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Glossary

Totalitarian- An individual will complete rule over the government of a country.

Regime- The government that is in power

Embargo- A governmental order to cut commercial trade/relations with another country/region. The United States has had an embargo on Cuba since the Cold War. To this day, relations with Cuba have been cut.

### Solvency Turn: Embargo Strengthens the Regime

#### [ ]

#### [ ] The embargo has categorically failed – it only functions as a lightning rod that secures Castro’s popularity.

Chapman, columnist for the Chicago Tribune, 2013

(Steve, “It's Time to End the U.S. Embargo of Cuba,” *Reason.com*, April 15, Online: <http://reason.com/archives/2013/04/15/its-time-to-end-the-us-embargo-of-cuba>)

The U.S. embargo of Cuba has been in effect since 1962, with no end in sight. Fidel Castro's government has somehow managed to outlast the Soviet Union, Montgomery Ward, rotary-dial telephones and 10 American presidents.¶ The boycott adheres to the stubborn logic of governmental action. It was created to solve a problem: the existence of a communist government 90 miles off our shores. It failed to solve that problem. But its failure is taken as proof of its everlasting necessity.¶ If there is any lesson to be drawn from this dismal experience, though, it's that the economic quarantine has been either 1) grossly ineffectual or 2) positively helpful to the regime.¶ The first would not be surprising, if only because economic sanctions almost never work. Iraq under Saddam Hussein? Nope. Iran? Still waiting. North Korea? Don't make me laugh.¶ What makes this embargo even less promising is that we have so little help in trying to apply the squeeze. Nearly 200 countries allow trade with Cuba. Tourists from Canada and Europe flock there in search of beaches, nightlife and Havana cigars, bringing hard currency with them. So even if starving the country into submission could work, Cuba hasn't starved and won't anytime soon.¶ Nor is it implausible to suspect that the boycott has been the best thing that ever happened to the Castro brothers, providing them a scapegoat for the nation's many economic ills. The implacable hostility of the Yankee imperialists also serves to align Cuban nationalism with Cuban communism. Even Cubans who don't like Castro may not relish being told what to do by the superpower next door.

### Solvency Turn: Embargo Strengthens the Regime

#### [ ]

#### [ ] Economic isolation only helps the Castro regime.

Johnson, former staff director of the Senate Intelligence Committee, 2010

(Andrew, “End the Embargo of Cuba” *Third Way Publications*, September 16, Online: <http://content.thirdway.org/publications/326/Third_Way_Memo_-_End_the_Embargo_of_Cuba.pdf>)

The US has had normal trade relations with many countries just as problematic, if not more so, than Cuba, including China, Vietnam (President Clinton lifted the 1975 trade embargo in 1994), and even the Soviet Union throughout the Cold War.8 In an era of global economic integration, maintaining strong economic relations with other countries is vital to growing the economy. The rest of the world has recognized that Cuba does not pose a threat and has normalized trade relations, leaving the US alone in its imposition of the embargo. As long as other countries are willing to supply Cuba with all of its needs, the US embargo will never be effective and will only hurt the US economy. Furthermore, by blaming the US for Cuba’s lack of economic prosperity and using the embargo as a scapegoat, Cuba’s leadership has eluded responsibility for the poor standard of living on the island and routinely portrays the US as an oppressor of the Cuban people. Cuba has the potential to be a sizeable market for US goods should the embargo come to an end. Despite all of the trade restrictions, the US exported $710 million worth of food to Cuba in 2008, making the US Cuba’s largest food supplier.9 A March 2010 Texas A&M University study found that expanding agricultural trade and travel between the US and Cuba could result in $365 million in increased sales of US goods in Cuba and create 6,000 new jobs in the US.10

### No Solvency: American Wealth and Ideals Promote Change

#### [ ] The embargo is a failed policy – trade would spread American wealth and ideals, promoting change.

Griswold, director of the Center for Trade Policy Studies at the Cato Institute, 2005

(Daniel, “Four Decades of Failure: The US Embargo against Cuba,” *Cato Institute*, October 12, Online: <http://www.cato.org/publications/speeches/four-decades-failure-us-embargo-against-cuba>)

Instead of the embargo, Congress and the administration should take concrete steps to expand America’s economic and political influence in Cuba. First, the travel ban should be lifted. According to U.S. law, citizens can travel more or less freely to such “axis of evil” countries as Iran and North Korea. But if Americans want to visit Cuba legally, they need to be a former president or some other well-connected VIP or a Cuban American.¶ Yes, more American dollars would end up in the coffers of the Cuban government, but dollars would also go to private Cuban citizens. Philip Peters, a former State Department official in the Reagan administration and expert on Cuba, argues that American tourists would boost the earnings of Cubans who rent rooms, drive taxis, sell art, and operate restaurants in their homes. Those dollars would then find their way to the hundreds of freely priced farmer’s markets, to carpenters, repairmen, tutors, food venders, and other entrepreneurs.¶ Second, restrictions on remittances should be lifted. Like tourism, expanded remittances would fuel the private sector, encourage Cuba’s modest economic reforms, and promote independence from the government.¶ Third, American farmers and medical suppliers should be allowed to sell their products to Cuba with financing arranged by private commercial lenders, not just for cash as current law permits. Most international trade is financed by temporary credit, and private banks, not taxpayers, would bear the risk. I oppose subsidizing exports to Cuba through agencies such as the Export-Import Bank, but I also oppose banning the use of private commercial credit.¶ Finally, the Helms-Burton law should be allowed to expire. The law, like every other aspect of the embargo, has failed to achieve its stated objectives and has, in fact, undermined American influence in Cuba and alienated our allies.¶ Lifting or modifying the embargo would not be a victory for Fidel Castro or his oppressive regime. It would be an overdue acknowledgement that the four-and-a-half decade embargo has failed, and that commercial engagement is the best way to encourage more open societies abroad. The U.S. government can and should continue to criticize the Cuban government’s abuse of human rights in the U.N. and elsewhere, while allowing expanding trade and tourism to undermine Castro’s authority from below.¶ We should apply the president’s sound reasoning on trade in general to our policy toward Cuba. The most powerful force for change in Cuba will not be more sanctions, but more daily interaction with free people bearing dollars and new ideas.¶ How many decades does the U.S. government need to bang its head against a wall before it changes a failed policy?

### No Solvency: American Wealth and Ideals Promote Change

#### [ ]

#### [ ] Embargo hurts reform efforts – it prevents us from offering assistance to the Cuban people.

Hanson, economics research at the American Enterprise Institute, 2013

(Daniel, “It's Time For The U.S. To End Its Senseless Embargo Of Cuba,” January 16th, *Forbes*, Online: <http://www.forbes.com/sites/realspin/2013/01/16/its-time-for-the-u-s-to-end-its-senseless-embargo-of-cuba/>)

Repealing the embargo would fit into an American precedent of lifting trade and travel restrictions to countries who demonstrate progress towards democratic ideals. Romania, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary were all offered normal trade relations in the 1970s after preliminary reforms even though they were still in clear violation of several US resolutions condemning their human rights practices. China, a communist country and perennial human rights abuser, is the U.S.’s second largest trading partner, and in November, trade restrictions against Myanmar were lessened notwithstanding a fifty year history of genocide and human trafficking propagated by its military government.¶ Which, of course, begs the question: when will the U.S. see fit to lift the embargo? If Cuba is trending towards democracy and free markets, what litmus test must be passed for the embargo to be rolled back?¶ The cost of the embargo to the United States is high in both dollar and moral terms, but it is higher for the Cuban people, who are cut off from the supposed champion of liberty in their hemisphere because of an antiquated Cold War dispute. The progress being made in Cuba could be accelerated with the help of American charitable relief, business innovation, and tourism.¶ A perpetual embargo on a developing nation that is moving towards reform makes little sense, especially when America’s allies are openly hostile to the embargo. It keeps a broader discussion about smart reform in Cuba from gaining life, and it makes no economic sense. It is time for the embargo to go.

### No Solvency: Embargo Failed in Past

#### [ ] The embargo has failed to create change - diplomatic strategies through engagement would be more effective.

Cuba Study Group, 2013

(Cuba Study Group, Restoring Executive Authority Over U.S. Policy Toward Cuba February 2013, http://www.cubastudygroup.org/index.cfm/files/serve?File\_id=45d8f827-174c-4d43-aa2f-ef7794831032)

Seventeen years after its enactment, the Helms-Burton Act—which further codified the sanctions framework commonly referred to as the U.S. embargo against Cuba and conditions its suspension on the existence of a transition or democratic government in Cuba—has proven to be a counterproductive policy that has failed to achieve its stated purposes in an increasingly interconnected world. Helms-Burton has failed to advance the cause of freedom and prosperity for the Cuban people, to encourage free and democratic elections in Cuba, to secure international sanctions against the Cuban government, or to advance the national security interests of the United States.1 It provides a policy framework for U.S. support to the Cuban people in response to the formation of a transition government in Cuba; yet, the all-or-nothing nature of its conditions for suspension undermine that very framework by effectively placing control over changes to embargo sanctions in the hands of the current Cuban leadership. Simply stated, it is an archaic policy that hinders the ability of the United States to respond swiftly, intelligently and in a nuanced way to developments on the island. Worst of all, the failures of Helms-Burton have more recently produced a tragic paradox: Policies once designed to promote democratization through isolation are now stifling civil society, including an emerging class of private entrepreneurs and democracy advocates whose rise represents the best hope for a free and open society in Cuba in more than 50 years.