lifting the embargo is an easy way to break with unilateral democracy promotion and signal to the entire world that the US is committed to engaging with other countries, despite their differences.

There are two impacts:

1. Stopping war. Kevin Fujimoto explains that the United States needs to redirect its efforts from unilateral democracy promotion towards multilateralism that accepts multiple forms of governance to address the inevitable rise of competitors like China. He continues explaining that a system focused on incorporating all actors would strengthen global institutions and international law since every country would be invested in positive outcomes and have equal influence in decision-making. This would prevent conflict between major powers from ever starting, as International affairs professor Charles Kupchan explains in 2012 that a system that is accepting of all nations would create coalitions to confront actors that are aggressive and breach international norms, reducing tensions and the chance of miscalculation or preemptive strikes that could spark war.
2. Creating a sustainable, cooperative world order. Kupchan continues in 2009 that an international order that values political diversity would encourage stability by including all countries as stakeholders in the international system. Kupchan continues in 2012 that by incorporating states that don't conform to western values, this new international order would create stronger and more legitimate coalitions of states to solve issues like terrorism, nuclear proliferation, economic stability, and water and food security.