

Pro

Naim Overview

If a Cuban civil war starts, it short circuits all of their impacts. Moises Naim at Foreign Policy explains in 2001 that a Cuban collapse would result in a chaotic failed state, not a democracy. This means if we win that lifting the embargo causes a civil war, none of your impacts ever happen — there's no central government to maintain the economy or human rights in a failed state.

AT: Gradualism DA

1. The link story doesn't make sense — if conditions in Cuba are rapidly improving under the Aff, the populous has literally zero incentive to rise up and start a civil war.
2. Reforms aren't happening. Democracy Digest reports in 2013 that Raul's approach of gradualism is simply a ruse to create the impression that Cuba is progressing and improving, when in reality, repression of human rights is continuing.
3. No violent revolution. Economic professor Monica Hirst explains in 2013 that dissident groups in Cuba no longer perceive violent revolution as the path to change, instead focusing on non-violent alternatives.
4. Civil war can't start. Gabriella Hoffman at the Washington Times explains in 2016 that ever since the Castros rose to power, guns have been non-existent in Cuba because the regime has made acquiring a gun legally impossible. If the citizens don't have guns they can't revolt.
5. XA Chicago Tribune, which says only 21% of reforms pass, and the ones that do pass are doomed to fail because of resistance from the communist party and Cuban elites, who backlash and siphon off profits from the private sector.
6. XA Katz, who says that while Raul is trying to gradually transition Cuba now, the embargo prevents the US from providing the technical assistance and market expertise to ensure that reforms are targeted in the right places, dooming the transition to failure.
7. XA Case, all our links prove that the aff makes the transition process more successful.

AT: Fast Reforms are bad

1. Turn, fast reforms are better. Carmelo Mesa Lago at American Studies Quarterly explains in 2016 that the current reform process in Cuba is too slow to be effective, whereas accelerated reform would be better for Cuban citizens and give the process more legitimacy. Marian Tupy at the Cato Institute confirms in 2016 that empirically, fast reforms in communist countries always result in higher GDP per capita, less poverty and inequality, and higher human development because slow reforms enable the ruling party to corrupt the reform process and funnel gains from the reforms back into their pockets.

Latin Relations solve:

1. No impact, David Perez at the Yale Law Review explains in 2010 that the improved Latin American relations from lifting the embargo would prevent Cuba from collapsing and becoming a failed state by creating a series of cooperative policies to prevent it from ever happening.

AT: Diaz Canel takes over general

1. Diaz Canel won't take over. Jose Azel at the University of Miami explains in 2013 that while Diaz Canel is in line to become head of the Council of State, the Communist Party is the entity that actually determines the successor to Raul Castro, so the second in command of the Cuban Communist Party, Machado, is the current successor to Castro.

AT: Diaz Canel solves US-Cuba Relations:

1. Diaz Canel won't improve relations with the US. Trump is taking a hardline stance on Cuba, which means the only chance diplomatic relations will improve is if the embargo is lifted, and Stephen Wilkinson at the International Institute for the Study of Cuba explains in 2013 that Diaz Canel's administration will be filled with people who fought in the Cuban Revolution, preventing him from changing much of anything.

AT: Diaz Canel does more reforms:

1. Diaz Canel won't reform, as Latin American studies professor Jaime Sucklicki explains in 2013 that Diaz Canel is a Marxist, doesn't have support from the Cuban populus or the military, and will be constrained by the communist party, so he won't push for significant political or economic reforms.

AT: Embargo gets lifted under Diaz Canel:

1. Turn it, Marcy Kreiter at the International Business Times explains in November 2016 that because Diaz Canel doesn't have a close relationship with the Cuban military, he won't be able to maintain as much control of the island and will just be a placeholder until the younger Castros are ready to take power, meaning lifting the embargo under Diaz Canel is more likely to result in instability and collapse.

AT: Scapegoat Link:

1. Non-unique, PhD Michael Kline reports in 2010 that Raul Castro admitted that although the embargo is a crippling and punitive policy it “could no longer be blamed for all the island’s woes.”

AT: Private Sector Link:

1. Non-unique, Scott Brown of the Atlantic Council explains in 2015 that since 2008 the private sector has tripled in size as the government has shrunk the public sector.

AT: Diaz Canel takes over / reforms **things**

1. Diaz Canel won't take over. Jose Azel at the University of Miami explains in 2013 that while Diaz Canel is in line to become head of the Council of State, the Communist Party is the entity that actually determines the successor to Raul Castro, so the second in command of the Cuban Communist Party, Machado, is the current successor to Castro.

AT: Appeasement DA (intl rivals act out)

1. No reason Cuba is uniquely key. Russia, China, and North Korea don't gauge whether they can afford to act out by the US's Cuba policy, they do it based on the US's willingness to use military force against other aggressive actors.
2. Should have happened — Damien Cave at the New York Times reports in 2012 that Obama relaxed portions of the embargo, if all your international scenarios about other rivals lashing out were true, they would have occurred.
3. Appeasement is wrong. Matthew Yglesias at the Center for American Progress explains in 2009 that fears of appeasement are out of touch with objective reality and presumes that all foreign leaders are hardcore irrational ideologues. This is a double bind, as Yglesias continues that "Genuine madmen aren't going to care what "signal" we're sending, and non-crazy people can be productively bargained with."
4. No impact to signaling weakness. Shiping Tang at the Center for Regional Security Studies explains in 2005 that because states always use a "worst case" mentality, signals of irresolution or lost reputation are irrelevant because adversaries always assume that a state is resolute to ensure that they don't miscalculate.
5. Turn, appeasement solves conflicts. Jeffrey Record at the Strategic Studies Institute explains in 2008 that empirically, when the state doing the appeasing is stronger than the appeased state, appeasement reduces tensions by removing the causes of conflict and disagreement.
6. Turn, Ray Takeyh at the Council on Foreign Relations explains in 2009 that US diplomatic concessions that try to change an adversary's behavior are always good because either the behavior change happens, or the fact that the adversary rejected diplomacy makes it easier for the US to assemble a durable international coalition to pressure the adversary.

AT: WWII Empiric

1. Record continues that the example of appeasement in WWII is fundamentally flawed because A, Europe wasn't appeasing from a position of strength, and B, Hitler's Germany was fundamentally unlike EVERY other state actor in history because it was unappeasable and undeterrable.

AT: Cuban Aggression

1. No impact. Arturo Lopez Levy at the University of Denver explains in 2011 that if the US appeased Cuba, the Cuban government would be unlikely to act out and has little capacity to threaten US interests because Cuba's government, while somewhat anti-American, doesn't harbor expansionist tendencies.
2. No impact to signaling weakness. Shiping Tang at the Center for Regional Security Studies explains in 2005 that because states always use a "worst case" mentality, signals of irresolution or lost reputation are irrelevant because adversaries always assume that a state is resolute to ensure that they don't miscalculate.
3. Appeasement is wrong. Matthew Yglesias at the Center for American Progress explains in 2009 that fears of appeasement are out of touch with objective reality and presumes that Cuban leaders are hardcore irrational ideologues, which they aren't. This is a double bind, as Yglesias continues that "Genuine madmen aren't going to care what "signal" we're sending, and non-crazy people can be productively bargained with."
4. Turn, Damien Cave at the New York Times reports in 2012 that Obama already relaxed portions of the embargo covering travel and remittances, but keeping the rest of the embargo in place will strengthen hardliners in the Cuban government by continuing the perception that the US is an arrogant imperial power.
5. Turn, appeasement solves conflicts. Jeffrey Record at the Strategic Studies Institute explains in 2008 that empirically, when the state doing the appeasing is stronger than the appeased state, appeasement reduces tensions by removing the causes of conflict and disagreement. In this case, removing the embargo gets rid of the source of disagreement, allowing for better diplomatic relations that stop Castro's aggression.
6. Turn, Ray Takeyh at the Council on Foreign Relations explains in 2009 that US diplomatic concessions that try to change an adversary's behavior are always good because either the behavior change happens, or the fact that the adversary rejected diplomacy makes it easier for the US to assemble a durable international coalition to pressure the adversary.

AT: HR/Democracy Crackdown

1. Your empirics aren't causal. Austin Tymins of the Harvard Political Review finds in 2014 that the reason the Castro regime cracks down on human rights when we partially lift the embargo is because they want to force us to reinstitute it.
2. Turn it, the embargo makes HR abuses worse, The Cuba Study Group explains in 2013 that the embargo on Cuba has created a scapegoat for the regime's oppressive practices and economic failures, legitimizing the regime. This explains your empirics — the regime only cracks down because it can blame the embargo for needing to suppress "illegitimate" dissent, but if there's no embargo, they're scared the populous will blame them.
3. Turn, empirically, sanctions like the embargo worsen human rights. Professor of Political Science Dursun Peksen finds in 2009 that sanctions increase human rights abuses by 151% and political imprisonment by 57% because sanctions are seen as an external threat to national unity, justifying the repression of anti-regime movements that want to divide the country.
4. Turn it, lifting the embargo improves human rights. Brandon Amash of Prospect Journal explains in 2012 that reopening diplomatic relations would decrease the chance of conflict and increase multilateral cooperation between the US and Cuba, resulting in a higher chance of improved human rights.

Case solves HR

1. The case solves human rights issues for two reasons.
 1. Leverage. Lance Koenig at the Army War College explains in 2010 that the increased leverage from lifting the embargo could be used to solve human rights issues within Cuba.
 2. Scapegoating. Arturo Lopez Levy at the New America Foundation explains in 2011 that the regime has used US hostility as an excuse to not provide civil liberties to the populace.

AT: More Money for Castros → Crackdown

1. This makes absolutely no sense. The Cuban government can already crack down on human rights — Raul can just call the head of the military and tell them to imprison activists and protesters, there's no reason it happens more if Raul has more money.

AT: Human Rights a priori/moral side constraint

1. This is internally contradictory — there will always be situations in which one possible action violates the rights of one group but the other possible action violates the rights of another group — you can't have a moral side constraint if it can never be followed.

AT: Embargo → Democracy

1. Empirically denied by 50 years of history. The Embargo has been in place for 50 years but they don't have a single piece of EV saying it's empirically caused more democracy.
2. Turn it, the embargo strengthens the regime, precluding democracy. The Cuba Study Group explains in 2013 that the embargo on Cuba has created a scapegoat for the regime's oppressive practices and economic failures, legitimizing the regime. This is why Professor of International Relations Amanda Licht quantifies in 2011 that sanctions decrease the likelihood that a challenger will replace the current authoritarian leader by 95%.
3. Turn, lifting the embargo causes more democracy for three reasons.
 1. Diplomacy. Brandon Amash of Prospect Journal explains in 2012 that lifting the embargo would reopen diplomatic relations, decrease the chance of conflict and increase multilateral cooperation between the US and Cuba, resulting in a higher chance of Cuba becoming a democracy.
 2. Tourism. Mike Stone of Reuters explains in 2015 that lifting the embargo would create 1.5 million more tourists because they can bypass the complicated visa process that currently exists. Increasing tourism is a prerequisite to democratic change as Enrique Peñalosa of the World Bank finds in 2013 that more tourism introduces democratic ideas, creating the seeds for a bottom-up democratic shift.
 3. Free Trade. Michael Barnes of the Baltimore Sun explains in 2015 that lifting the embargo would increase trade between the US and Cuba by \$9.3 billion. The CATO Institute finds in 2004 that empirically, free trade increases democratic values by 3 times and decreases the chance of political tyranny by 9 times.

AT: Embargo→ Regime collapse

1. This is literally our case — the regime will collapse in the status-quo because of Venezuela cutting of oil exports and the regime reversing reforms. Our Gorrell evidence indicates that if Cuba's government collapses, it will become a failed state that harbors terrorism, generating regional instability that destroys Latin American economies and crushes budding democracies.
2. Regime collapse won't result in democracy. Moises Naim at Foreign Policy explains in 2001 that a Cuban collapse would result in a chaotic failed state, not a democracy. This means if we win that lifting the embargo causes a civil war, none of your impacts ever happen — there's no central government to maintain the economy or human rights in a failed state.

AT: Embargo Lifting → Money to Castros

1. UNBEATABLE DEFENSE: Daniel Griswold at the Cato Institute finds in 2009 that while lifting the embargo would allow the Castro regime to skim off profits, the increase in US exports to Cuba would force the regime to spend its new money, resulting in the US economy reclaiming all of the regime's new profits.
2. Turn, political science professor Daniel Treisman finds in 2013 that empirically, even when economic growth helps the current regime survive in the short term, in the medium term, economic growth causes democracy after a leader leaves office. Raul Castro is planning on leaving office in 2018, which means your impacts last one year.
3. Non-unique, your own evidence says the Castro regime already reaps all the profits because the entire economy is controlled by the government — means you don't solve.
4. Status-quo solves. While the government used to control 90% of the economy, Timothy Ashby in case explains in 2013 that the private sector has grown to 28% of the Cuban economy and the government is gradually allowing workers to take over state owned businesses or open their own private businesses.
5. Turn, Ashby continues that lifting the embargo would stabilize the Cuban economy by helping them transition away from state owned businesses to a booming private sector because private businesses would now be able to export to the US.
6. Turn it, lifting the embargo expands Cuba's private sector, meaning the regime's control of the economy falls. Four reasons.
 1. Tourism. Daniel Griswold at the CATO Institute explains in 2005 that lifting the embargo would increase tourism to Cuba, growing the private sector by helping Cuban citizens who work in jobs like restaurants, taxis, and hotels.
 2. Remittances. Griswold continues that lifting the embargo would enable Cubans living in the US to send money back to relatives, directly growing the private sector by putting money in the pockets of Cuban citizens to start businesses.
 3. Entrepreneurship. Griswold continues that lifting the embargo would allow Cuban entrepreneurs to expand their business because it would enable them to export to the US.
 4. FDI. XA Bremmer from case, who says lifting the embargo would increase investment into Cuba by 34 times. Most of this would grow Cuba's private sector, as companies won't want to deal with the PR nightmare of investing in a government that violates human rights.

AT: Cuban Agriculture DA

1. Sustainable Cuban agriculture is a myth. Dennis Avery at the Hudson Institute explains in 2009 that while Cuba outwardly claims to have a large amount of sustainable agriculture, sustainability is a lie, and senior government officials have admitted that Cuba actually imports 84% of its food. Charles Thompson at Duke University furthers in 2012 that Cuba's agriculture is fundamentally unsustainable and can't meet the food demand of the island's population, resulting in food shortages.

Link Turn

2. Turn it, lifting the embargo boosts Cuban agriculture. Christina Cornell at the Council on Hemispheric Affairs explains in 2009 that lifting the embargo would give Cuba the ability to profit from exporting its food to the US because Cuba's food is competitively priced, and once other countries saw Cuba's agricultural model succeeding, they'd be likely to adopt the Cuban model.

Impact Turn

1. Turn it, Cuban domestic agriculture is bad. Damien Cave at the New York Times reports in 2012 that Castro's attempts to replace food imports with domestic agriculture has resulted in higher supply side costs, ultimately increasing food prices by 20% within Cuba.

AT: US companies buy Cuban land

1. No link, companies won't push out existing farmers. Agroecology professor Miguel Altieri writes in 2016 that "even if US firms buy land in Cuba to grow export crops...it wouldn't affect [small farmers...] because only about 70 percent of Cuba's arable rural land is currently in production."
2. Mitigate. Kim Severson at the New York Times reports in 2016 that the Cuban government owns 80% of agricultural land, which means that at worst, US companies can only take over 20% of Cuba's domestic agriculture.

AT: Food Exported to Cuba from US collapses Ag

1. Non-unique, the food embargo was already lifted. Danny Vinik of Politico reports in 2015 that an exception exists that allows Cuba to import US food and agricultural products even with the embargo in place. This means their impacts should have happened already.
2. Turn, closer relations mean less food imports. Vinik continues that as diplomatic relations between Cuba and the US grow, Cuba imports less food from the US because it wants to avoid dependence on the US.

AT: Modeling

1. The US won't model. Dale Pfeiffer at From the Wilderness explains in 2003 that attempts to shift the US toward the Cuban agricultural model would be met with stiff resistance because large scale agriculture is already more efficient.
2. Double bind — Cuban agriculture has existed for decades — either other countries are already modeling and the impact is non-unique or they aren't modeling in the squo and won't in the future.

AT: Renewables DA

1. Cuban oil has no impact on prices. Political science professor Andrew Hira explains in 2013 that Cuba's potential oil reserves are too small to make a significant dent on global oil prices or US-Cuban relations. Offshore Magazine furthers in 2012 that there is no commercially viable oil that could be obtained in Cuba.
2. Non-unique, oil prices are low and will stay low. Clifford Krauss at the New York Times explains in December 2016 that since June 2014, global oil prices have plunged 70%, and prices aren't expected to be high again for years to come.
3. Non-unique, embargo doesn't affect oil. Paul Guzzo at the Tampa Bay Times explains in January 2017 that a treaty was recently signed that clears up maritime territorial claims, in turn allowing Cuba to start drilling for oil where it previously couldn't.
4. No transition to renewables now. Brad Plumer at the Washington Post explains in 2013 that while renewable energy growth has stagnated over the past 20 years, fossil fuel usage has been continually increasing.
5. No solvency for warming. Elizabeth Rosenthal at the New York Times explains in 2013 that because renewable technologies like wind and solar are inherently intermittent because and expensive to integrate into power grids, the more effective path to reduce CO2 emissions is to improve the energy efficiency of existing fuels.

Latin Relations Turn:

1. Turn, lifting the embargo solves warming. Professor of Latin American studies Michael Shifter explains in 2012 that if the US ended its policy of Cuban isolation, it would enable the US to cooperate with Latin America to address climate change. Jim Garamone at the American Forces Press Service furthers in 2009 that because climate change requires interconnected solutions, only by cooperating with other nations in the Western Hemisphere can the US solve climate change.

AT: Oil Flood internal Link

1. This already happened — it's the reason oil prices crashed in 2014.
2. It's inevitable. Brad Plumer at the Washington Post explains in 2012 that increasing US and Canadian shale oil production will cause Saudi Arabia to flood the market with oil to try to crush the US's attempt to achieve energy independence.

AT: Healthcare DA

1. Non-unique, Cuban healthcare fails now. Hanna Plant at the University of St. Andrews explains in 2013 that Cuba's healthcare system is currently failing because Cuba lacks medical supplies, technology, and medicine, with most hospitals and pharmacies being understocked.
2. Non-unique, medical brain drain happens now. Political science professor Michael Erisman explains in 2013 that the US currently uses a program that specifically helps Cuban medical professionals leave the country, with over 12,000 medical professionals coming from Cuba to the US.
3. Turn, the embargo destroys Cuban health care. Amnesty International explains in 2009 that the embargo harms the Cuban healthcare system because A, it prevents medical technology from being exported to Cuba, B, it prevents UN programs from aiding Cuba, and C, it prevents upgrades to physical healthcare infrastructure by restricting Cuba's access to capital. Hou Quiang at Xinhua News furthers in 2012 that the embargo has forced Cuba to buy medical supplies for higher prices from other nations and in some cases, prevented access altogether because some technologies only exist in the US.

AT: Modeling

1. Double bind — the Cuban healthcare system has existed for decades — either other countries are already modeling and the impact is non-unique or they aren't modeling in the squo and won't in the future.
2. Turn, public health professor Halla Thorsteinsdóttir explains in 2004 that because the embargo prevents Cubans from coming to the US and restricts their access to medical technology, the embargo prevents Cuban health knowledge from flowing to the international community.

AT: Smoking

1. Non-unique; CNN Cuba correspondent Patrick Oppmann reports in 2016 that Obama has allowed Americans to import an unlimited number of Cuban cigars by completely lifting restrictions.
2. No link; Alison Griswold of Slate explains that the only reason that Cuban cigars are so popular is that they're banned. When the ban is reversed, they'll lose their allure and people will have no greater reason to buy them than other cigars or cigarettes.

AT: Biotech DA

1. No link. All your EV just says that Cuba has invested in biotechnology to cope with the embargo, none of it says that lifting the embargo would collapse the Cuban biotech sector. If anything, turn, lifting the embargo would give Cuba access to a massive new market to sell their superior biotech to, resulting in increased investment in the sector.
2. Turn, the embargo suppresses the Cuban biotech sector. Global health professor Halla Thorsteinsdóttir explains in 2004 that because the embargo limits Cuba's access to financial resources, it has prevented greater development in the biotechnology field.
3. Turn, the embargo prevents Cuban biotech knowledge from spreading. Thorsteinsdóttir explains that because the embargo prevents Cuban scientists from travelling to the US, it prevents Cuba from sharing its biotech knowledge with the world. However, Bill Frist at Forbes confirms in 2015 that as the US normalizes relations with Cuba, it will be able to access Cuba's advancements in biotech research.

AT: Modeling

1. Double bind — the Cuban biotech sector has existed for decades — either other countries are already modeling and the impact is non-unique or they aren't modeling in the squo and won't in the future.

AT: Free Trade Bad

1. Turn because free trade leads to more democracy. Dan Griswold of the CATO institute reports in 2004 that “free trade promotes democracy and respect for human rights” and that free trade increases the chance that a state is a democracy by 3x. That’s key because Sean Jones at Harvard writes in 1998 that democracies have less violence, enhanced quality of life, and less hunger.
2. Free trade leads to a reduction in income inequality. Maggie Flanigan reports in 2014 that trade decreases income inequality by facilitating economic growth and providing especially low cost items to the poor.
3. Free trade helps the US economy. Ramona Khan explains in 2016 that lifting the embargo will give american companies access to a \$1.2 billion a year market. She continues that lifting the embargo will create thousands of jobs.
4. This argument is empirically untrue. They cannot give a single example of any nations trading with Cuba who have had these negative effects.

AT: Cubans pay with cash under the embargo, lifting embargo means they pay with credit and default

1. Ramona Khan writes in 2016 that the current cash-only restriction is harming investors because the weak Cuban economy is unable to procure cash. However, lifting the embargo and moving to credit means that Cuba has time to pay back the money and fully pays back its debts. Affirm to reduce instances of Cuban default.

AT: Tourism Bad

1. Non-unique; increased US tourists would only displace tourists from other countries. Rafael Romeu of the IMF finds in 2009 that Cuba has an absolute maximum capacity for tourists, and that therefore an increase in US tourists would only displace tourists from other countries, leading to no net change in the amount of tourism.
2. Non-unique; US tourists can visit Cuba despite the embargo. Angelo Young of Salon finds in August that there are twelve reasons that Americans can visit Cuba, and that they are broad enough that almost any tourist is covered.

Turns:

1. Turn; tourism benefits the Cuban economy. Richard Feinberg of Brookings explains in December that Cuban “hotels exclusively employ Cubans” and that 82% of money from tourism would stay in the Cuban economy. This is especially important because Caroline Ashley of Harvard’s Overseas Development Institute explains in 2007 that tourism in developing countries, such as Cuba, has a 70% multiplier effect on the rest of the economy as profits spill over to other industries.
2. Turn; tourism promotes Cuban democracy. Enrique Peñalosa, the President of the Institute for Transportation and Development Policy, writes in 2013 that tourists bring more democratic ideas and attitudes to extremely unequal, undemocratic developing countries. He explains that these views can seed democratic change, leading to a more just, democratic society.
3. Turn; tourism benefits the US economy. Ed Sanders of the Center for Sustainable Tourism found that removing the embargo would increase US GDP by 2 billion dollars and create 12,000 new jobs primarily because of the new Cuban tourism market.

AT: Racism

1. Non-unique, tourism is already a huge industry in Cuba and there's no proof that having a few more tourists from the US significantly expands the tourism industry enough to make the racist hiring policies any worse.
2. If anything, it's better to provide more Cubans with jobs even if there's discriminatory hiring, having a job still improves the quality of life of poor Cubans.
3. Status-quo solves, Damien Cave at the New York Times reports in 2016 that Cuban society has undergone decades of racial reforms, with the regime ending segregation and the social welfare system ensuring that the society is overall more racially equal. Tourism will likely be the next sector to experience reform.

AT: Trump does the Aff / Squo removes soon

1. Doesn't take out our offense. We never specified a timeframe for doing the resolution, and this isn't policy debate — fiat isn't necessarily immediate. If we prove lifting the embargo is a good idea, you should affirm.
2. If it non-uniques us, it takes out your offense too — none of your arguments are unique if the resolution happens in the near future.
3. Embargo won't get lifted because it would flip Florida blue. Steven Byas at Randall University explains in 2016 that Obama's efforts at slowly easing the embargo generated resentment among Cuban Americans living in Florida and may have cost Hillary the state. Trump and the Republican Congress won't commit political suicide and lose a major battleground state.
4. Congressional Republicans block. Elizabeth Ernst at USC explains in 2016 that the embargo can only be lifted through legislative action in Congress, which is currently controlled by Republicans who oppose improving relations with Cuba.
5. Trump won't try to lift either. Olly Hopkins at the Center for Research on Globalization explains in 2016 that Trump appointed multiple people to his transition team who oppose lifting the embargo and Trump himself has publicly stated that he intends to roll back all of Obama's executive orders that eased parts of the embargo.

AT: Miguel Diaz Canel

1. None of your evidence says the US will remove the embargo under Diaz Canel — it just says one condition of the embargo being removed is that a Castro can't be in power — it doesn't say US politicians WANT to remove the embargo.

AT: Delay Aff Bad (blippy version)

1. We're predictable — we advocate for the most likely version of the rez, which your ev indicates is a removal of the embargo under Diaz Canel because Helms Burton prevents the resolution from happening until then.
2. Ground skew.
 1. No ground skew — we weren't going to squirrel out of your DA links and your DAs aren't timeframe specific so squirreling isn't even possible.
 2. Turn — there is literally zero viable aff ground under your interp. If you can just say the aff happens in a year, it's impossible to gain uniqueness on any potential aff offense because none of it is timeframe specific.
3. Should doesn't imply immediate, it doesn't imply any timeframe at all, it's just a normative statement about whether or not something is a good idea
4. Delay aff good: Policymaking Education — in the real world, policymakers don't do things instantly, they put timeframes on policy.

AT: MSJ embargo will be lifted slowly

overview

1. Embargo can't be lifted further. David Francis at Foreign Policy explains in 2016 that Obama has lifted as much of the embargo as he legally can, with the Helms Burton Act preventing more parts of the embargo from being lifted without Congressional approval.

AT: Sex Trafficking

1. The scope of the impact is really small. They can't tell you how many more people will travel to Cuba as sex tourists post-embargo, and the fact that sex trafficking occurs in the status-quo proves that traffickers are already circumventing the embargo by doing things like going to another country before going to Cuba to avoid travel restrictions.
2. Sex trafficking is not an issue in Cuba. In fact, UNICEF explains in 2014 that "Cuba is an example in the protection of children", and has continued to advance its protection.
3. Turn; remember in our case when we show that lifting the embargo benefits the Cuban economy. Because the Institute for Trafficked, Exploited & Missing Persons in 2014 identifies poverty as the root cause of international human trafficking and finds an empirical reverse correlation between a country's GDP and the amount of trafficking, lifting the embargo would reduce human trafficking.

AT: Tourism Link

1. Non-unique; increased US tourists would only displace tourists from other countries. Rafael Romeu of the IMF finds in 2009 that Cuba has an absolute maximum capacity for tourists, and that therefore an increase in US tourists would only displace tourists from other countries, leading to no net change in the amount of tourism.
2. Non-unique; US tourists can visit Cuba despite the embargo. Angelo Young of Salon finds in August that there are twelve reasons that Americans can visit Cuba, and that they are broad enough that almost any tourist is covered.

AT: Elections DA

1. This is silly. The election is literally four years away, the reason Obama's diplomatic overtures to Cuba caused Florida to go red is because it happened relatively close to the 2016 election.
2. Also the probability of the impact is tiny — there's no way they can guarantee that the Cuban American population in Florida will swing the next election.
3. This is ridiculously speculative — None of your evidence indicates that Republicans will need to win Florida in the midterms or the presidential election to maintain control of Congress and the White House.
4. Republicans are probably already screwed for midterms and 2020. Trump is already imploding and he's barely been in office for a week; democrats are seeing a historically unprecedented surge of activism everywhere through the refugee ban protests and the women's march, which is probably a pretty good indication that they'll have historically high turnout on election day.

AT: LNG Impacts

1. It should have already happened. Paul Parfomak at the Congressional Research Service reports in 2008 that because of numerous control systems and the double hulled design of tankers, LNG tankers have carried over 45,000 cargoes and traveled over 100 million miles without a serious accident.
2. No impact. Lloyd's List reports in 2008 that LNG in its liquid form is not flammable or explosive and it's impossible for LNG to be released fast enough to generate an explosion. They continue that claims about LNG having a nuclear explosion level impact refer to the amount of energy contained on an LNG tanker, not what would actually happen in the event of an attack. The San Diego Union Tribune furthers in 2004 that LNG is only explosive within a narrow range of concentrations in the air, between 5 percent to 15 percent.
3. No LNG terrorism. Analyst Tony Muncer explains in 2005 that in order to detonate the entire cargo of an LNG tanker, a group would have to launch a full scale military operation, and even then, the design of tankers would prevent most attacks from succeeding.

AT: 55 Hiroshima Bombs

1. This is false, Henry Ozog at ioMosaic explains in 2006 that the 55 Hiroshimas claim is based on a misleading and erroneous estimation about hazard energy potential.

AT: Terrorism Impacts

AT: ISIL is a big threat

1. ISIL isn't a threat, as Alex Ward at the Center on International Security finds in 2015 that ISIL's main focus is on territory grabbing and doesn't care about attacking the US, with lone wolf ISIL attacks being relatively small.

AT: Al Qaeda is a big threat

1. Al Qaeda isn't a threat, as Kangil Lee at the International Center for Political Violence and Terrorism Research finds in 2015 that Al Qaeda has lost 28 of its 29 leaders to drone strikes, lacks any training centers, communications ability, or funding, and has only launched two successful attacks in the last 20 years.

AT: Nuclear terrorism impacts

1. There is no risk of nuclear terrorism, as Leonard Weiss at Stanford explains in 2015 that a terrorist organization acquiring nuclear weapons is virtually impossible, as building a nuclear weapon requires overcoming tons of technical barriers and, stealing a nuclear weapon is practically impossible due to layered safeguards and security, and acquiring a nuclear weapon willingly from a state won't happen because nuclear states fear retaliation from other nuclear states.

AT: China SOI Good

1. Non-unique, Matt Ferchen at the Carnegie Endowment explains in 2012 that Latin American countries are beginning to pull away from China over fears that Chinese investment will foster potentially damaging economic dependency. Andres Oppenheimer of Columbia University confirms in 2016 that China has decreased trade with Latin America by 11% over the last two years.
2. The impacts only trigger if China takes over US influence in Latin America, but Patrick Duddy at Duke University explains in 2013 that China will never overtake the US's Latin American influence because the A, US is the region's largest investor and trade partner, B, trade is increasing, and C, the US's national reputation, popular culture, values, and institutions give the US unique and unquantifiably higher influence than others.
3. No link, social science professor Jiang Shixue explains in 2012 that trade competition between the US and China in Latin America is not zero sum, and that Chinese expansion into Latin America is actually welcomed by the US, which means lifting the embargo won't push China out of Latin America.

Turns:

1. Turn it, Chinese involvement in Latin America destroys the US's Latin American relations. The German Institute of Global and Area Studies explains in 2013 that as Chinese influence in Latin America increases, the US's relations with Latin America will decline because hostile regimes will be able to avoid US sanctions by trading more with China as they are no longer dependent on the US.
2. Turn it, Chinese involvement in Latin America causes a US-China war. National security professor Evan Ellis explains in 2005 that as China increases its influence and presence in the Western Hemisphere, the US is increasingly likely to view China as an immediate threat to national security that is attempting to erode US influence and lash out, starting a conflict with China.
3. Turn it, Chinese influence in Latin America causes a Taiwan invasion. Robbie Fergusson at the University of Glasgow explains in 2012 that because China's trade with Latin America is legally contingent on those nations not supporting Taiwan, increased Chinese economic ties in Latin America will pick off Taiwan's allies until China believes Taiwan is no longer legitimate, at which point China will take over Taiwan using force. This causes nuclear war, as William Lowther at the Taipei Times explains in 2013 that because the legitimacy of the Chinese government and US security commitments are contingent on Taiwan, a Chinese invasion of the island would force a US response that, through miscalculation and miscommunication, would escalate to a full scale nuclear conflict.

AT: Bioweapons Impacts

1. All your evidence saying the regime will use bioweapons is talking about what Fidel would do. Raul isn't crazy.
2. Bioweapons don't cause extinction — all your extinction EV just says pathogens could theoretically spread fast enough to kill everyone, not that Cuba has a bioweapon that is capable of killing everyone.
3. No Cuban bioweapons. Wayne Smith at the Center for International Policy explains in 2007 that allegations of a Cuban bioweapons program were politically motivated and that multiple international delegations have found “no evidence at all to suggest that Cuba is in fact developing biological weapons.”

AT: Environment DA

1. Lifting the embargo doesn't impact the environment. Eliza Barclay at Truthout explains in 2004 that Cuba already has numerous legal protections for the environment to prevent development from harming the ecosystem that won't be lifted, even if the embargo is lifted or Cuba's economy improves.
2. Impact is inevitable, The United Nations Environmental Programme reports in 2010 that Latin American and Caribbean biodiversity is being rapidly destroyed in the status-quo because of human activities.

AT: Informal economy/offshoring

1. The global organization Women in Informal Employment defines the informal sector as economic activities that are not regulated or protected by the state. Cuba will never have an informal sector because communist governments are built around the idea of regulating every industry, including the private sector.
2. The link makes no sense. Lifting the embargo increases investment into Cuba which definitionally cannot increase the informal sector because either A) no company would risk their investments in the informal sector and B) investment always has regulations which means if anything more investment shift the informal sector to the formal sector.
3. Cuba already has a significant informal sector like the black market because there is a lack of access to better paying jobs and basic supplies due to the embargo.
4. The informal sector doesn't cause inequality, it's reverse causal. Associate Professor Diego Winkelreid writes in 2005 that the relationship goes the other way. Income inequality increases the informal sector because when people are poor, they sell items on the black market.

Impact Turn to Income Inequality:

1. In an empirical analysis of less developed countries, Allison Hayes found in 2005 that a 1 point increase in income inequality boosts GDP per capita growth by .3% because there is an increased incentive for investment. This effect is exacerbated for a communist country like Cuba which currently has almost zero income inequality since the government has a universal monthly income.

Impact turn informal economy

1. Turn, Richard Feinberg of the Brookings Institute explains in 2016 that small businesses in Cuba actually prefer to have an informal economy because they can avoid the heavy costs imposed on them by the communist government; increasing the size of the informal economy decreases governmental control of the economy.

AT: SAPs

1. Cuba won't necessarily try to get credit from the IMF/World Bank — they can take out credit from things like the BRICS Bank, the Inter American development Bank, the Andean Development Bank, or individual countries like China.
2. Cuba doesn't need credit for their economy to grow. They can just trade with the US and get FDI and tourism.
3. Cuba is communist and historically is opposed to western countries meddling with their economy — there's no way Raul would agree to the conditions of an SAP. They withdrew from the IMF and World Bank in the 60's because they're ideologically opposed to the imperialism of the IMF and World Bank.
4. No link, Hector Torres at the World Economic Forum explains in 2015 that Cuba won't be able to join the IMF because the US would derail the process and couldn't join the World Bank without joining the IMF first. Even if we lift the embargo, the US political system is still controlled by anti-Cuba Republican's, so the joining process will still be derailed.
5. The Business Inquirer reports in 2014 that the IMF no longer imposes structural adjustment programmes on countries that take out loans. In fact, an IMF/World Bank conference changed the conditions of loans so that loan programmes are decided together with the recipient government.
6. Turn, Cuba will borrow from development banks instead of the IMF. Richard Torres at the Center of Studies of the Cuban Economy explains in 2015 that while the IMF provides credit access, development banks would provide funding for projects to build up Cuban infrastructure and social projects, which are the main barrier to Cuban economic expansion.

AT: Leverage

1. Empirically, embargo leverage fails, Daniel Erikson of the Inter-American Dialogue explains in 2009 that the last 50 years prove that the embargo represents a lack of leverage and trading parts of the embargo for incremental reforms is doomed to fail.
2. Turn, the embargo legitimizes Castro. The Cuba Study Group explains in 2013 that the embargo on Cuba has strengthened the Cuban government by creating a scapegoat for its oppressive practices and economic blunders. The embargo helps the Castros stay in power, so it never provides leverage.
3. Turn it, lifting the embargo increases diplomatic leverage. Brandon Amash of Prospect Journal explains in 2012 that lifting the embargo would reopen diplomatic relations and increase cooperation between the US and Cuba, resulting in a higher chance of improved human rights and democratic change.
4. Turn, the embargo kills leverage. Richard Haass at the Council on Foreign Relations explains in 1998 that sanctions reduce US leverage as they cut off the flow of aid and trade, resulting in higher anti-US sentiment.

AT: Monopolies (MSJ)

1. Either no link or impact already happened. Their link is literally that globalization causes monopolies; the fact that the entire world is already globalized means that either every country already has monopolies and there's no economic impact or globalization doesn't cause monopolies and they're just cherry-picking one example.
2. Social science professor David Seaman explains in 2010 that because the embargo is unilateral, Cuba has found other trading partners. This means the impact should have already happened in Cuba if trade actually caused monopolies.
3. The impact makes absolutely no sense — there's literally zero explanation for why monopolies magically increase inflation and unemployment by 300%; large corporations that have monopolies have an incentive to hire lots of workers and prevent there from being dangerously high inflation that would cut into their profits.
4. Their impact card is garbage — it's talking about monopolies in the context of having one central bank instead of multiple individual banks, and the part talking about 300% inflation never says privatization or free trade caused the high inflation, it just says that the Chilean government made multiple massive shifts in economic policy during a massive recession, so the whole thing is a sampling bias. Additionally, the whole card is talking about Chile in the 1970s while their economy was in continual free fall because the let students from the University of Chicago arbitrarily impose new economic policy.

AT: Cuban Claims

1. This argument makes no sense — there's no reason lifting the embargo would prevent the US and Cuba from settling outstanding claims.
2. Non-unique, Castro makes claims about what the US owes Cuba regardless of whether or not the embargo exists.
3. No impact. Castro's claims are just a political move to equal US claims about seized property, the international community isn't going to force the US to pay Cuba \$800 billion, which means Cuba won't seize US investments for fear of backlash.
4. Also, Castro won't seize US investments because he needs to ensure the economy doesn't collapse because he wants to avoid a civil war.
5. Status-quo solves, Jay Solomon at the Wall Street Journal explains in 2016 that Cuba and the US are already accelerating discussions to resolve outstanding claims. Mimi Whitefield at the Miami Herald corroborates in 2016 that both countries have entered substantial negotiations to resolve claims and both sides want to resolve the claims.
6. Turn, keeping the embargo only makes Cuba increase their claims. Solomon continues that Cuba's claims against the US are premised on the economic and humanitarian costs of the embargo, costs which only increase the longer we keep the embargo.
7. Turn, lifting the embargo would resolve competing claims. Political economy professor Richard Feinberg explains in 2015 that lifting the embargo would improve claims negotiations because the Cuban government would use the lifting of the embargo to offset any concessions made in the claims negotiations.

AT: Cuba Defaults

1. Empirically denied, other countries invest in Cuba's economy and there hasn't been some mass defaulting of debt, defaulting only happens in a small minority of cases
2. Cuba will not default on debts because economist Daniel Munevar explains in 2016 that Cuba understands that future investment is contingent on paying off current debt. Thus it will A) not default on debt and B) work to restructure any existing debt so that they can pay it back.
3. Cuba's credit rating is improving. The Jamaica Observer reports in 2015 that Moody's credit rating agency recently upgraded Cuba's status. Realize that Cuba has improved, and the problems my opponents talk about have gone away.

Con

Naim Overview

If a Cuban civil war starts, it short circuits all of their impacts. Naim in case explains that a Cuban collapse would result in a chaotic failed state, not a democracy. This means if we win that lifting the embargo causes a civil war, none of your impacts ever happen — there's no central government to maintain the economy or human rights in a failed state.

Watson Overview

Weigh food scarcity first. Philosophy professor Richard Watson argues in 1977 that because every human has equal value and a right to equal access to the necessities of life, the highest moral obligation is to ensure equal distribution of food, no matter the consequences.

Delay Aff Bad (If they delay to spike out of Gradualism)

The aff must end the embargo immediately. Four warrants.

1. The resolution is a question of whether or not to lift the embargo in the present tense, where Cuba hasn't met the original conditions for the embargo to be lifted. The Aff has to prove that lifting the embargo before conditions are met is good, neg just has to prove we should wait until the conditions are met.
2. Topicality. The verb phrase "should lift" in the resolution is present tense, which indicates immediate action.
3. Ground skew. Allowing the aff to delay fiat allows them to squirrel out of any disad ground by delaying until the disad won't happen.
4. Predictability. The neg is confined to the status quo, meaning the aff only has to prep against one neg world, whereas if the aff can arbitrarily and unpredictably choose a timeframe, the neg has to prep for infinite aff worlds.

AT: Latin American Relations

1. The warrant is incoherent — Latin American countries might be annoyed about US policy towards Cuba but their interactions with the US are determined far more by the US's policy towards their own country, and there's no reason they'd resume cooperation specifically because the US lifted the embargo.
2. Status quo solved. Shawn Lansing at the Naval War College confirms in 2016 that when the US and Cuba resumed diplomatic relations in 2014, it removed the sticking point in US-Latin American relations and allowed the US to start cooperating with the region again at Summit conferences.
3. Non-unique, Patrick Duddy at Duke University explains in 2013 that US influence in Latin America is unparalleled because the US is Latin America's largest trade partner and is continually increasing economic ties in the region.
4. Trump will never cooperate with Latin America. Ryan Dube at the Wall Street Journal explains in 2016 that Trump intends to undo Obama's attempts to thaw diplomatic tensions between the US and Cuba and drive a wedge between the US and Latin America.
5. Alternate causality to low relations. Professor of Latin American Studies Michael Shifter explains in 2012 that Latin American countries are outraged over the US's failed drug policy which has failed to stop Latin American drug cartels. Ming Tang at the Center for Economic and Policy Research furthers in 2016 that relations with Latin America are at an all time low because of the US's response to the Honduran Coup and the US's Plan Colombia policy.

Turns

1. Turn, 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. Turn, 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, resulting in the spread of communism
3. Turn, 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.

AT: Democracy Promotion

1. None of their evidence says democracy promotion causes Latin countries to democratize or that Trump would want to do democracy promotion, which he's historically opposed to.
2. Turn, US democracy promotion is a sham that ruins relations. Steven Gilbert at Eastern Michigan University explains in 2008 that historically, so-called US democracy promotion in Latin America is simply a guise for imperialism that cares more about US resource access than actual democracy, and has resulted in the US overthrowing democratic governments that posed small threats to US interests.

AT: Soft Power

1. No evidence that losses in soft power from the Cuba embargo somehow spill over and quantifiably harm our ability to use soft power elsewhere — Obama used soft power for 8 years despite the UN voting every year to condemn the embargo which proves the embargo doesn't significantly damage soft power.
2. Non-unique, Ian Mount of Fortune reports in 2015 that the US empirically has the most soft power of any country in the world.
3. Trump means we won't use soft power no matter what; his whole policy is America first; he is planning on withdrawing funding from the UN and massively expanding the military.
4. Even if Trump tries to use soft power, he'll fail. Jed Babbin at The Spectator explains in December that Trump's diplomacy is reminiscent of a "bull who brings his own china shop with him".

Impact Turn:

1. Soft power fails and causes aggression. Jennifer Rubin at the Washington Post confirms in 2014 that empirically, Obama's use of diplomacy and soft power failed to resolve conflict in Ukraine, Syria, Iran, and Yemen and has tempted our enemies to act more aggressively because they know they US won't respond.

Link Turn:

1. The embargo IS an example of soft power failing to achieve ANYTHING, Peter Brookes at the Center for Foreign Policy explains in 2006 that economic sanctions are a type of diplomatic soft power. This means lifting the embargo actually hurts soft power, as Nancy Menges explains at the Center for Security Policy explains in 2008 that lifting the embargo will send a poor message about U.S. toleration of Cuba's human rights violations.

AT: UN condemns embargo

1. The UN also consistently votes to condemn Guantanamo, police brutality, the US criminal justice system, and system US war crimes — there's no reason the Cuba embargo is unique.

AT: Healthcare

1. Cuba's healthcare system is already the best in South America. Professor of Global Health Paul Drain finds in 2010 that because Cuba's healthcare system focuses on education, disease prevention, and primary care, Cuba's health outcomes are comparable to those of most developed countries.
2. Turn. Laurie Garrett from the Council on Foreign Relations writes in 2010 that if the embargo were to be lifted Cuba's public health system would collapse with an exodus of Cuban physicians leaving to the US for better pay.
3. Turn, Garrett continues that after an embargo lift, for-profit US companies would turn Cuba into a destination for expensive medical tourism from the US seeking superior healthcare, making costs for Cuban citizens prohibitively high.

AT: Lung Cancer vaccine

1. Non-unique, Obama lifted the part of the embargo that prevented Cuba from sending Cimavax to the US. Nick Mulcahy at Medscape reports in 2016 that Cuba's lung cancer vaccine has already begun a clinical trial under FDA approval in the US.

AT: No medical cooperation

1. Non-unique. Rebekah Sager of Fox News reports in October of 2016 that the US Treasury lifted the medical embargo allowing US medical research centers to collaborate with Cubans in commercial and non-commercial research.

AT: No medicine/supply access.

1. Non-unique. Katy Cashman at Matter reports in 2015 that Obama's decision to normalize diplomatic relations enables the US to send medical supplies and equipment to Cuba.

AT: Democracy

1. No link. Claudia Senik at the Paris School for Economics finds in 2009 in a study of 28 transitioning countries that economic liberalization has no statistically significant effect on support for democracy.
2. Turn, economic opening causes less democracy. Dennis Quinn at Georgetown University finds in 2000 that empirically, higher economic openness cause de-democratization because economic openness increases income inequality and fosters corporate corruption.
3. The Castros will never voluntarily transition to a democracy, Raul isn't going to wake up the day after the embargo ends and hold an election. Jose Azel at the University of Miami explains in 2013 that the Cuban government's ideology is inherently totalitarian and undemocratic and that democratic reform won't happen because Cuban elites profit massively under authoritarianism.
4. Trying to transition to democracy causes civil war. Political science professor Patrick Regan finds in 2009 that empirically, moving from an autocratic government to an anocratic government that is halfway in between autocracy and democracy dramatically increases the chance of a civil war because anocratic regimes have weak institutions and are vulnerable to demands from citizens to change.

Crackdown Turn:

1. Lifting the embargo would cause a crackdown on democracy. Nancy Menges at the Center for Security Policy confirms in 2008 that if the US fully lifted the embargo, it would result in more domestic repression because the regime fears the potentially subversive effects of US influence on the Cuban people. This independently links to our civil war argument, the Rost evidence in case finds that human rights abuses increase the chance of civil war.

Embargo→ Democracy

1. Turn. The embargo makes democratic change more likely by restricting Cuba's economy. Juan Lopez finds in 2000 that the embargo damages Cuban economy, which forces Cuba to democratize. Empirically Cuba's economic crisis of the 1990's increased public opposition, and created dissenting groups that challenged the government.

AT: Tourism→ democracy

1. Not true, Jose Azel at the University of Miami explains in 2015 that despite two million tourists from democratic nations traveling to Cuba per year, tourism has empirically failed to promote democracy, and has instead provided money to the Cuban government without encouraging reform because the tourism industry is controlled by the military. He furthers that there's no reason to believe US tourists would be any different, as most tourist locations are isolated from Cuban society.

AT: Scapegoating

1. This is the reason there will be a civil war — our Cave EV says lifting the embargo takes away the regime's excuse for bad conditions, causing Cubans to push for faster reform by overthrowing the government.

AT: Cuba Economy

1. The embargo doesn't impact Cuba's economy. Social science professor David Seaman explains in 2010 that because the embargo is unilateral, Cuba has found other trading partners. The reason Cuba's economy isn't improving quickly is that the regime is bad at managing the economy, not the embargo.
2. Status-quo solves. The Cuba Business Report explains in January 2017 that despite Venezuela reducing oil exports to Cuba in 2016, Cuba's economy will recover in 2017 and grow 2%.
3. Turn, lifting the embargo causes poverty. The UN finds in a 2010 study of 17 Latin American countries that empirically, financial liberalization increased poverty because companies from other countries export cheap goods to Latin America, pricing out local industries. Alhaji Ibrahim confirms in 2013 that globalization has economically marginalized developing countries in Africa by making them dependant on mercantilist western nations for imports of key goods, increasing poverty and income inequality and forcing cultural domination
4. Turn, lifting the embargo destroys jobs. Altieri in case explains that when US agribusinesses buy agricultural land from Cuban farmers after lifting the embargo, those farmers go unemployed, resulting in 300,000 people losing their jobs.
5. This is the link to our civil war argument, the Perez evidence indicates that lifting the embargo would rapidly grow the private sector, destabilizing the government because they no longer have as much control of the economy.

AT: \$1 Trillion lost

1. The 1 trillion figure is an estimate that was made up by the Cuban government, which has a vested interest in painting the embargo in a negative light.

AT: Free Trade Good

1. According to Legal Expert Michael Margulies of New York University in 2008, free trade won't increase absent a US-Cuban embargo for three reasons.
 1. Cuba will stick with its current allies current trade partners like Bolivia and Venezuela who have more similar political ideals who offer more to Cuba as allies due to their similarities.
 2. Cuba's poor credit rating makes it unlikely that people would invest or trade in Cuba.
 3. Cuba is ideologically opposed to the US, which empirically caused them reject the US offer to increase agricultural exports in 2001.

Impact Turns:

1. Turn; free trade is empirically bad in developing countries. Alhaji Ibrahim explains in 2013 that globalization has economically marginalized developing countries in Africa by making them dependant on mercantilist western nations for imports of key goods, increasing poverty and income inequality and forcing cultural domination.

AT: FDI

1. Cuba's policies deter investors. Professor of international studies Jaime Suchlicki explains in 2013 that Cuba is an unattractive investment option because it lacks a transparent legal system, is full of corruption, and has the right to arbitrarily seize foreign-invested assets under Law 77.
2. Investors will go elsewhere so they can profit. Jose Perales explains in 2010 that companies are inherently efficiency and market seeing, but Cuba lacks an ideal labor force in comparison to its neighbors and its massive impoverishment means that any market has very few consumers.
3. Investment doesn't help the Cuban people. Michael Bustillo at the International Policy Digest explains in 2013 that the government would siphon away 90% of all foreign investment if the embargo was lifted to fund itself.

AT: US Econ Benefits

1. US GDP is already 17 trillion, there's no reason we specifically need the trade with the tiny nation of Cuba to grow the economy.
2. US economy is already growing, Patrick Gillespie at CNN Money reports in October 2016 that the US economy is growing at 3% a year and has bounced back from initially underwhelming performance.

AT: Civil war/Failed State

AT: Venezuela

1. Venezuela's economy collapsed in 2014, if Venezuela's collapse was going to affect Cuba it would have already happened.

AT: Reform Rollback/Katz

1. Reform can't be rolled back. Samuel George at Se Mancha reports in 2016 that Raul Castro's economic reforms have been almost entirely irreversible.
2. There's no reason the regime will roll back reforms knowing that the citizens will backlash so hard that a civil war starts, and there's no reason that the regime will roll back reforms just because current reforms haven't been complete successes.

AT: Cuba's economy collapses, causes civil war

1. Cuba's economy won't collapse. The Cuba Business Report explains in January 2017 that despite Venezuela reducing oil exports to Cuba in 2016, Cuba's economy will recover in 2017 and grow 2%
2. Empirically denied. Cuba was economically dependent on the Soviet Union and when the Soviet Union collapsed in 1990, Cuban GDP declined 35% but there was no civil war. Cuba's economy also collapsed in 2008 when the US housing bubble popped but there was no civil war.
3. Civil war can only start when we lift the embargo. XA Cave, the regime blames all economic problems on the embargo which prevents the Cuban citizens from ever rising up, which is why previous economic collapses didn't cause civil war. Since recessions are an inevitable part of economics, the only chance of an economic collapse causing civil war is if the regime can't blame the embargo.
4. XA Perez, lifting the embargo expands the Cuban private sector, which destabilizes the government because the regime no longer controls as much of the economy, creating the perception of governmental weakness that starts the civil war.

AT: Food Scarcity

3. Cuba has practically no hunger. The International Food Policy Research Institute found in 2016 that Cuba has less hunger than almost every other country in South America and has an infant mortality rate of .6 percent, less than countries like the United States.
4. Non-unique. The embargo doesn't apply to the agricultural sector as Danny Vinik of Politico reports in 2015 that an exception exists that allows Cuba to import US food and agricultural products even with the embargo in place.

Turns:

1. Turn. Closer diplomatic relations decrease food imports. Vinik continues that as diplomatic relations between Cuba and the US grew, Cuba imported less food from the US and increased imports from other countries to avoid dependence on the US for survival of its people.
5. Turn. Increased tourism from lifting the embargo will only make food scarcity worse. Azam Ahmed of the New York Times reports in 2016 that increased tourism from lifting restrictions lead to higher prices and shortages since the private tourist industry is in direct competition for food with the general population.
6. Turn, lifting the embargo collapses Cuban agriculture. Corinne Kinser at the Climate Institute explains in 2008 that because the embargo cut off food exports to Cuba, it forced the government to develop sustainable organic agriculture that has eliminated food scarcity in Cuba. However, law professor Colin Crawford explains in 2003 that lifting the embargo would cause large US agribusiness corporations to flood the Cuban market with comparatively cheaper food, collapsing Cuba's sustainable agriculture.

AT: Food a priori / Food ethics stuff

1. The warrant makes no sense — hunger is bad, but so is thirst, racism, and literally every other human rights abuse in existence — there's no reason hunger is so much uniquely worse that it justifies an a priori status.
2. The idea that the right to food must come first is flawed, as professor of human ecology Garrett Hardin explains in 1974 that the idea that we must achieve pure justice, in which everyone has perfectly equal rights and access, is infinitely regressive because there's always some small unfairness that we must sacrifice everything else for to eliminate.

AT: Human Rights

1. Status quo solves. Ron Radosh at the Hudson Institute explains in 2013 that over the last decade, Cuba has improved human rights, and is finally on the verge of change.
2. Turn. Increasing relations with Cuba increases human rights violations. Rich Lowry of the National Review empirically finds in 2016 that Cuba increased political imprisonment by 4 times after beginning to normalize relations with the US because the Castro regime views US-Cuban relations as an attempt by the US to control Cuban politics and people. Nancy Menges at the Center for Security Policy confirms in 2008 that if the US fully lifted the embargo, it would result in more domestic repression because the regime fears the potentially subversive effects of US influence on the Cuban people.
3. Turn. Increasing relations radicalizes the Cuban government. Guy Taylor of the Washington Times writes in 2016 that Obama's policy of normalization has emboldened the Cuban government who has made moves to secure the regime by promoting Communist hardliners to key positions. He continues explaining that Cuba loses the will to reform when the US pursues a policy of appeasement and concessions because it undermines any leverage the US has over Cuba.

AT: Tourism Good

1. Non-unique, Obama already lifted the travel ban. Angelo Young of Salon finds in August that there are twelve different ways for Americans to visit Cuba, and that they are broad enough that almost any tourist is covered.
2. Non-unique; increased US tourists would only displace tourists from other countries. Rafael Romeu of the IMF finds in 2009 that Cuba has an absolute maximum capacity for tourists, and that therefore an increase in US tourists would only displace tourists from other countries, leading to no net change in the amount of tourism.

Turns:

1. Turn; tourism is extremely ecologically destructive. Council on Hemispheric Affairs Research Associate Erika Sato explains in 2016 that Cuba is extremely biodiverse right now, but that “increase[d tourism] could easily lead to the ecosystem’s destruction from the sheer number of people stepping on various delicate parts”.
2. Turn; tourism in Cuba serves as a disguise for sex traffickers. Investigative journalist Robert Cribb of the Miami Herald explains in 2013 that sex traffickers come to Cuba under the guise of tourism, which means if the embargo increases tourism, the problem gets worse. This is confirmed by a 2016 report from the US State Department, which found that these criminals also subject Cuban citizens to sex trafficking and forced labor in South America and the Caribbean.

AT: Tourism→ democracy

1. Not true, Jose Azel at the University of Miami explains in 2015 that despite two million tourists from democratic nations traveling to Cuba per year, tourism has empirically failed to promote democracy, and has instead provided money to the Cuban government without encouraging reform because the tourism industry is controlled by the military. He furthers that there's no reason to believe US tourists would be any different, as most tourist locations are isolated from Cuban society.

AT: Scapegoating

1. The warrant is incoherent — just because the embargo lets the Castros blame the US for Cuba's economic troubles doesn't mean the regime gets stronger. It might increase the regime's perceived stability, but the Cuban people still blame the regime for failed economic policy and human rights abuses.
2. This is the reason there will be a civil war — our Cave EV says lifting the embargo takes away the regime's excuse for bad conditions, causing Cubans to push for faster reform by overthrowing the government.

AT: Oil Drilling

1. Non-unique, Paul Guzzo of the Tampa Bay Times reported on January 20th that Obama has removed restrictions on US/Cuba oil cooperation, allowing drilling to start.
2. No one will drill for Cuban oil, as Mark Sullivan of the Congressional Research Service found in 2013 that after a string of unsuccessful attempts to drill for Cuban oil, companies have decided that it simply isn't profitable. Reuters confirms in 2012 that due to the recent exodus of foreign oil investors, it will take between 15 and 20 years for Cuba to begin drilling for oil again.
3. No impact. Political science professor Andrew Hira explains in 2013 that there simply isn't enough oil in Cuba for drilling to make a significant impact on US-Cuban relations, the Cuban economy, or international oil prices.

Renewables DA:

1. Turn it, Cuban oil drilling kills renewable energy. Increased Cuban oil production would give the US access to new oil, allowing it to become energy independent from Saudi Arabian oil. However, Urban Times explains in 2013 that US attempts to gain energy independence will result in Saudi Arabia flooding the market with oil to crash prices so that others can't compete. This would destroy renewables, as Marianne Haug at the International Energy Agency explains in 2011 that low oil prices would stop people from developing renewable energy by making it cost-ineffective, preventing the world from solving climate change.

AT: Biodiversity/Oil spill

1. Status-quo solves potential oil spills. Ben German at The Hill explains in 2012 that Cuba has agreed to review potential oil drilling with the US to ensure oil rigs meet US safety standards to minimize the risk of an oil spill.
2. Non-unique, any deepwater oil drilling causes a spill, with or without the US. Physics professor Michael Pravica explains in 2012 that the most advanced technology used to do deepwater drilling is highly prone to a failure that would cause a hole in the ocean floor, resulting in a massive oil spill that would permanently poison the water.
3. No impact to oil spills. Selena Ross at AOL explains in 2010 that natural ocean bacteria break down oil when spills happen into water and CO₂, resulting in no oil remaining from a spill within a year.

AT: China Resource war

1. The link chain makes absolutely no sense — US oil companies helping Cuba get the technology to drill oil isn't going to stop China from competing over resources in the rest of Latin America.
2. Resource scarcity doesn't cause war, as David Victor at the Council on Foreign Relations explains in 2008 that resource scarcity is almost never the root cause of conflict; instead, states that already have high tensions start conflict.
3. No impact, resource wars won't happen, as Victor continues in 2008 that resource wars are incredibly rare, and will soon be non-existent, as it's cheaper for wealthy nations to get resources through trade than by starting an expensive war.
4. No impact, China and the US won't go to war. Political scientist Charles Glaser writes in 2011 that the nuclear deterrent will always be enough to prevent a China-US war from even being a possibility. Zachary Keck of the Diplomat furthers in 2014 that even a small conflict between the US and China wouldn't escalate into all out nuclear war because leaders would try to contain the conflict at every step due to mutually assured destruction.

AT: Oil key to Cuba Economy

1. No impact, the Cuban economy is resilient, as Third World Planet explains in 2013 that Cuba's economy wasn't significantly affected by the embargo or the loss of aid from the Soviet Union.
2. Turn, Clifford Krauss at the New York Times explains in 2012 that the loss of Cuba's oil drilling prospects will push Cuban leaders to accelerate their economic opening.

AT: Latin American Relations

1. Warrant makes no sense. There's literally no reason the US helping Cuba drill oil would magically spill over into better relations with the entirety of Latin America.

AT: China SOI/Taiwan

1. There's literally no reason the US helping Cuba drill oil will stop China from expanding into the rest of Latin America.

AT: China SOI Bad

1. Non-unique, Matt Ferchen at the Carnegie Endowment explains in 2012 that Latin American countries are beginning to pull away from China over fears that Chinese investment will foster potentially damaging economic dependency. Andres Oppenheimer of Columbia University confirms in 2016 that China has decreased trade with Latin America by 11% over the last two years.
2. The impacts only trigger if China takes over US influence in Latin America, but Patrick Duddy at Duke University explains in 2013 that China will never overtake the US's Latin American influence because the A, US is the region's largest investor and trade partner, B, trade is increasing, and C, the US's national reputation, popular culture, values, and institutions give the US unique and unquantifiably higher influence than others.
3. No link, social science professor Jiang Shixue explains in 2012 that China's expansion into Latin America is purely economic and is not an attempt to harm US interests, trade in Latin America is not zero sum, and that Chinese expansion into Latin America is actually welcomed by the US, which means lifting the embargo won't push China out of Latin America.
4. No China Taiwan war. Zachary Keck of the Diplomat writes in 2014 that China won't invade Taiwan in the status-quo because A, the rest of the world would backlash against China, and B, China would have to deal with Taiwanese resistance for years to come.

Taiwan War Turn:

1. Turn it, pushing out China triggers a Taiwan war. National security professor Evan Ellis explains in 2011 that because China has begun to exhaust its export potential in traditional markets, China's ability to export to Latin American nations without US interference helps China diversify its exports base, which is critical to sustaining its economic growth. This causes war with Taiwan, as Dan Lewis at the Economic Research Council explains in 2008 that without economic growth, the Chinese government would be likely to remedy internal civil unrest by invading Taiwan because Chinese citizens believe Taiwan should have never become independent.

AT: LNG Impacts (Liquid Natural Gas)

1. It should have already happened. Paul Parfomak at the Congressional Research Service reports in 2008 that because of numerous control systems and the double hulled design of tankers, LNG tankers have carried over 45,000 cargoes and traveled over 100 million miles without a serious accident.
2. No impact. Lloyd's List reports in 2008 that LNG in its liquid form is not flammable or explosive and it's impossible for LNG to be released fast enough to generate an explosion. They continue that claims about LNG having a nuclear explosion level impact refer to the amount of energy contained on an LNG tanker, not what would actually happen in the event of an attack. The San Diego Union Tribune furthers in 2004 that LNG is only explosive within a narrow range of concentrations in the air, between 5 percent to 15 percent.

AT: LNG Terrorism

1. No LNG terrorism. Analyst Tony Muncer explains in 2005 that in order to detonate the entire cargo of an LNG tanker, a group would have to launch a full scale military operation, and even then, the design of tankers would prevent most attacks from succeeding.

AT: 55 Hiroshima Bombs

1. This is false, Henry Ozog at ioMosaic explains in 2006 that the 55 Hiroshimas claim is based on a misleading and erroneous estimation about hazard energy potential.

AT: LNG Tradeoff Trinidad and Tobago

1. Impact should have happened already — Trinidad and Tobago has been exporting LNG to Cuba for decades, if terrorists were going to attack, they would have by now.
2. It's inevitable, if Trinidad and Tobago can't export to Cuba, they'll export to China, as the Bank of Finland Institute for Economies in Transition explains in 2013 that China is looking to import LNG from Trinidad and Tobago.

AT: Terrorism Impacts

Generic

1. Should have happened already — embargo has existed for 50 years, the terrorism that the Aff claims to solve should have occurred.

AT: ISIL is a big threat

1. ISIL isn't a threat, as Alex Ward at the Center on International Security finds in 2015 that ISIL's main focus is on territory grabbing and doesn't care about attacking the US, with lone wolf ISIL attacks being relatively small.

AT: Al Qaeda is a big threat

1. Al Qaeda isn't a threat, as Kangil Lee at the International Center for Political Violence and Terrorism Research finds in 2015 that Al Qaeda has lost 28 of its 29 leaders to drone strikes, lacks any training centers, communications ability, or funding, and has only launched two successful attacks in the last 20 years.

AT: Nuclear terrorism impacts

1. There is no risk of nuclear terrorism, as Leonard Weiss at Stanford explains in 2015 that a terrorist organization acquiring nuclear weapons is virtually impossible, as building a nuclear weapon requires overcoming tons of technical barriers and, stealing a nuclear weapon is practically impossible due to layered safeguards and security, and acquiring a nuclear weapon willingly from a state won't happen because nuclear states fear retaliation from other nuclear states.

AT: Science Cooperation

1. Nothing about the embargo stops Cuban scientists from spreading scientific discoveries and knowledge to the rest of the world, even if it stops cooperation with the US. They can just send an email to another country's scientists.
2. Non-unique, US scientists already cooperate with scientists from every country in the world. There's no unique reason that Cuban scientists are special and cooperation with them is better.
3. Status-quo solves. Franco Ordonez at McClatchy News explains in 2012 that restrictions on cooperation have already been lifted, with American and Cuban scientific organizations already cooperating. Paul Haven at the Associated Press confirms in 2013 that American and Cuban scientists already work together on a daily basis.

AT: Bioweapons Impacts

1. All your evidence saying the regime will use bioweapons is talking about what Fidel would do. Raul isn't crazy, he doesn't want a war with the US.
2. Bioweapons don't cause extinction — all your extinction EV just says pathogens could theoretically spread fast enough to kill everyone, not that Cuba has a bioweapon that is capable of killing everyone.
3. No Cuban bioweapons. Wayne Smith at the Center for International Policy explains in 2007 that allegations of a Cuban bioweapons program were politically motivated and that multiple international delegations have found “no evidence at all to suggest that Cuba is in fact developing biological weapons.”

AT: Remittances

1. Non-unique. Rob Lovitt at NPR reports in 2015 that restrictions preventing remittances from being sent to Cuba have already been lifted; they're no longer restricted by the embargo.
2. Turn, Michael Bustillo at the International Policy Digest explains in 2013 that the Cuban government siphons away a significant portion of remittances to use for itself. Increasing remittances makes the oppressive regime stronger.

AT: Internet

Uniqueness

1. Non-unique: The embargo does not apply to internet. Bradley Klapper of PBS explains in 2015 that Obama loosened the embargo to now allow for trade of "internet technologies."
2. Non-unique; Alexandre Meneghini reports in December 2016 that Google has signed a deal with Cuba to bring faster and better internet access to Cuba.
3. Non-unique: Jon Fingas writes in 2016 that Cuba is making progress on internet, giving home internet access to 2,000 houses. Andrea Rodriguez of the Denver Post furthers in 2017 that Cuba has opened public Wi-Fi access points nationwide and cut down costs by more than 5x.
4. Non-unique: Cuban people are building their own internet. Michael Weissenstein of the independent reports in 2014 that Cuban people built routers for 9,000 computers.
5. Non-unique: Cuba has already made a deal with the US to increase internet access. Max Fisher of Vox reports in 2016 that Cuba has already made a deal with the US to improve internet access.
6. Non-unique: Diaz Canel solves. Newsmax reports last December that Miguel Diaz Canel, who will take over from Raul Castro in 2018, intends to expand Cuban internet access.

Delinks

7. NO LINK: They don't solve because lifting the embargo does not solve the root cause—the Cuban government's laws and regulations. Alexandre Meneghini explains in 2016 that the reasons most cubans don't have internet is because A: Home connections remain illegal for most Cubans, and B: The government charges unbearably high prices. Lifting the embargo does not solve these issues.
8. NO LINK: Journalist Mike Elgan reports in 2015 that Cuba's decision to not have internet is politically motivated. Lifting the embargo would not solve this problem; the Cuban government would still prevent internet access as a form of political control
9. NO LINK: US companies will never invest in Cuban internet. Alan Gomez of USA today reports in 2015 that the Cuban government will demand "backdoor" access "to monitor the Internet," which will dissuade US companies from investing in internet. Empirically, Google backed out of China because they were opposed to China's censorship policy. Gomez furthers, "Until Cuba signals a willingness to connect its people, all the telecom firepower and know-how in the USA won't make a difference."

IF SAYING EMBARGO BLOCKS US PROVIDING INTERNET

1. Journalist Anthony Fisher writes in 2015 that the lack of internet is the fault of terrible infrastructure. They don't solve for that, so providing access is useless without sufficient infrastructure.

IMPACT TURNS:

1. Turn. Freedom House in 2015 writes that the Cuban government uses the internet to surveil its citizens in an NSA-esque scheme. All internet traffic is routed through government servers and all emails attachments are subject to surveillance. This often results in violence against bloggers and activists.
2. Turn: The internet strengthens the regime. Author Shanthi Kalathil explains in 2001 that the Cuban government would “profit from the internet,” entrenching the regime.

AT: DEMOCRACY IMPACT

1. The internal link to their argument is that the internet gives Cubans freedom of expression, and this creates democracy. However, Jose Vivanco of Time explains in 2014 that internet censorship in Cuba prevents freedom of expression, so they have no link to democracy.
2. They read generic evidence about the internet promoting democracies, but realize the internet is used as a weapon in autocratic regimes. Nils Weidmann of University of Konstanz finds in a 2015 study that specifically in autocratic regimes, the internet had **no** impact on democracy, only serving to increase repression by empowering the government.

AT: Sugar Ethanol

1. Law professor Jonathan Specht explains in 2013 that it the sugar ethanol industry would develop extremely slowly because Cuba would have to make changes to its business climate before foreign companies would invest. Specht continues that even if a massive investment happened due to a US policy change, it wouldn't be enough to generate a sugar ethanol industry from scratch.
2. FDI won't happen. Marc Frank at Reuters explains in 2008 that the Cuban government prevents foreign investment in Cuban agriculture, including sugar ethanol, because they want to protect domestic industries.
3. Doesn't solve warming. Specht continues that in order to replace just 10% of global gasoline usage, it would require an 10 fold GLOBAL increase in sugarcane production.
4. Turn, scientist Joanne Nova explains in 2012 that sugar ethanol produces 10 times as much toxic carbon monoxide and nitrous oxide as fossil fuels.

AT: Multilateralism

1. They never prove that the Cuban embargo spills over and completely preventing the US from participating in the international system — we've functionally led the UN since it was created, despite the embargo.
2. None of their evidence says lifting the embargo will suddenly make the US start focusing on multilateralism, we've been very unilateral for decades, that isn't going to change.
3. Even if the US stops doing multilateralism, other countries will continue efforts at cooperation, which means your impacts happen in either world. None of your evidence says US efforts at multilateralism are uniquely key.
4. Trump means we won't do multilateralism no matter what; he wants to withdraw from NATO and is planning on withdrawing funding from the UN; he wants to put America first, the refugee ban proves that he doesn't care what other countries think.
5. Even if Trump tries to do multilateralism, he'll fail, as Jed Babbin at The Spectator explains in December that Trump's diplomacy is reminiscent of a "bull who brings his own china shop with him" and he has already caused backlash over his communications with Pakistan and Taiwan.
6. Multilateralism doesn't work. Richard Haas of the Council on Foreign Relations writes in 2014 that divergent national interests and the sheer number of states makes it impossible to have an effective multilateral world order.

AT: Diaz Canel takes over under the aff

1. Diaz Canel won't take over. Jose Azel at the University of Miami explains in 2013 that while Diaz Canel is in line to become head of the Council of State, the Communist Party is the entity that actually determines the successor to Raul Castro, so the second in command of the Cuban Communist Party, Machado, is the current successor to Castro.

AT: Microfinance

1. Non-Unique: According to AboutMicrofinance in 2015, following Cuba's 2012 banking reforms the government permitted three state banks to offer microloans with incredibly low interest rates of 3.5%. This means that Cubans can currently get microloans in the status-quo.
2. No Link: AboutMicrofinance furthers that despite available microloans with interest rates 50x lower than those offered in other LA Nations, Cuban Entrepreneurs have stayed away due to factors such as "a limited credit culture in Cuba," "fear of submitting financial statements to bank officials," "inadequate collateral," or Cuba's "money distortion problems." This means that the Aff can never solve as nobody would accept loans.

Impacts:

1. Terminal Defense. Sefa K. Awawory of Monash University finds in 2014 that in a meta-analysis of virtually all Microfinance studies, Microloans were found to have an insignificant, or even negative, impact on poverty or economic growth.
2. The microloans the Aff makes available have incredibly high interest rates that entrench poverty. Kentaro Toyama of the Atlantic writes in 2011 that the largest microfinance bank in Latin America charges annual interest rates of 75-100%, and that virtually all other regional banks' rates are higher. This leads to endless cycles of loans, debt, and poverty, as economist Hugh Sinclair states in 2012 that poor individuals end up having to seek out microloans to pay back the high interest rate microloans they took out previously.

Additional:

1. Sinclair concludes that even the microloan institutions are morally tenuous. Contending that the same banks that caused the financial recession in 2008 in regulated systems, now run rampant in unregulated developing markets through microloans.
2. Terminal Defense. Ogden writing for the Harvard Business Review in 2007 finds that empirically in Bangladesh, where one quarter of all households had at least one microloan, there was literally negative development over a 15 year timeframe.

AT: 112% income 90% poverty card

1. This is anecdotal evidence. It's talking about one program in Indonesia for Small female farmers, it only looks at 121 women, and it doesn't even provide an significant control group. You should always prefer our more holistic evidence of all microloans.
2. The conclusions were due to alternate causality in two ways.
 1. The test group who got microloans also got extensive technical information and training programs on leadership, marketing strategies, business formation, and the like. The training was responsible for the improvement, not the loan.
 2. The study analyzed cloth weavers during a tourism boom, which naturally increased demand for and profit of their goods, causing the increased income.