# 1AC

## 1AC Solvency

### 1AC Plan

#### The United States Federal Government should substantially reduce restrictions on production of crude oil by entities engaged in joint crude oil production with Cuban energy-producing entities in the area of the Gulf of Mexico’s Eastern Gap included in the United States’ Outer Continental Shelf Planning Areas.

### 1AC Solvency

#### The plan allows for US-Cuban oil cooperation

Benjamin 10 – Jonathan Benjamin-Alvadaro, Report for the Cuban Research Institute, Florida International University, PhD, Professor of Political Science at University of Nebraska at Omaha, Director of the Intelligence Community Centers of Academic Excellence Program at UNO, Treasurer of the American Political Science Association, 2010, Brookings Institution book, “Cuba’s Energy Future: Strategic Approaches to Cooperation”

Conclusion and Recommendations

Undoubtedly, after fifty years of enmity, there is a significant lack of trust and confidence between the United States and Cuba. This is plain from the almost quaint maintenance of a sanctions regime that seeks to isolate Cuba economically and politically but hardly reflects the dramatic changes that have occurred on the island since 1991, not to mention since 2008,when Fidel Castro officially stepped aside as Cuba’s president. Now, the opportunity to advance relations in the energy arena appears to be ripe. Since 2004, representatives from American companies, trade organizations, universities, and think tanks have had the opportunity to meet with Cuban energy officials. The scope and objectives of Cuban energy development schemes have been disseminated, dissected, and discussed across a number of settings where the interested parties are now familiar with and well versed in the agendas and opportunities that exist in this arena. In public discussions, Cuban energy authorities have made it clear that their preferred energy development scenario includes working closely with the U.S. oil and gas industry and using state-of-the- art U.S. oil technologies. The **assessment from U.S. energy experts on the technical acumen and capability of Cuban energy officials has been overwhelmingly positive**.9 Should the U.S. government and the Obama administration see fit to shift its policy so as to allow broader participation of American academics and practitioners in the energy field to attend conferences and meet with Cuban energy officials, it may pave the way to **establishing much-needed familiarity and confidence across these communities**.¶ The United States and Cuba will have a unique opportunity to employ a highly educated and competent cadre of Cuban engineers and technicians to work in critical areas of the energy sector. This will deploy an underused segment of the Cuban workforce, and allow U.S. oil, construction, and engineering firms to subcontract work to an emerging class of Cuban firms specializing in these areas. **The Cubans have accumulated experience and training from past energy cooperation projects and exchanges in Cuba, Mexico, Venezuela, and other countries in the region**. Anecdotal evidence suggests that these contacts and exchanges have been wildly successful because of the Cubans’ high level of competence and strong work ethic. The Cubans have gained invaluable knowledge and experience through the operation and construction of energy facilities in collaboration with their joint-venture partners on the island.¶ The United States possesses few options when it comes to balancing the various risks to U.S. energy security and satisfying energy demand, because U.S. energy independence is not attainable, the policy tools available to deal with energy supply disruptions are increasingly inadequate, and the United States needs to articulate a new vision of how best to manage international energy interdependence. In particular, even if the United States were to choose to exploit all of its domestic energy resources, it would remain dependent on oil imports to meet its existing and future demand. The critical need to improve the integrity of the U.S. energy supply requires a much broader, more flexible view on the quest for resources—a view that does not shun a source from a potential strategic partner for purely political reasons. U.S. decisionmakers must look dispassionately at potential energy partners in terms of the role they might play in meeting political, economic, and geostrategic objectives of U.S. energy security. The Obama administration has signaled that it wants to reinvigorate inter-American cooperation and integration; a movement toward energy cooperation and development with Cuba is consistent with, and may be central to, that objective. ¶ The energy-security environment for the United States is at a critical juncture. The productive capacity of two of the United States’ largest oil suppliers, Mexico and Venezuela, has declined, and the supporting energy infrastructure in both countries is in need of significant revitalization. The vagaries of the politics in the region, the variability of weather patterns, and the overall dismal state of the global economy create a setting of instability and uncertainty that requires close attention to the national security interests of the United States vis-à-vis energy. Cuba’s energy infrastructure, too, is in need of significant repair and modernization (its many energy projects notwithstanding); the price tag is estimated to be in the billions of dollars. Delaying work on many of these projects increases costs, because deterioration of the infrastructure continues and eventually pushes up the cost of renovation and replacement. It also stands to reason that the lion’s share of the financial burden of upgrading Cuba’s energy infrastructure will fall to the United States, directly and indirectly. **Changes in U.S. policy to allow investment and assistance in Cuba’s energy sector are a** precondition for international entities to make significant investments, yet this change implies a large American footprint. Trade and investment in the energy sector in Cuba have been severely constrained by the conditions of the embargo placed on the Cuban regime. These constraints also affect foreign firms seeking to do business in Cuba because of the threat of penalties if any of these firms use technology containing more than 10 percent of proscribed U.S. technologies needed for oil and gas exploration and production. American private investment and U.S. government assistance will constitute a large portion of the needed investment capital to undertake this colossal effort. **The longer that work is delayed, the higher the cost to all the investors, which will then potentially cut into the returns from such undertakings**.¶ U.S. cooperation with Cuba in energy just may create an opportunity for the United States to improve its relations with Venezuela, if it can demonstrate that it can serve as a partner (or at a minimum, a supporter) of the Petrocaribe energy consortium. The United States could provide much-needed additional investment capital in the development of upstream, downstream, and logistical resources in Cuba that simultaneously addresses Petrocaribe objectives, diversifies regional refining capacity, and adds storage and transit capabilities while enhancing regional cooperation and integration modalities. **This does not mean that the United States has to dismantle the nearly fifty-year-old embargo against Cuba, but the United States will have to make special provisions** that create commercial and trade openings for energy development that serve its broad geostrategic and national security goals, as it has in the case of food and medicine sales to Cuba.¶ This discussion is intended to help distill understanding of U.S. strategic energy policy under a set of shifting political and economic environmental conditions in Cuba and its implications for U.S. foreign policy for the near and long term. Because the policies can be considered works-in-progress, an understanding of possible outcomes is **important to those crafting future policy** and making changes in the policymaking milieu.

## 1AC Relations

#### Chavez’s death means now is key to solve Cuban relations---that’s key to broader Latin America relations

Tisdall 3-5 – Simon Tisdall, writer for the Guardian, March 5th, 2013, "Death of Hugo Chávez brings chance of fresh start for US and Latin America" [www.guardian.co.uk/world/2013/mar/05/hugo-chavez-dead-us-latin-america/print](http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2013/mar/05/hugo-chavez-dead-us-latin-america/print)

Hugo **Chávez's departure furnishes Barack Obama with an** opportunity to repair US ties with Venezuela**, but also with** other Latin American states **whose relations with Washington were adversely affected by Chávez's politics of polarisation and the Bush administration's viscerally unintelligent reaction**.¶ In particular, **the change of leadership in Caracas could** unlock the deadlock over Cuba, if the White House can summon the requisite political will.¶ Possibly anticipating a transition, Washington quietly engineered a diplomatic opening with Caracas last November after a lengthy standoff during which ambassadors were withdrawn.¶ Roberta Jacobson, assistant secretary of state for western hemisphere affairs, telephoned Nicolás Maduro, Venezuela's vice-president and Chávez's preferred successor, and discussed, among other things, the restoration of full diplomatic relations.¶ "According to US officials, the Venezuelan vice-president offered to exchange ambassadors on the occasion of the beginning of President Barack Obama's second term. Jacobson, in turn, is said to have proposed a **step-by-step approach to improve bilateral relations, starting with greater co-operation in** counter-narcotics**,** counter-terrorism **and** energy issues," Andres Oppenheimer reported in the Miami Herald.¶ There is much ground to make up. "Relations between the United States and Venezuela have ranged from difficult to hostile since Chávez took office in 1999 and began to implement what he calls 21st-century socialism," wrote a former US ambassador to Caracas, Charles Shapiro.¶ "Chávez blamed a failed 2002 coup against him on the United States (not true), nationalised US companies, insulted the president of the United States and blamed 'the empire' – his term for the United States – for every ill … In foreign affairs, the government actively supports the Assad regime in Syria, rejects sanctions on Iran and generally opposes the US at every turn."¶ Despite such strains, economic self-interest always prevented a complete rupture. The US remained Venezuela's most important trading partner throughout Chávez's presidency, buying nearly half its oil exports. Caracas is the fourth largest supplier of oil to the US.¶ In fact, the US imports more crude oil annually from Mexico and Venezuela than from the entire Persian Gulf. This shared commerce now provides a formidable incentive and a launch platform for a fresh start.¶ Whether the opportunity is grasped depends partly on Maduro, a Chávez loyalist but a reputed pragmatist with close ties to Raúl Castro in Cuba.¶ Yet **it depends even more on Obama, whose first term, after a promising start, ended up perpetuating Washington's historical neglect of Latin America**. **He now has a chance to do better**.¶ The political climate seems propitious. Economic and cultural ties are also strengthening dramatically. Trade between the US and Latin America grew by 82% between 1998 and 2009. In 2011 alone, exports and imports rose by a massive 20% in both directions.¶ "We do three times more business with Latin America than with China and twice as much business with Colombia [as] with Russia," an Obama official told Julia Sweig of the US Council on Foreign Relations. Latinos now comprise 15% of the US population; the US is the world's second largest Spanish-speaking country (after Mexico).¶ Despite this convergence, high-level US strategic thinking about the region has continued to lag, Sweig argued.¶ "For the last two decades, US domestic politics have too often driven Washington's Latin America agenda – whether on issues of trade, immigration, drugs, guns or that perennial political albatross, Cuba, long driven by the supposedly crucial 'Cuban vote' in Florida," she said.¶ Obama could change this dynamic if he tried and **one way to do it would be to unpick** the Cuban problem**, which continues to** colour the way Latin Americans view Washington.¶ "Having won nearly half of the Cuban American vote in Florida in 2012, a gain of 15 percentage points over 2008, Obama can move quickly on Cuba. If he were to do so, he would find a cautious but willing partner in Raúl Castro, who needs rapprochement with Washington to advance his own reform agenda," Sweig said.

#### The plan allows for US-Cuban energy cooperation---spurs broader relations

Benjamin 10 – Jonathan Benjamin-Alvadaro, Report for the Cuban Research Institute, Florida International University, PhD, Professor of Political Science at University of Nebraska at Omaha, Director of the Intelligence Community Centers of Academic Excellence Program at UNO, Treasurer of the American Political Science Association, 2010, Brookings Institution book, “Cuba’s Energy Future: Strategic Approaches to Cooperation”

Conclusion and Recommendations

Oil exploration is an inherently risky enterprise; there are always trade-offs between negatives and positives relating to energy security, environmental integrity, and geostrategic considerations. The consensus arising from the studies and the analyses in this book is that the creation of mutually beneficial trade and investment opportunities between the United States and Cuba is long overdue. Throughout most of the twentieth century, Cuban infrastructure and economic development were direct beneficiaries of commercial relations with the United States. This relationship was instrumental in providing Cuba with access to advanced technologies and the signs of modernity that were unparalleled in Latin America and far beyond.¶ Once again, the United States is presented with an opportunity that might serve as the basis of a new relationship between the United States and Cuba. It holds out the possibility of enhancing the stability and development of a region that is wrestling with questions of how and when it too might benefit from engagement with a global economic development model. The question is whether the United States chooses to be at the center, or to leave Cuba to seek some alternate path toward its goals.¶ Ironically, Cuban officials have invited American oil companies to participate in developing their offshore oil and natural gas reserves. American oil, oil equipment, and service companies possess the capital, technology, and operational know-how to explore, produce, and refine these resources in a safe and responsible manner. Yet they remain on the sidelines because of our almost five-decades-old unilateral political and economic embargo. The United States can **end this impasse by licensing American oil companies to participate in the development of Cuba’s energy resources**. By seizing the initiative on Cuba policy, the United States will **be strategically positioned to play an important role** in the future of the island, thereby giving Cubans a better chance for a stable, prosperous, and democratic future. The creation of stable and transparent commercial relations in the energy sector will bolster state capacity in Cuba while enhancing U.S. geostrategic interests, and can help Cuba’s future leaders avoid illicit business practices, minimize the influence of narcotrafficking enterprises, and stanch the outflow of illegal immigrants to the United States.¶ If U.S. companies are allowed to contribute to the development of Cuba’s hydrocarbon reserves, as well as the development of alternative and renewable energy (solar, wind, and biofuels), it will give the United States the opportunity to **engage Cuba’s future leaders to carry out long-overdue** economic reforms and development that will perhaps pave the way to a **more open and representative society** while helping to promote Cuba as a stable partner and leader in the region and beyond.¶ Under no circumstances is this meant to suggest that the United States should come to dominate energy development policy in Cuba. The United States certainly has a role to play, but unlike its past relationship with Cuba, its interaction and cooperation will be predicated on its ability to accept, at a minimum, that Cuba will be the dominant partner in potential commercial ventures, and an equal partner in future diplomatic and interstate relations. Without a doubt Cuban government actors are wary of the possibility of being dominated by the “colossus of the North,” but as Cuba’s energy policymakers face the daunting reality of their nation’s energy future, it is abundantly clear that they possess the willingness and the capacity to assiduously pursue sound policy objectives and initiatives that begin to address the island’s immediate and long-term challenges. In the end, this course of action will have **direct and tangible benefits for the people of Cuba, it neighbors, and beyond.**

#### Plan shores up US-Cuban relations—that solves US influence in Latin America, drug trafficking, and stops Chinese encroachment

Benjamin-Alvadaro 06 (Jonathan, Report for the Cuban Research Institute, Florida International University, PhD, Professor of Political Science at University of Nebraska at Omaha, Director of the Intelligence Community Centers of Academic Excellence Program at UNO, Treasurer of the American Political Science Association, “The Current Status and Future Prospects for Oil Exploration in Cuba: A Special,” http://cri.fiu.edu/research/commissioned-reports/oil-cuba-alvarado.pdf)

Given that there are no formal diplomatic of economic relations between the governments of the United States and Cuba, the level of interest has grown significantly in the 3 years due primarily to three reasons in the following interest areas: energy security interests; broader regional strategic; and purely economic interests. First, the energy security interests in the potential of Cuban oil – although it really would not minimize the immediacy of an American energy crisis – is seen as possible if only partial remedy to energy supply concerns. Second, as Cuba, in part because of the increasing number of oil partnerships furthers its diplomatic and economic ties to with countries like Venezuela, China, Brazil and members of the European Union it may prove to provide Cuba for a sufficient buffer against U.S. opposition as it solidifies it economic and diplomatic role in the region. This is important inasmuch as there is a de facto trend in the Americas that clearly disavows and attempts to minimize the influence of the United States in the region, and with the growing demands on the world economy by China, it stands to reason that Cuba may assume an increasing stature that almost potentially lessens the presence of American influence in Cuban and hence regional affairs. Finally, and as demonstrated by the presence of American oil interests in the February 2006 U.S.- Cuban Energy Summit in Mexico City, there may be interest in cooperating in joint venture projects, and by extension assisting in the long-term development in Cuba’s oil industry. ¶ To accomplish this task the report seeks to lay out some national security policy considerations applying strategic thought to what I will term “Post-Oil” Cuba – a Cuba that has a small but vibrant and growing oil and gas production capacity with extensive relations with a number of partners, and an increasingly positive outlook toward addressing energy and economic development questions that have plagued the Castro regime since the Cuban Revolution.3¶ The primary consideration is to determine the present state of Cuban energy and what possibilities exist that would be available to American foreign policy decision makers and business interests as the relations with Cuba evolve over the coming years.4 This is important because any realistic appraisal of how Cuba is to take advantage of its oil bonanza involves the United States. Previous research in this area has clearly laid out the scope and objectives of Cuban energy development schemes in the period since the demise of Cuba’s favorable trade arrangements with the former Soviet Union. Recently, and as a result of the oil discovery and Cuba’s energy arrangement with the government of Hugo Chavez in Venezuela there is renewed interest in Havana’s energy policies. Most of that analysis has been focused on concrete possibilities where there can be cooperation in the energy field between these two neighbors. Specifically, the work has looked at areas for the convergence of energy interests as they apply to the near- and long-term energy development scenarios facing both countries. Myers Jaffe and Soligo have addressed this possibility by looking at the potential to increase diversification and dispersion of energy resources. This is an important consideration when one takes into consideration that well over one-third of all oil refining capacity resides on or near the Houston shipping channel. The potential negative impact on America’s refining capacity following Hurricane Rita5 made a significant impression on oil industry analysts for the necessity of diversifying the location of these vital national resources. The potential of viewing Cuba as a “staging area” for American oil storage and refining is plausible because of the proximity of the island. The also becomes more attractive because of the growing climatic concerns over the uncertain security of oil resources in the Gulf region as clearly demonstrated by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita in 2005. While it is true that Venezuela has initiated an investment of $1 billion dollars to bring the Cienfuegos refinery online, there are still many other possibilities open and available to American companies, as well as a growing number of foreign firms.6 Additionally, Venezuela remains the fourth largest importer of oil to the United States and one can surmise that the existing trade arrangements between the U.S. and Venezuela will remain intact, the evolution of the Bolivarian revolution under Chavez and a growing Chinese presence in the region notwithstanding. Additionally, pursuing such a path would allow United States policymakers to take advantage of what Cuba has to offer in the following areas: domestic technical capabilities; continuing human capital development; strategic positioning in the Caribbean, and an improved diplomatic stature. Cuba, by any measure, possesses a largely untapped technical capacity owing to advanced training and education in the core mathematic and scientific areas. This was clearly demonstrated by its attempt to develop a nuclear energy capability in the 1980s and 1990s whereby thousands of Cubans pursued highly technical career paths leaving Cuba with among the highest ratios of scientists and engineers to the general population in all of the Americas. Moreover, the foundation of Cuba’s vaunted public education system remains intact and increased investment under various scenarios suggests that Cuba will continue to produce a welleducated workforce that will be critical to its future economic vitality. This raises an important consideration that being the role that Cuba will play in the region in the 21st century. It suffices to say that Cuba remains the strategically important state by virtue of its geographical location alone, in efforts against drug and human trafficking and related national and regional security matters. The extent to which a stable Cuban government has cooperated with the U.S. in drug interdiction efforts in the past suggests that the results from improved diplomatic relations between neighbors would have the effect of improving national security concerns related to terrorist activity, illicit weapons transfers and the like. Ultimately, a successful normalization of relations between the U.S. and Cuba in these areas may well enhance and stabilize regional relations that could possibly lessen (or at a minimum, balancing) fears of a Chinese incursion in hemispheric affairs. To lessen those fears it may be useful to review the present structure of joint-venture projects in the energy sector in Cuba to ascertain the feasibility and possible success of such an undertaking become available to American firms. Moreover, it is interesting to note that U.S. firms in the agriculture sector have successfully negotiated and consummated sales to Cuba totaling more than $1 billion dollars over the past four years under conditions that are less than optimal circumstances but have well-served the commercial interests of all parties involved.

#### China’s expanding into Latin America---US influence is key to crowd them out

Dowd 12 (Alan, Senior Fellow with the American Security Council Foundation, “Crisis in the America's,” http://www.ascfusa.org/content\_pages/view/crisisinamericas)

Focused on military operations in the Middle East, nuclear threats in Iran and North Korea, and the global threat of terrorism, U.S. policymakers have neglected a growing challenge right here in the Western Hemisphere: the expanding influence and reach of China.¶ Eyeing energy resources to keep its economy humming, China is engaged in a flurry of investing and spending in Latin America.¶ In Costa Rica, China is funding a $1.24-billion upgrade of the country’s oil refinery; bankrolling an $83-million soccer stadium; backing infrastructure and telecommunications improvements; and pouring millions into a new police academy.¶ In Colombia, China is planning a massive “dry canal” to link the country’s Pacific and Atlantic coasts by rail. At either terminus, there will be Chinese ports; in between, there will be Chinese assembly facilities, logistics operations and distribution plants; and on the Pacific side, there will be dedicated berths to ship Colombian coal outbound to China.¶ In mid-January, a Chinese-built oil rig arrived in Cuba to begin drilling in Cuba’s swath of the Gulf of Mexico. Reuters reports that Spanish, Russian, Malaysian and Norwegian firms will use the rig to extract Cuban oil. For now, China is focusing on onshore oil extraction in Cuba.¶ New offshore discoveries will soon catapult Brazil into a top-five global oil producer. With some 38 billion barrels of recoverable oil off its coast, Brazil expects to pump 4.9 million barrels per day by 2020, as the Washington Times reports, and China has used generous loans to position itself as the prime beneficiary of Brazilian oil. China’s state-run oil and banking giants have inked technology-transfer, chemical, energy and real-estate deals with Brazil. Plus, as the Times details, China came to the rescue of Brazil’s main oil company when it sought financing for its massive drilling plans, pouring $10 billion into the project. A study in Joint Force Quarterly (JFQ) adds that Beijing plunked down $3.1 billion for a slice of Brazil’s vast offshore oil fields.¶ The JFQ study reveals just how deep and wide Beijing is spreading its financial influence in Latin America: $28 billion in loans to Venezuela; a $16.3-billion commitment to develop Venezuelan oil reserves; $1 billion for Ecuadoran oil; $4.4 billion to develop Peruvian mines; $10 billion to help Argentina modernize its rail system; $3.1 billion to purchase Argentina’s petroleum company outright. The New York Times adds that Beijing has lent Ecuador $1 billion to build a hydroelectric plant.¶ There is good and bad to Beijing’s increased interest and investment in the Western Hemisphere. Investment fuels development, and much of Latin America is happily accelerating development in the economic, trade, technology and infrastructure spheres. But China’s riches come with strings.¶ For instance, in exchange for Chinese development funds and loans, Venezuela agreed to increase oil shipments to China from 380,000 barrels per day to one million barrels per day. It’s worth noting that the Congressional Research Service has reported concerns in Washington that Hugo Chavez might try to supplant his U.S. market with China. Given that Venezuela pumps an average of 1.5 million barrels of oil per day for the U.S.—or about 11 percent of net oil imports—the results would be devastating for the U.S.¶ That brings us to the security dimension of China’s checkbook diplomacy in the Western Hemisphere.¶ Officials with the U.S. Southern Command conceded as early as 2006 that Beijing had “approached every country in our area of responsibility” and provided military exchanges, aid or training to Ecuador, Jamaica, Bolivia, Cuba, Chile and Venezuela.¶ The JFQ study adds that China has “an important and growing presence in the region’s military institutions.” Most Latin American nations, including Mexico, “send officers to professional military education courses in the PRC.” In Ecuador, Venezuela and Bolivia, Beijing has begun to sell “sophisticated hardware…such as radars and K-8 and MA-60 aircraft.” The JFQ report concludes, ominously, that Chinese defense firms “are likely to leverage their experience and a growing track record for their goods to expand their market share in the region, with the secondary consequence being that those purchasers will become more reliant on the associated Chinese logistics, maintenance, and training infrastructures that support those products.”¶ Put it all together, and the southern flank of the United States is exposed to a range of new security challenges.¶ To be sure, much of this is a function of China’s desire to secure oil markets. But there’s more at work here than China’s thirst for oil. Like a global chess match, China is probing Latin America and sending a message that just as Washington has trade and military ties in China’s neighborhood, China is developing trade and military ties in America’s neighborhood.¶ This is a direct challenge to U.S. primacy in the region—a challenge that must be answered.¶ First, Washington needs to relearn an obvious truth—that China’s rulers do not share America’s values—and needs to shape and conduct its China policy in that context.¶ Beijing has no respect for human rights. Recall that in China, an estimated 3-5 million people are rotting away in laogai slave-labor camps, many of them “guilty” of political dissent or religious activity; democracy activists are rounded up and imprisoned; freedom of speech and religion and assembly do not exist; and internal security forces are given shoot-to-kill orders in dealing with unarmed citizens. Indeed, Beijing viewed the Arab Spring uprisings not as an impetus for political reform, but as reason “to launch its harshest crackdown on dissent in at least a decade,” according to Director of National Intelligence James Clapper.¶ In short, the ends always justify the means in Beijing. And that makes all the difference when it comes to foreign and defense policy. As Reagan counseled during the Cold War, “There is no true international security without respect for human rights.”¶ Second, the U.S. must stop taking the Western Hemisphere for granted, and instead must reengage in its own neighborhood economically, politically and militarily.¶ That means no more allowing trade deals—and the partners counting on them—to languish. Plans for a hemispheric free trade zone have faltered and foundered. The trade-expansion agreements with Panama and Colombia were left in limbo for years, before President Obama finally signed them into law in 2011.¶ Reengagement means reviving U.S. diplomacy. The Wall Street Journal reports that due to political wrangling in Washington, the State Department position focused on the Western Hemisphere has been staffed by an interim for nearly a year, while six Western Hemisphere ambassadorial posts (Uruguay, Venezuela, Ecuador, El Salvador, Nicaragua and Barbados) remain empty.¶ Reengagement means reversing plans to slash defense spending. The Joint Forces Command noted in 2008 that China has “a deep respect for U.S. military power.” We cannot overstate how important this has been to keeping the peace. But with the United States in the midst of massive military retrenchment, one wonders how long that reservoir of respect will last.¶ Reengagement also means revitalizing security ties. A good model to follow might be what’s happening in China’s backyard. To deter China and prevent an accidental war, the U.S. is reviving its security partnerships all across the Asia-Pacific region. Perhaps it’s time to do the same in Latin America. We should remember that many Latin American countries—from Mexico and Panama to Colombia and Chile—border the Pacific. Given Beijing’s actions, it makes sense to bring these Latin American partners on the Pacific Rim into the alliance of alliances that is already stabilizing the Asia-Pacific region.¶ Finally, all of this needs to be part of a revived Monroe Doctrine.¶ Focusing on Chinese encroachment in the Americas, this “Monroe Doctrine 2.0” would make it clear to Beijing that the United States welcomes China’s efforts to conduct trade in the Americas but discourages any claims of control—implied or explicit—by China over territories, properties or facilities in the Americas. In addition, Washington should make it clear to Beijing that the American people would look unfavorably upon the sale of Chinese arms or the basing of Chinese advisors or military assets in the Western Hemisphere.¶ In short, what it was true in the 19th and 20th centuries must remain true in the 21st: There is room for only one great power in the Western Hemisphere.

#### Chinese influence in Latin America causes Taiwan war

Fergusson 12 (Robbie, Researcher at Royal Society for the Arts, Featured Contributor at International Business Times, Former Conference & Research Assistant at Security Watch, Former Researcher at University College London, Master of Science, China in the International Arena, The University of Glasgow, “The Chinese Challenge to the Monroe Doctrine,” http://www.e-ir.info/2012/07/23/does-chinese-growth-in-latin-america-threaten-american-interests/)

Taiwan – domestic, or foreign policy?¶ China’s goals in the region amount to more than the capture of natural resources. Although the People’s Republic of China considers resolution of the Taiwan issue to be a domestic issue, it is with some irony that one of China’s main foreign policy goals is to isolate Taipei internationally. The PRC and the ROC compete directly for international recognition among all the states in the world. . Nowhere is this more evident than in Latin America, where 12 of the 23 nations that still have official diplomatic relations with the ROC reside.¶ The historical background¶ Following the mainland Communist victory in the Chinese Civil War in 1949, the nationalist Kuomintang retreated to the island of Formosa (Taiwan) where it continued to claim to be the legitimate government of all of China. In June 1950 the United States intervened by placing its 7th fleet in the Taiwan straits to stop a conclusive military resolution to the civil war and slowly the battlefield became primarily political, concerned with legitimacy.¶ When the United Nations was formed in 1945, the Republic of China (ROC) became one of the five permanent members of the Security Council. This gave the ROC a de facto advantage over the PRC in attaining recognition from other nation states; particularly as the diplomatic clout of the hegemonic United States supported its position as the true representative of the Chinese people, until the rapprochement of the 1970s, when the Nixon administration wished to improve ties with the de facto rulers of China in order to exploit the Sino-Soviet split. UN Resolution 2758 granted the ’China seat’ to the PRC at the expense of the ROC who were in effect exiled from the organization, and the famous 1972 visit of President Nixon to China further added legitimacy to the communist regime. All this resulted in a thawing of world opinion, and gradually as the durability and permanence of the PRC regime became ingrained, countries began switching their diplomatic recognition from Taipei to Beijing.¶ The economics of international recognition¶ In the Americas, the PRC had international recognition and longstanding support from ideological allies such as Cuba. However, the ROC has maintained more diplomatic support in the Americas than any other region, mainly due to the small nature of the states involved and the importance of Taiwanese aid to their economies. Li notes that “from the late 1980s to the early 1990s, roughly 10 percent of Taiwan’s direct foreign investment (FDI) went to Latin America and the Caribbean,” [51] highlighting the concerted effort made in the region. Economic solidarity is increasingly important to the formation of the Taiwan-Latin America relationship, for two reasons. The first is that for Latin American states, the decision of which China to support is less ideological and political than it ever has been; which makes the decision a straight up economic zero-sum choice. The second is that Latin America is home to natural resources which are of great significance to the hungry growing economies of the PRC and the ROC regardless of international recognition.¶ However, while the decision is not political for Latin American countries, for Taiwan, every country which switches its recognition to the PRC damages its legitimacy as a nation state in the international arena. The Table below shows the designation of diplomatic recognition in the region in 2008.¶ Countries Recognising the PRC (China)Countries Recognising the ROC (Taiwan)Central AmericaMexico, Costa RicaEl Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, PanamaCaribbeanAntigua & Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Cuba, Dominica, Grenada, Guyana, Jamaica, Suriname, Trinidad & TobagoBelize, Dominican Republic, Haiti, St Kitts & Nevis, St. Lucia, St. Vincent & the GrenadinesSouth AmericaArgentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Uruguay, VenezuelaParaguay¶ On the other hand, for the PRC, every state which withdraws its support for the ROC takes it one step closer to being in a position where it can resolve the ‘Taiwan issue’ unilaterally. Subsequently, undermining Taiwan is of the utmost importance to China, and it has taken to ‘outbidding’ Taiwan in offers of foreign aid, a strategy made possible by the decline in aid from the defunct Soviet Union, and the West, which is pre occupied with terrorism and the Middle East. Li notes that “the region’s leaders have turned to Asia for help to promote trade and financial assistance, and consequently played the PRC and Taiwan against each other.” [53] Despite its smaller size, Taiwan has fared remarkably well in this bidding war; focusing its aid investments on infrastructure such as stadiums in St Kitts & Nevis for the Cricket World Cup in 2007.¶ However, even Taiwan‘s economy can be put under strain by the seemingly relentless stream of foreign aid which has brought only debateable and mild gains to the Taiwanese cause. This has contributed to the PRC picking off the few remaining supporters of the ROC – take for example, the Dominican case.¶ In early 2004, Commonwealth of Dominica asked Taipei for a $58 million aid, which is unrelated to public welfare. The Caribbean nation had relied on Taiwan to develop its agriculture-based economy since 1983. Diplomatic relationship was soon broken after Taipei turned down the request. [54]¶ This incident showcased the fact that in economic terms, the PRC is winning the battle for Latin America.¶ Political strategies of the PRC¶ In political terms too; the PRC is in an advantageous position, thanks in part again to its position within the UN. While it can be argued that China “provides incentives but does not threaten harm to induce countries to defect from recognizing Taiwan,” [55] the reality is that the use of force and direct harm are not the only means available to an economic entity as powerful as China. It refuses to maintain official relations with any state that recognises the ROC; an action which can be quite prohibitive to the country being able to take advantage of the growing Chinese market. Although Domínguez suggests that the PRC “has not been punitive toward those states that still recognize the Republic of China (Taiwan),” [56] the legitimacy of this claim has to be brought into question – for example “in June 1996, China fought the extension of the UN mission in Haiti, to punish the Caribbean nation for its appeal for UN acceptance of Taiwan.” [57] This incident showed that China is prepared to use its global clout to play spoiler and apply indirect pressure on countries to adopt its position. Similarly, China’s experience with one-party rule has taught it the importance of party-to-party relations in addition to state-to-state relations, further cementing the PRC by establishing a relationship based on goodwill and common understanding. Indeed by the start of 1998 “the CCP had established relations with almost all major political parties in the countries that were Taiwan’s diplomatic allies in Latin America,” [58] further isolating the ROC.¶ The effect on American interests¶ Were the ROC to be deserted by its remaining allies in Latin America, the USA would be disadvantaged in attempting to maintain the status quo across the Taiwan Strait. A Taiwan that was not recognised by any state from the Americas, or Europe (with the exception of the Vatican) would not be seen as a genuine sovereign entity whose defence would be more important than the upkeep of good relations between China and the West. As China’s economic and political position in the world improves vis-à-vis both America and Taiwan, so might its ambitions. The U.S.A might find itself in a position where it could no longer withstand the diplomatic pressure to allow the PRC to conclude a settlement on Taiwan, perhaps by force.

#### Taiwan crisis is likely this year---draws in the U.S.

Michael Mazza 1-3, research fellow in foreign and defense policy at the American Enterprise Institute, 1/3/13, “Four Surprises That Could Rock Asia in 2013,” http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2013/01/03/four\_surprises\_that\_could\_rock\_asia\_in\_2012?page=full

Since President Ma Ying-jeou came to power in 2008, Taipei and Beijing have improved ties and deepened their economic integration: cross-strait trade reached $127.6 billion in 2011, an increase of more than 13 percent from 2010. Some national security experts misinterpret this trend, thinking that growing economic interdependence will overwhelm factors pushing the two sides apart, and that interdependence will provide Beijing with leverage it can use to compel unification. But while Taiwan's businesspeople enjoy closer ties with China, the average Taiwanese voter continues to move toward independence. Over the last 20 years, the portion of citizens of Taiwan identifying as "Taiwanese" has increased from 17.6 percent of those polled in 1992 to a whopping 53.7 percent today; those identifying as "Chinese" has declined over the same period from 25.5 percent to just 3.1 percent today. Support for independence has nearly doubled over the last two decades, from 11.1 percent to 19.6 percent. Support for immediate or eventual unification, meanwhile, has more than halved, from 20 percent in 1992 to 9.8 percent in 2012.¶ Economic integration is apparently failing to halt what Beijing sees as a troubling trend. With a cross-strait trade agreement and a slew of other, easier deals already on the books, Beijing now expects Ma to discuss political issues. But Ma doesn't have the domestic political support to pursue political talks -- in March 2012, two months after his reelection, 45 percent of those polled said the pace of cross-strait exchanges was "just right," but the share of respondents answering "too fast" had increased to 32.6 percent, from 25.7 percent before the election. Any Chinese shift toward a more strident Taiwan policy could portend a new crisis in the Taiwan Strait sooner than many expect, as a lack of progress on these issues may buttress hawks in the new Xi Jinping administration. And America would surely be dragged in: Even low-level coercive measures against Taiwan -- a top 10 U.S. trading partner and security ally -- could throw U.S.-China relations into a tailspin.

#### Taiwan escalates and goes nuclear---no defense

William Lowther 3-16, Taipei Times, citing a report by the Center for Strategic and International Studies, 3/16/13, “Taiwan could spark nuclear war: report,” <http://www.taipeitimes.com/News/taiwan/archives/2013/03/16/2003557211>

Taiwan is the most likely potential crisis that could trigger a nuclear war between China and the US, a new academic report concludes.¶ “Taiwan remains the single most plausible and dangerous source of tension and conflict between the US and China,” says the 42-page report by the Washington-based Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS).¶ Prepared by the CSIS’ Project on Nuclear Issues and resulting from a year-long study, the report emphasizes that Beijing continues to be set on a policy to prevent Taiwan’s independence, while at the same time the US maintains the capability to come to Taiwan’s defense.¶ “Although tensions across the Taiwan Strait have subsided since both Taipei and Beijing embraced a policy of engagement in 2008, the situation remains combustible, complicated by rapidly diverging cross-strait military capabilities and persistent political disagreements,” the report says.¶ In a footnote, it quotes senior fellow at the US Council on Foreign Relations Richard Betts describing Taiwan as “the main potential flashpoint for the US in East Asia.”¶ The report also quotes Betts as saying that neither Beijing nor Washington can fully control developments that might ignite a Taiwan crisis.¶ “This is a classic recipe for surprise, miscalculation and uncontrolled escalation,” Betts wrote in a separate study of his own.¶ The CSIS study says: “For the foreseeable future Taiwan is the contingency in which nuclear weapons would most likely become a major factor, because the fate of the island is intertwined both with the legitimacy of the Chinese Communist Party and the reliability of US defense commitments in the Asia-Pacific region.”¶ Titled Nuclear Weapons and US-China Relations, the study says disputes in the East and South China seas appear unlikely to lead to major conflict between China and the US, but they do “provide kindling” for potential conflict between the two nations because the disputes implicate a number of important regional interests, including the interests of treaty allies of the US.¶ The danger posed by flashpoints such as Taiwan, the Korean Peninsula and maritime demarcation disputes is magnified by the potential for mistakes, the study says.¶ “Although Beijing and Washington have agreed to a range of crisis management mechanisms, such as the Military Maritime Consultative Agreement and the establishment of a direct hotline between the Pentagon and the Ministry of Defense, the bases for miscommunication and misunderstanding remain and draw on deep historical reservoirs of suspicion,” the report says.¶ For example, it says, it is unclear whether either side understands what kinds of actions would result in a military or even nuclear response by the other party.¶ To make things worse, “neither side seems to believe the other’s declared policies and intentions, suggesting that escalation management, already a very uncertain endeavor, could be especially difficult in any conflict,” it says.¶ Although conflict “mercifully” seems unlikely at this point, the report concludes that “it cannot be ruled out and may become increasingly likely if we are unwise or unlucky.”¶ The report says: “With both sides possessing and looking set to retain formidable nuclear weapons arsenals, such a conflict would be tremendously dangerous and quite possibly devastating.”

#### \*\*\*Cuba-Russia relations are increasing and will cause war---boosting US-Cuba relations solves

Inter-American Dialogue 12 (U.S. based think tank for policy analysis, exchange, and communication on issues in Western Hemisphere affairs, “Are External Tensions Entangling Latin American Countries?” http://www.cepr.net/documents/CEPR\_News/LAA120810.pdf)

A Stephen Johnson, senior fellow and director of the Americas Program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies: "It may or may not be true that Russia's government is seeking to build resupply bases for its navy in Cuba, Vietnam and the Seychelles islands. While Russian navy officials say 'da,' the foreign ministry says 'nyet.' Similar talk of establishing bases elsewhere, such as Venezuela, has not materialized. In any case, it would not present a direct threat unless such a facility became an entry point for hostile arms similar to the nuclear-tipped missiles that provoked the 1962 crisis. Like any other state, Russia can strike diplomatic agreements to base military units in other countries. On the other hand, it would be a challenge. First, it would rekindle a military relationship that ended when Russia transferred its signals intelligence facility at Lourdes to the Cuban government in 2002. A new base might be a shot in the arm to the Cuban economy, helping the Castro brothers hang on to aspects of their old command economy without going cold turkey for market reforms. A base could also serve as a hub for military weapons sales to other Latin American nations when the region needs help in fighting transnational crime. The Soviet Union fell more than 20 years ago, but Russia still has large military industries and needs to sell arms more than washing machines. Its prime customers would, like Cuba, be in the Bolivarian alliance. Second, a Russian navy station in Cuba might complicate U.S. politics, specifically any plans a U.S. administration might have to hand back Guantanamo Naval Base in the near future, for which Cuba's current government refuses to cash our rent checks. At a time when U.S. Northern and Southern Commands are gearing more toward military support for civilian law enforcement missions, it would reintroduce a strategic deterrence component into joint exercises and training. That might not be a bad thing, but it would argue for more U.S. defense spending on the Western Hemisphere. All of which seems to argue that recent threat trends in the Americas are not very predictive and that certain old alliances won't go easily into the sunset."¶ A Stephen Wilkinson, chairman of the International Institute for the Study of Cuba: "Russia is in military talks with Cuba for three reasons. One is economic, related to Russian investment in Cuban nickel and oil and the need to guarantee protection of these investments. Another factor is geostrategic. Recent events in Syria have confirmed Russian fears of the long-term strategic aims of the United States. The Russians are very aware that the United States and Western Europe have been supporting the rebels in Syria and they see this as an indirect attack upon their interests as Assad provides them with a naval base at Tartus, on the Mediterranean. The third reason is possibly rather more personal, Vladimir Putin has turned his face against Washington since his recent re-election because he perceived a U.S. hand in organizing the protests against him. From Cuba's point of view, having a Russian military base would be a guarantee of security since it would mean that U.S. military action against it would be less likely. If Washington would not wish for Havana to have such an ally, it ought to reconsider its own policy toward the island. At present, the embargo, and especially the Helms Burton Law, makes it sensible for the Cuban government to seek alliances with as many powers as possible in order to protect itself. U.S. military presence in Latin America has grown in recent years. There are now 24 bases including two new ones in Chile and Argentina. Seven bases in Colombia are being expanded. The justification for this expansion is the war on drugs and for humanitarian intervention purposes. However, it should come as no surprise that this is not the way that Cuba or its closest allies such as Hugo Chávez or Evo Morales view them. They see the bases as potential threats to their independence and sovereignty and a sign that Washington's hegemonic designs on the region are very much alive."¶ A Wayne S. Smith, senior fellow and director of the Cuba Project at the Center for International Policy: "Given the history of the 1962 U.S.-Soviet missile crisis, for the Russians now to propose exploring with the Cubans the setting up of naval bases on the island would seem a rather maladroit idea. The United States made it clear in 1962 that the positioning of offensive nuclear missiles on the island was unacceptable and demanded that they be withdrawn. The world has never been so close to an allout nuclear war. Fortunately, both Kennedy and Khrushchev showed themselves to be sensible men. They reached an understanding under which Khrushchev agreed to withdraw the missiles and Kennedy gave assurances that the United States would not invade Cuba. Subsequently, without informing the United States, the Soviets began building a submarine base on the island, but when it was made clear to them that the United States would consider this a violation of the Kennedy-Khrushchev understanding of 1962, work on the base was quietly halted and never resumed. The United States should of course oppose the positioning of Russian bases in Cuba today, as should the other countries of the hemisphere. They would serve no reasonable purpose and could only unnecessarily add to tensions. The United States has not increased its military presence in Latin America. There is no reason for the Russians to do so."

#### Increased Cuba-Russia relations causes war

Richter 08 (Paul, Staff Writer for New York Times, “Moscow-Havana ties worry U.S.” http://articles.latimes.com/2008/sep/01/world/fg-usrussia1)

But at a time when Russia has intervened forcefully in Georgia and is extending the global reach of its rebuilt military, some senior officials fear it may not be only bluster.¶ Russia "has strategic ties to Cuba again, or at least, that's where they're going," a senior U.S. official said recently, speaking, like others, on condition of anonymity because of the sensitive implications of the assessments.¶ The officials said they doubted the Russians would risk stationing nuclear bombers on Cuba. But some believe that Moscow might seek to restore its once-energetic intelligence cooperation with Havana, and to resume limited military cooperation, possibly including refueling stops for aircraft and warships.¶ In the current environment, such contacts would make U.S. officials uneasy, serving as a reminder of a military relationship between Havana and Moscow that stretched from the Cuban Revolution in 1959 until a weakened, post-Soviet Russia finally closed a massive electronic intelligence complex in Lourdes near Havana in 2001.¶ One senior military officer said a return of Russian ships or planes could force additional U.S. deployments in the region. But the Bush administration and Pentagon declined to comment publicly on the implications.¶ "It is very Cold War retro," said a government official. "The topic could be reminiscent of the Cuban missile crisis, and that is a chapter that people don't want to revisit."¶ The Russian Defense Ministry dismissed a report in the newspaper Izvestia in July that quoted an unidentified Russian official as saying the government intended to begin basing Tupolev Tu-160 Blackjack and Tupolev Tu-95 Bear nuclear bombers in Cuba.¶ However, the report was taken seriously enough in Washington that Gen. Norton A. Schwartz, the new Air Force chief of staff, said during his Senate confirmation hearing at the time that sending the bombers would cross a "red line in the sand."

#### Normalizing relations with Cuba crowds out Russia

Blank 09 (Stephen, Research Professor of National Security Affairs at the Strategic Studies Institute of the U.S. Army War College, “Russia in Latin America: Geopolitical Games in the US’s Neighborhood,” pdf)

The only way in which Russian policy truly threatens the US and Latin America is its military and intelligence support for Chavez and similar leaders. This support is passed on to insurgents while strengthening Chavez and his allies. Adequate responses to such threats are inherently economic and political, and only military as a last resort. ¶ Washington can do much more to facilitate security in Latin America: regenerating its own economy; simultaneously opening up trade markets and eliminating barriers to Latin American exports; enhancing multilateralism and interoperability among defense forces as requested by Latin American militaries; and beginning the normalization of Cuba.¶ Havana is no longer the threat it was, Venezuela has claimed that dubious honor. Rehabilitating Cuba, given that Castro’s days are clearly numbered, would take the air out of Chavez’s balloon; it is quite clear that Havana would probably welcome a path towards better relations with the US, especially the economic benefits they would inevitably bring. A policy with a more symbolically important impact upon Latin America is currently difficult to imagine.¶ Nonetheless, there should be no illusion that the security problems that plague this region are easily overcome, quite the opposite. But that is all the more reason why the US cannot ignore the area and let it drift to Moscow, Tehran, and Beijin for want of a better alternative. That outcome would only confirm once again that in world politics, there is no such thing as benign neglect. Instead neglect is malign and engenders negative results for the negligent state along with those neglected. The policies of the Bush administration allowed Russia to gain a foothold in Latin American politics, a result of Washington’s negligence; under President Obama, the US should reverse those outcomes and demonstrate what liberal democracy in action can truly accomplish.

#### Russian expansion spurs a new Cold War and proxy conflicts

Walle 12 (Walter, Research Associate at the Council on Hemispheric Affairs, “Russia Turns to the South for Military and Economic Alliances,” http://www.coha.org/russia-turns-to-the-south-for-military-and-economic-alliances/)

Quite clearly, Russia’s interest in Latin America is escalating. Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov, argued in his article, “The New Stage of Development of Russian-Latin American Relations,” that there is great attractiveness in establishing bilateral relations, especially when three of the top twenty emerging economies -Mexico, Brazil and Argentina- are in Latin America.[23] Lavrov has also stated that the Russian Federation has an interest in joining the Inter-American Development Bank, perhaps a move to better accommodate Russian interests in the region, while at the same time neutralizing American influence.¶ Demonstrably, Russia has been developing cooperative relationships with prominent organizational bodies of the region, such as the OAS (Organization of American States), and has ratified visa-free travel agreements with countries like Colombia, Venezuela, Ecuador, Peru, Brazil, Chile, and Argentina. In his article, Lavrov argues that Russia’s intention behind quests for partnerships is the establishment of non-ideologized relationships with Latin American countries, relationships that could be of mutual benefit to all parties involved.¶ However, the Russian stance on Latin America ultimately may be cause for apprehension. The establishment of bilateral, cordial relations between Russia and Latin American countries could evolve to a proxy, neo-Cold War scenario. If the situation in the regions worsens, some countries would be funded and supported by the U.S., while others, including several members of Latin America’s “New Left”, would become the major beneficiaries of Moscow. An analogy of such practice is the Georgia – Russia crisis that surfaced in August of 2008. During this brief war, the U.S. sent military aid to Georgia[24] on warships to territory Russia considers its “backyard” (i.e. the Caucasus and the Black Sea), infuriating Moscow. A month after the conflict erupted, ostensibly in retaliation, Russia sent two Tu-160 bombers to conduct military exercises with Washington’s least favorite nation in Latin America: Venezuela[25]. More importantly, in November of 2008 Moscow conducted war games with Caracas, in which a small Russian fleet was sent to the Caribbean to participate in joint naval maneuvers with the Venezuelan navy.[26] This was a powerful symbolic act: as it was the first time that Russian warships had visited the Caribbean since the Cuban Missile Crisis.¶ In the wake of the post-Georgia conflict, such joint military maneuvers between Russia and Venezuela were revitalized, and helped to build up the tensions between Washington and Moscow, sending strong signals of a Cold War revival. Furthermore, in the aftermath of the declarations of independence by the breakaway regions of Georgia, South Ossetia and Abkhazia, Venezuela[27] and Nicaragua[28] were alone among Latin American countries in recognizing the independence of the new republics.

#### That causes miscalculation

Orozco 08 (Jose, Correspondent for Christian Science Monitor, “Cold war echo: Russian military maneuvers with Venezuela,” http://www.csmonitor.com/World/Americas/2008/0912/p01s05-woam.html)

The last time a Russian Navy ship plied the azure waters of the Caribbean for major joint maneuvers with an anti-US country was during the cold war.¶ But in a move out of Cuban leader Fidel Castro's historical playbook, Venezuela's Hugo Chávez announced this week that his nation will host four Russian warships and 1,000 troops in November for joint military exercises.¶ That was followed Wednesday by the arrival in Venezuela of two Russian long-range bombers.¶ Although Latin American leaders so far have shrugged off the moves as another act of bravado in Mr. Chávez's push against what he calls "Yankee hegemony," some diplomats and US officials see the potential for real trouble.¶ The US typically ignores the leftist leader's angry tirades, and is playing down the news.¶ Still, an extensive military relationship between Venezuela and Russia could heighten tensions and signal the start of a new regional cold war.¶ "This is a risky step that could provoke the US," says retired Navy Vice Admiral and former Vice Minister of Defense Rafael Huizi Clavier. "Any incident, any error, could bring problems." This week, Russia announced that it will send a naval squadron, including the nuclear-powered missile cruiser Peter the Great, as well as long-range patrol planes for the upcoming joint exercises with Venezuela.

#### Extinction

Helfand and Pastore 9 [Ira Helfand, M.D., and John O. Pastore, M.D., are past presidents of Physicians for Social Responsibility. March 31, 2009, “U.S.-Russia nuclear war still a threat”, http://www.projo.com/opinion/contributors/content/CT\_pastoreline\_03-31-09\_EODSCAO\_v15.bbdf23.html]

President Obama and Russian President Dimitri Medvedev are scheduled to Wednesday in London during the G-20 summit. They must not let the current economic crisis keep them from focusing on one of the greatest threats confronting humanity: the danger of nuclear war. Since the end of the Cold War, many have acted as though the danger of nuclear war has ended. It has not. There remain in the world more than 20,000 nuclear weapons. Alarmingly, more than 2,000 of these weapons in the U.S. and Russian arsenals remain on ready-alert status, commonly known as hair-trigger alert. They can be fired within five minutes and reach targets in the other country 30 minutes later. Just one of these weapons can destroy a city. A war involving a substantial number would cause devastation on a scale unprecedented in human history. A study conducted by Physicians for Social Responsibility in 2002 showed that if only 500 of the Russian weapons on high alert exploded over our cities, 100 million Americans would die in the first 30 minutes. An attack of this magnitude also would destroy the entire economic, communications and transportation infrastructure on which we all depend. Those who survived the initial attack would inhabit a nightmare landscape with huge swaths of the country blanketed with radioactive fallout and epidemic diseases rampant. They would have no food, no fuel, no electricity, no medicine, and certainly no organized health care. In the following months it is likely the vast majority of the U.S. population would die. Recent studies by the eminent climatologists Toon and Robock have shown that such a war would have a huge and immediate impact on climate world wide. If all of the warheads in the U.S. and Russian strategic arsenals were drawn into the conflict, the firestorms they caused would loft 180 million tons of soot and debris into the upper atmosphere — blotting out the sun. Temperatures across the globe would fall an average of 18 degrees Fahrenheit to levels not seen on earth since the depth of the last ice age, 18,000 years ago. Agriculture would stop, eco-systems would collapse, and many species, including perhaps our own, would become extinct. It is common to discuss nuclear war as a low-probabillity event. But is this true? We know of five occcasions during the last 30 years when either the U.S. or Russia believed it was under attack and prepared a counter-attack. The most recent of these near misses occurred after the end of the Cold War on Jan. 25, 1995, when the Russians mistook a U.S. weather rocket launched from Norway for a possible attack. Jan. 25, 1995, was an ordinary day with no major crisis involving the U.S. and Russia. But, unknown to almost every inhabitant on the planet, a misunderstanding led to the potential for a nuclear war. The ready alert status of nuclear weapons that existed in 1995 remains in place today.

### Econ

#### Venezuela is going to cut Cuba off from oil---that wrecks their economy

Keppel 3/16 (Stephen, ABC News, “What Chávez's Death Means for Cuba, Venezuela and the U.S.” http://abcnews.go.com/ABC\_Univision/chavezs-death-means-cuba-venezuela-us/story?id=18669003)

Upon hearing news of the death of Hugo Chávez, scores of Venezuelans gathered in cautious celebration in Doral, a South Florida community with the highest concentration of Venezuelans outside Venezuela. They are hoping that Chávez's passing will bring about change in their homeland.¶ Others in the region were not as happy.¶ Sure Chávez was politically influential in Latin America, but in many ways his economic influence was even greater — especially with friendly countries like Cuba, Nicaragua, Ecuador, Argentina, Bolivia and a score of Caribbean nations that benefited from Venezuela's oil-discount program, PetroCaribe.¶ In the name of "economic solidarity," Chávez was extremely generous with these friends, offering oil at discounted rates and with flexible lending conditions. Nicaragua, for example, was known to pay for Venezuelan oil with shipments of beef, sugar, coffee, milk and even 19,000 pairs of pants.¶ According to figures from the state-owned oil company PDVSA, in 2011 Venezuela sent 243,500 barrels of oil a day (or around 8 percent of its production) to 16 countries across Latin America.¶ Yet the absence of Chávez and the potential drawdown of economic support would have the biggest impact on Cuba. That country receives more than 100,000 barrels of discounted oil per day and billions of dollars each year in exchange for Cuban medical personnel, technology experts, political consultants and other "professionals."¶ That's because Chávez had a special relationship with Cuba and the Castros. His relationships with other presidents were also often very personal. That approach may be difficult to sustain in his absence. Even if Nicolas Maduro, Chávez's chosen replacement, wins the upcoming election, he will be more susceptible to domestic pressure to reduce Venezuela's foreign aid, given all the economic challenges at home.¶ The Cubans have bad memories of the ending of Soviet patronage in the 1990s and are right to be worried about what the death of Chávez may bring.¶ Where will Cuba turn this time if Venezuelan aid dries up? Maybe the United States. That doesn't mean the U.S. government, however. Rather, Cuba would likely turn to the nearly two million Cubans living in this country. They are already sending around $2 billion a year back to the island in remittances. Already, Raul Castro seems to have been preparing to make the Cuban economy a little bit more flexible and open to investment, and the Obama administration has made it easier for Cubans in the U.S. to send money back home.¶ Which brings us to Venezuela's financial situation. The truth is the economic state there has been uncertain and chaotic ever since Chavez got sick, and that is unlikely to change in the short term. There is supposed to be a new election, and it appears that Maduro will win. But he will face a tough economic situation. Plus, he lacks the charisma of Chávez and may not be able to maintain popularity if things get tougher.

#### Venezuelan oil is key to Cuba’s economy

Benjamin-Alvadaro 10 (Jonathan, Report for the Cuban Research Institute, Florida International University, PhD, Professor of Political Science at University of Nebraska at Omaha, Director of the Intelligence Community Centers of Academic Excellence Program at UNO, Treasurer of the American Political Science Association, “Cuba’s Energy Future: Strategic Approaches to Cooperation”)

The power and hydrocarbon sectors are inextricably linked, as Cuba produces about 85 percent of its power using liquid fuels, a very high percentage compared with other countries.3 The total value of the energy consumed in Cuba has been estimated at 14 percent of GDP, compared with a world average of about 10 percent. In 2007, domestic production of crude oil accounted for about 40 percent of total consumption and the rest was imported from Venezuela. About 50 percent of the total supply of fuel oil is applied to power generation and 50 percent for transportation and other uses; this is consistent with the usage breakdown seen in other countries.

#### Cuban oil solves dependence on Venezuela---revenues lead to political reforms that create stability

Pinon 11 – Jorge R. Piñón is a visiting research fellow at the Latin American and Caribbean Center’s Cuban Research Institute at FIU. Spring 2011, "Why the United States and Cuba Collaborate (and What Could Happen If They Don't)"casgroup.fiu.edu/pages/docs/2157/1306356964\_Hemisphere\_Vol.\_20.pdf

If Cuba’s suspected but yet undiscovered hydrocarbon reserves are proven real, it will take between three and five years to develop them fully. Production volumes would have to reach more than 200,000 barrels per day to have the same positive economic impact currently derived from foreign oil subsidies. If this occurs, **significant revenues from oil, natural gas and sugarcane ethanol would integrate Cuba into global and regional markets within the next five years.**¶ International oil companies such as Spain’s Repsol, Norway’s Statoil Norsk Hydro and Brazil’s Petrobras are actively exploring Cuba’s Gulf of Mexico waters. Cuban authorities have invited United States oil companies to participate in developing the island’s offshore oil and natural gas resources, but US law does not allow this.¶ Although US oil, oil equipment and service companies have the capital, technology and operational knowhow to explore, produce and refine Cuba’s potential reserves in a safe and responsible manner, the almost five-decade old unilateral political and economic embargo keeps them on the sidelines.¶ Cuba currently **relies on heavily subsidized oil from Venezuela** for two-thirds of its petroleum needs. This supply **contributes to the Cuban government’s ability to maintain a** politically antagonistic and belligerent position **towards the US**.¶ The collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 made Cuba aware of the political and economic risks and consequences of depending on a single source of imported oil. **Only when Cuba diversifies suppliers and develops its offshore hydrocarbon resources**, estimated by the United States Geological Survey at 5.5 million barrels of oil and 9.8 trillion cubic feet of natural gas, will it have the economic independence to consider political and economic reforms. It is in the US interest to develop a new policy toward the island based on constructive engagement to support the emergence of a Cuban state in which Cubans themselves can determine the political and economic future of their country through democratic means. Cuba is about to embark on an 18-month oil exploration drilling program to validate the presence of recoverable hydrocarbon reserves.¶ US support of such endeavors would be beneficial in the framework of a constructive engagement policy. The Deepwater Horizon drilling semi-submersible incident and the resulting catastrophic oil spill demonstrate the urgency of developing a policy of energy and environmental cooperation between the United States and Cuba. As Cuba develops its deepwater oil and natural gas potential, the possible consequences of a spill call for proactive planning by both countries to minimize or avoid an environmental disaster.¶ To respond effectively to an oil-related marine accident, any company operating in Cuba would require immediate access to US oil services companies for the nearinstant technology and know-how needed to halt and limit damage to the marine environment. Obviously, the establishment of working relations between the US and Cuba in the area of marine environmental protection would assist enormously in the contingency planning and cooperation necessary for an early and effective response to an oil spill.¶ The United States and Cuba are already parties to a number of multilateral oil pollution agreements, such as the 1973 International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships (MARPOL) and the 1983 Convention for the protection and Development of the Marine Environment in the Wider Caribbean Region (Cartagena Convention). Both agreements address prevention of pollution of the marine environment by ships from operational or accidental causes. The 1990 International Convention on Oil Pollution Preparedness, Response and Cooperation also offers a precedent for cooperation. The convention is designed to encourage and facilitate international cooperation and mutual assistance in preparing for and responding to major oil pollution incidents. Signatory nations are tasked with developing and maintaining adequate capabilities to deal with such an emergency. In the case of Cuba and the United States, the capabilities must be transnational, as there is no barrier to the movement of oil from one country’s waters to another’s. The United States, therefore, must develop appropriate regulatory and procedural frameworks for the free movement of equipment, personnel and expertise between the two countries as part of any oil spill response.¶ The 1980 Agreement of Cooperation between the United States and Mexico Regarding Pollution of the Marine Environment by Discharges of Hydrocarbons and Other Hazardous Substances (MEXUS Plan) provides the foundation for a similar protocol with Cuba. This would include the establishment of joint response teams, coordinating roles, rapid incident notification mechanisms, joint operations centers and communication procedures, along with regular exercises and meetings. The United States government, irrespective of the current embargo, has the power to license the sale, lease or loan of emergency relief and reconstruction equipment and the travel of expert personnel to Cuba following an oil spill.¶ Cuba’s long-term energy challenges will be a consequence of its future economic growth and rising standard of living within a market environment. This anticipated growth will depend largely on the development of a competitively priced, readily available and environmentally sound long-term energy plan. Cuban energy policy should embrace energy conservation, modernization of the energy infrastructure, and balance in sourcing oil/gas supplies and renewable energy sources that protect the island’s environment. **The country would benefit from the guidance of a variety of partners, including the United States.**

#### The US embargo prevents successful Cuban oil development

Benjamin-Alvadaro 06 (Jonathan, Report for the Cuban Research Institute, Florida International University, PhD, Professor of Political Science at University of Nebraska at Omaha, Director of the Intelligence Community Centers of Academic Excellence Program at UNO, Treasurer of the American Political Science Association, “The Current Status and Future Prospects for Oil Exploration in Cuba: A Special,” http://cri.fiu.edu/research/commissioned-reports/oil-cuba-alvarado.pdf)

But why has Sherritt succeeded when the perception on the part of many American observers has been that Cubans are difficult and mercurial partners? Sherritt Oil is a medium sized firm with medium sized aspirations that simultaneously seeks to produce a reasonable return on investment for its ventures in Cuba while operating a commercial enterprise that is working within a country in dire need of reliable energy sources that operates under the strictures of a command economy.8¶ This perhaps explains why Sherritt has been successful where others failed. The terms of “doing business” in Cuba are often too severe for conventional profit-seeking firms, but in this case, Sherritt appears to have altered its basis for success to coordinate its objectives with those available under the prevailing Cuban joint venture model. The Spanish oil firm, Repsol spent $53 million in oil and gas exploration in 2004 and came up with nothing and yet has contracted to continue exploration of 8 offshore tracks on the northwest coast of Cuba.9¶ It is also interesting that all, of the firms operating in Cuba at the present time are operating with dated technology and must be able to service all of its own exploration operations. This owes in part to the fact that American oil engineering represents the leading edge of oil exploration technology and explicit in all of its foreign sales are export control stipulations that none of that technology can be sold or transferred to a short but well known list of countries: Iraq; North Korea; until recently Libya; and of course, Cuba. This proscription adds up to 30 percent to the operating costs that what is still for Sherritt, and other joint venture partners, a profit making venture. Sherritt must also account for being largely responsible for providing all engineering support services as Cuba provides few of these services owing to the denial of technology on the part of the U.S. ¶ On this point, the U.S. embargo has been successful in relegating Cuba’s energy development schemes to a less than world class status. Moreover, it appears to have had a residual effect – as not to appear to be suffering from a technology gap, Cuba pursues upstream investment, such as the purchase of three drilling rigs from the Chinese for symbolic as well as practical reasons.10 Legitimately, given the existing resources on the island and interest from oil and gas exploration firms from Europe, Latin America and Canada, and especially because of Cuba’s cozy relationship with oil-rich Venezuela it is perhaps a questionable investment. American oil industry experts suggest that for a small country like Cuba, it could derive a greater benefit from investment in oil infrastructure such as pipelines, terminals, batteries, etc. These are the types of services essential to oil production and serve as revenue generating sources long after the reverie of an oil find. In an inherently risk driven industry it makes better sense for a small relatively resource constrained state to pursue this course of energy investment.

#### The plan catalyzes investment that is key to Cuban oil development

Benjamin-Alvadaro 6 (Jonathan, Report for the Cuban Research Institute, Florida International University, PhD, Professor of Political Science at University of Nebraska at Omaha, Director of the Intelligence Community Centers of Academic Excellence Program at UNO, Treasurer of the American Political Science Association, “The Current Status and Future Prospects for Oil Exploration in Cuba: A Special,” http://cri.fiu.edu/research/commissioned-reports/oil-cuba-alvarado.pdf)

Why is it important to clarify the current status of Cuban energy in the face of a continuing opposition by the United States to anything resembling what can be construed as “good news” for the Castro regime? Obviously, because up until this point it hasn’t cost the United States much if anything. The current policy continues to clearly place at the forefront the sanctity and utility of a comprehensive economic and political embargo in the hopes that it helps to foment a change in regime and a peaceful transition to a democratic system of governance and a complimentary market economy. As energy security concerns continue to percolate up to an increasingly important status in the realm of national security objectives we may begin to see the erosion of the hard position against the Cuban regime regardless of its leadership.¶ The overview of the Cuban energy developments clearly and unambiguously reveals that the Castro regime has every intention of continuing to promote, design and implement energy development policies that will benefit Cuba for generations to come. Cuba is sparing no effort by instituting bottom-up and top-down policy initiatives to meet this challenge. It has significantly increased its international cooperation in the energy sector and continues to enhance its efforts to ensure energy security in these most uncertain of times. But it stands to reason that no matter how successful these efforts are, they will come up short. Two factors may alter this present situation. First, Cuba may indeed realize a bonanza from the offshore tracts that will allow it to possibly address its many energy challenges, from increasing oil production and refining capacity, to improving the nation’s energy infrastructure, ensuring a stable energy future. Second, and no less significant, is the possibility of normalization of trade relations with the United States. This is important not only because it will allow direct foreign investment, technology transfer and information sharing between these neighboring states but it possibly enhances the energy security of both states, and hence, the region, realized through a division of labor and dispersion of resources that serve as a hedge against natural disaster and market disruptions. Moreover, all states could derive benefit from the public information campaigns to promote energy efficiency and conservation presently being promoted in Cuba in the face of diminishing energy stocks and uncertain global markets. Ultimately, and only after normalization, the task still falls to the Cuban government, but the cost will necessarily be spread through a number of sources that are predominately American because of strategic interests, proximity and affinity. It suffices to say that the requisite investment and assistance will have a distinct American tinge to it, inasmuch as American corporations, U.S. government agencies, and international financial institutions, of which the U.S. is a major contributor, will play important roles in the funding of the effort to revitalize the Cuban energy sector. Cuban officials are not averse and perhaps would prefer that the U.S. be its major partner in this effort owing to the fact that most if not all of the cutting-edge technology in energy, oil and gas comes from the United States. It is remarkable that the Cuban energy sector is as vibrant as it presently is, absent the type of infrastructural investment that is available to most developing states, in large part because of the American economic embargo. ¶ Finally, the cost is significant and it stands to reason that the longer one waits to address the challenge at hand the higher the cost of modernizing the energy sector. For this reason alone, the American role in assisting Cuba in this effort will be significant and every day that the task is put off, it increases the long-term cost of the effort. This should serve as an obvious point of entry into cooperation with the Cuban government and perhaps can serve as a catalyst for promoting confidence, trust and cooperation in this critical issue area across the region.

#### Cuban instability causes Caribbean instability, democratic backsliding, and refugee flows

Gorrell 5 (Tim, Lieutenant Colonel, “CUBA: THE NEXT UNANTICIPATED ANTICIPATED STRATEGIC CRISIS?” 3/18, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA433074)

Regardless of the succession, under the current U.S. policy, Cuba’s problems of a post Castro transformation only worsen. In addition to Cubans on the island, there will be those in exile who will return claiming authority. And there are remnants of the dissident community within Cuba who will attempt to exercise similar authority. A power vacuum or absence of order will create the conditions for instability and civil war. Whether Raul or another successor from within the current government can hold power is debatable. However, that individual will nonetheless extend the current policies for an indefinite period, which will only compound the Cuban situation. When Cuba finally collapses anarchy is a strong possibility if the U.S. maintains the “wait and see” approach. The U.S. then must deal with an unstable country 90 miles off its coast. In the midst of this chaos, thousands will flee the island. During the Mariel boatlift in 1980 125,000 fled the island.26 Many were criminals; this time the number could be several hundred thousand fleeing to the U.S., creating a refugee crisis.¶ Equally important, by adhering to a negative containment policy, the U.S. may be creating its next series of transnational criminal problems. Cuba is along the axis of the drug-trafficking flow into the U.S. from Columbia. The Castro government as a matter of policy does not support the drug trade. In fact, Cuba’s actions have shown that its stance on drugs is more than hollow rhetoric as indicated by its increasing seizure of drugs – 7.5 tons in 1995, 8.8 tons in 1999, and 13 tons in 2000.27 While there may be individuals within the government and outside who engage in drug trafficking and a percentage of drugs entering the U.S. may pass through Cuba, the Cuban government is not the path of least resistance for the flow of drugs. If there were no Cuban restraints, the flow of drugs to the U.S. could be greatly facilitated by a Cuba base of operation and accelerate considerably.¶ In the midst of an unstable Cuba, the opportunity for radical fundamentalist groups to operate in the region increases. If these groups can export terrorist activity from Cuba to the U.S. or throughout the hemisphere then the war against this extremism gets more complicated. Such activity could increase direct attacks and disrupt the economies, threatening the stability of the fragile democracies that are budding throughout the region. In light of a failed state in the region, the U.S. may be forced to deploy military forces to Cuba, creating the conditions for another insurgency. The ramifications of this action could very well fuel greater anti-American sentiment throughout the Americas. A proactive policy now can mitigate these potential future problems.¶ U.S. domestic political support is also turning against the current negative policy. The Cuban American population in the U.S. totals 1,241,685 or 3.5% of the population.28 Most of these exiles reside in Florida; their influence has been a factor in determining the margin of victory in the past two presidential elections. But this election strategy may be flawed, because recent polls of Cuban Americans reflect a decline for President Bush based on his policy crackdown. There is a clear softening in the Cuban-American community with regard to sanctions. Younger Cuban Americans do not necessarily subscribe to the hard-line approach. These changes signal an opportunity for a new approach to U.S.-Cuban relations. (Table 1)¶ The time has come to look realistically at the Cuban issue. Castro will rule until he dies. The only issue is what happens then? The U.S. can little afford to be distracted by a failed state 90 miles off its coast. The administration, given the present state of world affairs, does not have the luxury or the resources to pursue the traditional American model of crisis management. The President and other government and military leaders have warned that the GWOT will be long and protracted. These warnings were sounded when the administration did not anticipate operations in Iraq consuming so many military, diplomatic and economic resources. There is justifiable concern that Africa and the Caucasus region are potential hot spots for terrorist activity, so these areas should be secure. North Korea will continue to be an unpredictable crisis in waiting. We also cannot ignore China. What if China resorts to aggression to resolve the Taiwan situation? Will the U.S. go to war over Taiwan? Additionally, Iran could conceivably be the next target for U.S. pre-emptive action. These are known and potential situations that could easily require all or many of the elements of national power to resolve. In view of such global issues, can the U.S. afford to sustain the status quo and simply let the Cuban situation play out? The U.S. is at a crossroads: should the policies of the past 40 years remain in effect with vigor? Or should the U.S. pursue a new approach to Cuba in an effort to facilitate a manageable transition to post-Castro Cuba?

#### Caribbean terrorism leads to attack on the US---they’ll use bioweapons

Bryan 1 (Anthony T. Bryan, director of the North-South Center’s Caribbean Program, 10-21-2001. CFR, Terrorism, Porous Borders, and Homeland Security: The Case for U.S.-Caribbean Cooperation, p.  
http://www.cfr.org/publication/4844/terrorism\_porous\_borders\_and%20\_homeland\_%20security.html)

Terrorist acts can take place anywhere. The Caribbean is no exception. Already the linkages between drug trafficking and terrorism are clear in countries like Colombia and Peru, and such connections have similar potential in the Caribbean. The security of major industrial complexes in some Caribbean countries is vital. Petroleum refineries and major industrial estates in Trinidad, which host more than 100 companies that produce the majority of the world’s methanol, ammonium sulphate, and 40 percent of U.S. imports of liquefied natural gas (LNG), are vulnerable targets. Unfortunately, as experience has shown in Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America, terrorists are likely to strike at U.S. and European interests in Caribbean countries. Security issues become even more critical when one considers the possible use of Caribbean countries by terrorists as bases from which to attack the United States. An airliner hijacked after departure from an airport in the northern Caribbean or the Bahamas can be flying over South Florida in less than an hour. Terrorists can sabotage or seize control of a cruise ship after the vessel leaves a Caribbean port. Moreover, terrorists with false passports and visas issued in the Caribbean may be able to move easily through passport controls in Canada or the United States. (To help counter this possibility, some countries have suspended "economic citizenship" programs to ensure that known terrorists have not been inadvertently granted such citizenship.) Again, Caribbean countries are as vulnerable as anywhere else to the clandestine manufacture and deployment of biological weapons within national borders.

#### Bioterror leads to extinction

Anders Sandberg 8, is a James Martin Research Fellow at the Future of Humanity Institute at Oxford University; Jason G. Matheny, PhD candidate in Health Policy and Management at Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health and special consultant to the Center for Biosecurity at the University of Pittsburgh Medical Center; Milan M. Ćirković, senior research associate at the Astronomical Observatory of Belgrade and assistant professor of physics at the University of Novi Sad in Serbia and Montenegro, 9/8/8, “How can we reduce the risk of human extinction?,” Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists,<http://www.thebulletin.org/web-edition/features/how-can-we-reduce-the-risk-of-human-extinction>

The risks from anthropogenic hazards appear at present larger than those from natural ones. Although great progress has been made in reducing the number of nuclear weapons in the world, humanity is still threatened by the possibility of a global thermonuclear war and a resulting nuclear winter. We mayface even greater risks from emerging technologies. Advances in synthetic biology might make it possible to engineer pathogens capable of extinction-level pandemics. The knowledge, equipment, and materials needed to engineer pathogens are more accessible than those needed to build nuclear weapons. And unlike other weapons, pathogens are self-replicating, allowing a small arsenal to becomeexponentially destructive. Pathogens have been implicated in the extinctions of many wild species. Although most pandemics "fade out" by reducing the density of susceptible populations, pathogens with wide host ranges in multiple species can reach even isolated individuals. The intentional or unintentional release of engineered pathogens with high transmissibility, latency, and lethality might be capable of causing human extinction. While such an event seems unlikely today, the likelihood may increase as biotechnologies continue to improve at a rate rivaling Moore's Law.

#### \*\*\*Refugee crises divert Coast Guard resources---they gut mission effectiveness

Stock 1 – Margaret D. Stock, Associate Professor, Department of Social Sciences, United States Military Academy, West Point, New York and Lieutenant Colonel, Military Police Corps, United States Army Reserve. 2001, “National Security and Immigration Policy: Reclaiming Terms, Measuring Success, and Setting Priorities” http://www.aclu.org/files/fbimappingfoia/20111110/ACLURM002826.pdf

7 Fed. Reg. 68924 (Nov. 13, 2002) (“A surge in illegal migration by sea threatens national security by diverting valuable United States Coast Guard and other resources from counter-terrorism ...”); In re D-J-, 23 I & N Dec. 572 (A.G. 2003) (“[T]here is a substantial prospect that the release of such aliens .... [would] encourage future surges in illegal migration by sea ... diverting valuable Coast Guard and DOJ resources **from counterterrorism and** homeland security responsibilities.”)

#### Coast Guard capabilities are key to naval power projection

Decker 1 – Scott Decker, LT CMNDER USCG, Feb 2001, The coast guard is capable of conducting and leading expeditionary harbor defense/port security and Harbor approach defense operations, http://handle.dtic.mil/100.2/ADA389731

.. .From the Sea touches on this, identifying sealift as a key enabler for joint operations and identifying the potential for Coast Guard involvement. Protection of our sealift assets is vital to our success as "sea lines of communication carry more than 95 percent of the logistic support for forward-deployed forces.. .Although vessels are vulnerable throughout their voyage, that vulnerability is greatest in the transition area between "blue water" (deep oceans and seas) and "brown water" (coastal regions) and at [the] points of origin and destination."6 **This transition area is the Coast Guard's backyard: its units play there everyday.** As America elected to spend the Cold War peace-dividend at home, the Navy sought to increase efficiencies and maximize the use of declining defense funds by improving the multi-mission capabilities of its high-end combatants. As less capable ships are being decommissioned to save money, the Navy is losing the flexibility it professes is necessary for future success. In essence it is finding itself between the "rocks" of limited defense dollars and the uncharted "shoals" of asymmetric warfare. Fewer combatants, although highly capable, equate to less forward presence and a net loss when conflict ensues. "If you lose a multi-mission platform, the impact on your overall warfighting capability [is more significant] with the remainder of the force."7 Then CNO ADM Jay Johnson correctly identified the situation in late summer 1999 and recommended a way out: "the Navy must consider increasing the size of its fleet to further diminish the threat of an attack along a coast.. .Simply put, **numbers do matter**."8 While defense spending is likely to rise with the pro-defense Bush administration, it will likely not be enough to support both a significant increase in the number of combatants and the development of a theater missile defense system. The "rocks and shoals" will still exist. Admiral James Loy, the Coast Guard's current Commandant recently observed, "In the [Cold War] era of a 600-ship Navy, 40 or so Coast Guard cutters were a virtual afterthought. But today with regional instability and strife around the world and 116 surface combatants in the Navy, [our 41major] cutters along with several hundred coastal patrol boats take on a new significance."9 This statement demonstrates that **Coast Guard resources can help fulfill the low-end role.** The CINCs have identified these deficiencies as well and are seeking ways to fill the gaps. A 1992 research study on 21s1 century Coast Guard roles and missions asked them the following: "What specialized service could the CG perform for DOD in the next century, and is there a gap in DOD capabilities that the Coast Guard could fill?" The responses ranged from consolidating the Navy's naval control of the shipping mission into the MDZ [maritime defense zone] command structure to assuming responsibilities for "the low end of the high-low mix of ships." Additional responses addressed providing capabilities for which the Navy does not have sufficient resources, and presence in low threat areas.10 Seven years later, the Joint Interagency Task Force on Roles and Missions of the United States Coast Guard [hereafter referred to as' Interagency Task Force'], established by then-President Clinton to "provide advice and recommendations regarding the appropriate roles and missions for the United States Coast Guard through the year 2020,"11 validated this continuing need for Coast Guard involvement, and concluded, "The National Security Strategy and the conclusions of the Quadrennial Defense Review require forces capable of fighting and winning two nearly simultaneous Major Theater Wars. To effect that strategy, the war-fighting Commanders-in-Chief have incorporated and depend upon Coast Guard assets for their war plans."12 In summation, the CINCs are depending on Coast Guard forces—as key partners in the larger joint USN/USCG harbor defense/port security organization currently in place-to fulfill the vision in Forward...From the Sea that"... U.S. naval forces will assume critical roles in the protection of vital sealift along the strategic lines of approach to the theater of conflict, including the air- and sea-ports of debarkation."13 The Coast Guard is ready to respond: permitting the U.S. to project a "seamless" joint force, filling a critical role in protecting U.S power projection capabilities, and freeing up additional combatants for offensive use.

#### Naval power independently solves great power war

Conway et al. 7 – James T., General, U.S. Marine Corps, Gary Roughead, Admiral, U.S. Navy, Thad W. Allen, Admiral, U.S. Coast Guard, “A Cooperative Strategy for 21st Century Seapower,” October, http://www.navy.mil/maritime/MaritimeStrategy.pdf

No other disruption is as potentially disastrous to global stability as war among major powers. Maintenance and extension of this Nation’s comparative seapower advantage is a key component of deterring major power war. While war with another great power strikes many as improbable, the near-certainty of its ruinous effects demands that it be actively deterred using all elements of national power. The expeditionary character of maritime forces—our lethality, global reach, speed, endurance, ability to overcome barriers to access, and operational agility—provide the joint commander with a range of deterrent options. We will pursue an approach to deterrence that includes a credible and scalable ability to retaliate against aggressors conventionally, unconventionally, and with nuclear forces. Win our Nation’s wars. In times of war, our ability to impose local sea control, overcome challenges to access, force entry, and project and sustain power ashore, makes our maritime forces an indispensable element of the joint or combined force. This expeditionary advantage must be maintained because it provides joint and combined force commanders with freedom of maneuver. Reinforced by a robust sealift capability that can concentrate and sustain forces, sea control and power projection enable extended campaigns ashore.

#### Studies prove the effectiveness of US hegemony

Barnett 11 – Thomas P.M. Barnett is Former Senior Strategic Researcher and Professor in the Warfare Analysis & Research Department, Center for Naval Warfare Studies, U.S. Naval War College American military geostrategist and Chief Analyst at Wikistrat., worked as the Assistant for Strategic Futures in the Office of Force Transformation in the Department of Defense, March 7th, 2011, “The New Rules: Leadership Fatigue Puts U.S., and Globalization, at Crossroads,” http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/8099/the-new-rules-leadership-fatigue-puts-u-s-and-globalization-at-crossroads

It is worth first examining the larger picture: We live in a time of arguably the greatest structural change in the global order yet endured, with this historical moment's most amazing feature being its relative and absolute lack of mass violence. That is something to consider when Americans contemplate military intervention in Libya, because if we do take the step to prevent larger-scale killing by engaging in some killing of our own, we will not be adding to some fantastically imagined global death count stemming from the ongoing "megalomania" and "evil" of American "empire." We'll be engaging in the same sort of system-administering activity that has marked our stunningly successful stewardship of global order since World War II. Let me be more blunt: As the guardian of globalization, the U.S. military has been the greatest force for peace the world has ever known. Had America been removed from the global dynamics that governed the 20th century, the mass murder never would have ended. Indeed, it's entirely conceivable there would now be no identifiable human civilization left, once nuclear weapons entered the killing equation. But the world did not keep sliding down that path of perpetual war. Instead, America stepped up and changed everything by ushering in our now-perpetual great-power peace. We introduced the international liberal trade order known as **globalization** and played loyal Leviathan over its spread. What resulted was the collapse of empires, an explosion of **democracy,** the persistent spread of **human rights**, the liberation of women, the doubling of life expectancy, a roughly 10-fold increase in adjusted global GDP and a **profound** and persistent **reduction in** battle deaths from state-based **conflicts**. That is what American "hubris" actually delivered. Please remember that the next time some TV pundit sells you the image of "unbridled" American military power as the cause of global disorder instead of its cure. With self-deprecation bordering on self-loathing, we now imagine a post-American world that is anything but. Just watch who scatters and who steps up as the Facebook revolutions erupt across the Arab world. While we might imagine ourselves the status quo power, we remain the world's most vigorously revisionist force. ¶ As for the sheer "evil" that is our military-industrial complex, again, let's examine what the world looked like before that establishment reared its ugly head. The last great period of global structural change was the first half of the 20th century, a period that saw a death toll of about 100 million across two world wars. That comes to an average of 2 million deaths a year in a world of approximately 2 billion souls. Today, with far more comprehensive worldwide reporting, researchers report an average of less than 100,000 battle deaths annually in a world fast approaching 7 billion people. Though admittedly crude, these calculations suggest a 90 percent absolute drop and a 99 percent relative drop in deaths due to war. We are clearly headed for a world order characterized by multipolarity, something the American-birthed system was designed to both encourage and accommodate. But given how things turned out the last time we collectively faced such a fluid structure, we would do well to keep U.S. power, in all of its forms, deeply embedded in the geometry to come.

#### Perception of decline causes US lashout – triggers hegemonic wars

Goldstein 7 – Professor of Global Politics and International Relations @ University of Pennsylvania “Power transitions, institutions, and China's rise in East Asia: Theoretical expectations and evidence,” Journal of Strategic Studies, Volume 30, Issue 4 & 5 August 2007, pages 639 – 682

Two closely related, though distinct, theoretical arguments focus explicitly on the consequences for international politics of a shift in power between a dominant state and a rising power. In War and Change in World Politics, Robert Gilpin suggested that peace prevails when a dominant state’s capabilities enable it to ‘govern’ an international order that it has shaped. Over time, however, as economic and technological diffusion proceeds during eras of peace and development, other states are empowered. Moreover, the burdens of international governance drain and distract the reigning hegemon, and challengers eventually emerge who seek to rewrite the rules of governance. As the power advantage of the erstwhile hegemon ebbs, it may become desperate enough to resort to the ultima ratio of international politics, force**,** to forestall the increasingly urgent demands of a rising challenger. Or as the power of the challenger rises, it may be tempted to press its case with threats to use force. It is the rise and fall of the great powers that creates the circumstances under which major wars, what Gilpin labels ‘hegemonic wars’, break out.13 Gilpin’s argument logically encourages pessimism about the implications of a rising China. It leads to the expectation that international trade, investment, and technology transfer will result in a steady diffusion of American economic power, benefiting the rapidly developing states of the world, including China. As the US simultaneously scurries to put out the many brushfires that threaten its far-flung global interests (i.e., the classic problem of overextension), it will be unable to devote sufficient resources to maintain or restore its former advantage over emerging competitors like China. While the erosion of the once clear American advantage plays itself out, the US will find it ever more difficult to preserve the order in Asia that it created during its era of preponderance. The expectation is an increase in the likelihood for the use of force – either by a Chinese challenger able to field a stronger military in support of its demands for greater influence over international arrangements in Asia, or by a besieged American hegemon desperate to head off further decline. Among the trends that alarm those who would look at Asia through the lens of Gilpin’s theory are China’s expanding share of world trade and wealth (much of it resulting from the gains made possible by the international economic order a dominant US established); its acquisition of technology in key sectors that have both civilian and military applications (e.g., information, communications, and electronics linked with to forestall, and the challenger becomes increasingly determined to realize the transition to a new international order whose contours it will define. the ‘revolution in military affairs’); and an expanding military burden for the US (as it copes with the challenges of its global war on terrorism and especially its struggle in Iraq) that limits the resources it can devote to preserving its interests in East Asia.14 Although similar to Gilpin’s work insofar as it emphasizes the importance of shifts in the capabilities of a dominant state and a rising challenger, the power-transition theory A. F. K. Organski and Jacek Kugler present in The War Ledger focuses more closely on the allegedly dangerous phenomenon of ‘crossover’– the point at which a dissatisfied challenger is about to overtake the established leading state.15 In such cases, when the power gap narrows, the dominant state becomes increasingly desperate. Though suggesting why a rising China may ultimately present grave dangers for international peace when its capabilities make it a peer competitor of America, Organski and Kugler’s power-transition theory is less clear about the dangers while a potential challenger still lags far behind and faces a difficult struggle to catch up. This clarification is important in thinking about the theory’s relevance to interpreting China’s rise because a broad consensus prevails among analysts that Chinese military capabilities are at a minimum two decades from putting it in a league with the US in Asia.16 Their theory, then, points with alarm to trends in China’s growing wealth and power relative to the United States, but especially looks ahead to what it sees as the period of maximum danger – that time when a dissatisfied China could be in a position to overtake the US on dimensions believed crucial for assessing power. Reports beginning in the mid-1990s that offered extrapolations suggesting China’s growth would give it the world’s largest gross domestic product (GDP aggregate, not per capita) sometime in the first few decades of the twentieth century fed these sorts of concerns about a potentially dangerous challenge to American leadership in Asia.17 The huge gap between Chinese and American military capabilities (especially in terms of technological sophistication) has so far discouraged prediction of comparably disquieting trends on this dimension, but inklings of similar concerns may be reflected in occasionally alarmist reports about purchases of advanced Russian air and naval equipment, as well as concern that Chinese espionage may have undermined the American advantage in nuclear and missile technology, and speculation about the potential military purposes of China’s manned space program.18 Moreover, because a dominant state may react to the prospect of a crossover and believe that it is wiser to embrace the logic of preventive war and act early to delay a transition while the task is more manageable, Organski and Kugler’s power-transition theory also provides grounds for concern about the period prior to the possible crossover.19 pg. 647-650
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#### Russia economy low now---multiple alt causes

Businessweek 13 – Scott Rose AND\*\*\* Olga Tanas, January 31st, 2013, "Russian Economy Probably Slowed to Three-Year Low in 2012" [www.businessweek.com/news/2013-01-30/russian-economy-probably-slowed-to-three-year-low-in-2012](http://www.businessweek.com/news/2013-01-30/russian-economy-probably-slowed-to-three-year-low-in-2012)

Russia’s economy probably grew last year at the weakest pace since a contraction in 2009 and is set to slow further, casting doubt on President Vladimir Putin’s drive for an investment-led acceleration in output.¶ Gross domestic product expanded 3.6 percent in 2012, down from 4.3 percent the previous two years, according to the median of 18 estimates in a Bloomberg survey. The Economy Ministry estimated growth at 3.5 percent. The Federal Statistics Service in Moscow will report the data this week.¶ **The slowdown highlights the challenges facing the world’s largest energy exporter as** oil prices are forecast to stagnate **this year and** Europe’s stumbling economy saps demand **for Russian commodity exports**. The government began an open campaign this month to push the central bank to lower rates, a step the regulator is resisting because of concerns the economy is already growing near its potential.¶ “We need a government that is more proactive on the reform side,” Peter Westin, chief strategist at Aton Capital in Moscow, said by phone. “The central bank is doing a good job, but **the government is definitely behind the curve when it comes to what needs to be done to stimulate the economy.**”¶ Russian stocks lagged behind other emerging markets, with the MSCI Russia Index advancing 9.6 percent in 2012, trailing a 15 percent jump in the MSCI Emerging Markets Index. The Micex Index (INDEXCF) of 50 stocks was little changed, trading 0.1 percent lower at 1,542.73 at 2:32 p.m. The ruble-denominated gauge trades at 5.7 times projected earnings, making it the cheapest of 21 emerging markets tracked by Bloomberg.¶ ‘Critically Important’¶ Russia faces a “critically important” period over the next five years as the government targets “steady economic growth” of at least 5 percent a year, Prime Minister Dmitry Medvedev said at a government meeting in Moscow today. Speaking at the same event, Putin pointed to the economy’s “slowdown” over the last two quarters and said **high interest rates are affecting bank lending.**¶ **“**The main risks aren’t external, but domestic**,”** Medvedev said. “The potential of development in the context of a traditional export-oriented model has practically been exhausted.”¶ Economy Slumps¶ GDP probably expanded 2.4 percent in the final three months of last year compared with the same period a year earlier, according to the median of 17 estimates in a Bloomberg survey. Growth reached an estimated 2.2 percent, Deputy Economy Minister Andrei Klepach told reporters Jan. 29.¶ **The deceleration is likely to continue well into next year**, according to Evgeny Nadorshin, chief economist at AFK Sistema, a Russian investment company with assets ranging from telecommunications to oil.¶ “Russia’s economy is hitting the brakes, and the December data show growth slowing in the very important areas” of investment and consumer demand, Nadorshin said. “Economic growth is not only at its potential, but **the room to increase output is exhausted. We’re close to the point of overheating that we neared before the crisis.”**¶ ‘Achilles Heel’¶ Fixed-capital investment contracted in annual terms in December for the second time in four months, the Federal Statistics Service in Moscow said in a report last week. **Sluggish spending by companies to boost output has become the “Achilles heel” of the economy**, according to Klepach.¶ “**Interest rates for companies today are at a level that is really stifling investment,**” Economy Minister Andrei Belousov told reporters yesterday in Moscow.¶ The central bank raised borrowing costs in September, becoming the largest emerging market to do so last year. First Deputy Chairman Alexei Ulyukayev said this month he doesn’t see any potential gains from reducing interest rates.¶ The joblessness rate fell to 5.3 percent in December, putting it below the full employment rate of about 6 percent, according to Aton’s Westin. That means competition for workers may start to push up wages, stoking inflation that overshot the central bank’s 6 percent target last year.¶ The government is looking to investment as a source for growth amid signs that **household consumption, which accounts for about half the economy, is stumbling**. Real wages advanced at the slowest pace in more than three years in December, which may sap buying power.

#### Collapse of Russia oil/gas production inevitable---decreased Europe use and US shale revolution

Rapoza 10-3 – Kenneth Rapoza, writer for Forbes, October 3rd, 2012, "Is Russia Ready For Life After Oil?" www.forbes.com/sites/kenrapoza/2012/10/03/is-russia-ready-for-life-after-oil/

Earlier this year, as in April 2012, major oil producers had their worst month in a year. **Oil production is flat to declining** for companies like Rosneft and Lukoil. All told, for the roughly 10 companies drilling for oil and gas in Russia, production rose 0.9 percent on the year back in April. It’s not much better now.¶ Oil exports are in decline, as are gas exports to Europe. Oil production at traditional fields is in decline. Same with gas. New fields won’t make up for it with their average one to two percent growth rate, said Maxim Oreshkin, chief Russian economist at VTB Capital in Moscow.¶ “We clearly see that in the government,” said Andrey Belousov, Minister of Economic Development. ”**There is a deteriorating situation in Europe and that impacts natural gas sales for us**. In the not so distant future, we see natural gas playing a tiny role in Russia, and maybe even a negative one because of Europe.”¶ Moreover, the U.S. doesn’t need Russian natural gas anymore. We have our own. As the world also looks for sources of renewable energy and transport, such as electric cars, demand will stabilize. Russia needs to figure out what to do with itself before time runs out.¶ Last year, oil production in Russia reached 511.3 million tons, or 10.26 million barrels per day. It was the highest level since the collapse of the Soviet Union and the highest in the world together with Saudi Arabia. Russia’s declared goal in its oil policy is to maintain annual output at around 505 million tons over the next few years and increase it to 535 million tons by 2030.¶ However, despite the fact that proven Russian oil reserves are still vast, and that Russia probably has very large undiscovered deposits, it will be practically impossible to achieve this goal because of structural deficiencies in the market structure (taxation on revenue instead of profit).¶ A significant fall of Russian oil production is inevitable. The degree of the decline will depend on the actions the government takes in its fiscal policy and the investment climate in general.

#### No economy impact

Goodrich and Zeihan 9 [Lauren Goodrich, Stratfor's Director of Analysis and Senior Eurasia analyst, and Peter Zeihan, Vice President of Analysis at Stratfor, “The Financial Crisis and the Six Pillars of Russian Strength,” March 3 2009, <http://www.stratfor.com/weekly/20090302_financial_crisis_and_six_pillars_russian_strength>]

Thus, while Russia's financial sector may be getting torn apart, the state does not really count on that sector for domestic cohesion or stability, or for projecting power abroad. Russia knows it lacks a good track record financially, so it depends on -- and has shored up where it can -- six other pillars to maintain its (self-proclaimed) place as a major international player. The current financial crisis would crush the last five pillars for any other state, but in Russia, it has only served to strengthen these bases. Over the past few years, there was a certain window of opportunity for Russia to resurge while Washington was preoccupied with wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. This window has been kept open longer by the West's lack of worry over the Russian resurgence given the financial crisis. But others closer to the Russian border understand that Moscow has many tools more potent than finance with which to continue reasserting itself.

#### US sanctions mean no companies have tech—wrecks solvency

Benjamin-Alvadaro 10 (Jonathan, Report for the Cuban Research Institute, Florida International University, PhD, Professor of Political Science at University of Nebraska at Omaha, Director of the Intelligence Community Centers of Academic Excellence Program at UNO, Treasurer of the American Political Science Association, “Cuba’s Energy Future: Strategic Approaches to Cooperation”)

As long as the economic and trade restrictions imposed on the government of Cuba by the U.S. government continue, all companies, regardless of their technical competence, will have a very difficult time in monetizing any newly discovered hydrocarbon resources because they need access to the U.S. oil services and equipment market. Also Cuba urgently needs, but does not have, a complex oil-refining system able to process the probable large quantities of heavy crude oil found in Cuba’s offshore waters. Until Cuba develops its own heavy-oil-refining infrastructure, any newly found oil most likely will have to be exported. Its natural market is the United States, the largest importer of oil in the world—yet that market is closed to Cuba by the trade and commercial restrictions currently in place.

“The good news is we found oil; the bad news is we found oil” will be the likely announcement of any new oil discovery in the corporate headquarters of the oil companies doing business in Cuba. Repsol and Statoil–Norsk Hydro certainly have the necessary capacities and competencies described earlier to develop and produce any oil they find. Their challenge is how and where to commercialize the “black gold”—refine it and bring it to market. Some international oil companies are in Cuba for strictly economic and business reasons. Others acquire concessions in the expectations that U.S. policy will change before the end of their seven-year exploratory term, at which time they will be able to bring in a majority U.S. oil company as a partner. Others could be grandstanding on behalf of the Cuban government: putting a spotlight on Cuba’s oil and natural gas potential in order to influence United States special interest groups to lobby for lifting the economic and trade restrictions.

#### Companies will say no—don’t want to challenge the US

Benjamin-Alvadaro 10 (Jonathan, Report for the Cuban Research Institute, Florida International University, PhD, Professor of Political Science at University of Nebraska at Omaha, Director of the Intelligence Community Centers of Academic Excellence Program at UNO, Treasurer of the American Political Science Association, “Cuba’s Energy Future: Strategic Approaches to Cooperation”)

The pursuit of deepwater offshore deposits may not unfold as rapidly as the news releases suggest. Exploration in these areas has been limited in the past because the technology needed to explore and develop deepwater deposits was owned by international oil companies that were severely constrained by U.S. sanctions. Today, other companies, such as Petrobras and Norsk Hydro, have the technology, but they are still reluctant to challenge U.S. sanctions. In addition, under U.S. law, ships that visit Cuban ports are barred from U.S. ports for a period of six months. If this policy is applied to drill ships, as is most likely, it will impose higher costs on oil companies. Drill ships can earn several hundred thousand dollars a day, so each day used to move them from one location to another is costly. By denying immediate access to the U.S. Gulf, the policy forces companies to move their drilling vessels to more distant locations driving up the cost of using them in Cuba. The absence of markets for services, equipment, and supplies in Cuba itself adds to the difficulty and cost of mounting a serious exploration and production effort, because oil firms must plan and bring all equipment and other necessary materials to Cuba rather than rely on local suppliers. Jonathan Benjamin-Alvarado estimates that the absence of these suppliers adds up to 30 percent to a project’s cost.17

#### Russia exploration fails

Benjamin-Alvadaro 10 (Jonathan, Report for the Cuban Research Institute, Florida International University, PhD, Professor of Political Science at University of Nebraska at Omaha, Director of the Intelligence Community Centers of Academic Excellence Program at UNO, Treasurer of the American Political Science Association, “Cuba’s Energy Future: Strategic Approaches to Cooperation”)

In 2008 Brazil’s Petrobras was awarded an exploration and production concession for block 37, just north of Cuba’s current coastal production area. The project called for an initial budget of $8 million for seismic work during 2009. This marks Petrobras’s return from its major Cuban exploration setback in 2001,when its first exploration effort resulted in a dry well.36 In 2008, a consortium of state- and privately owned Russian oil companies signed a letter of intent with Cupet in order to identify investment opportunities in Cuba’s offshore deep waters in the Gulf of Mexico.37 The financial and technical ability of these Russian companies to invest in and develop Cuba’s undiscovered hydrocarbon resources in its northwest EEZ sector seems a bit uncertain at a time when Russia’s own domestic oil and natural gas production is declining. Furthermore, the Russian hydrocarbon sector seems to be generally cash-strapped. In 2009, China finalized a $10 billion loan to the Russian oil pipeline monopoly Transneft and another $15 billion loan to the state-run major oil enterprise Rosneft, in exchange for 300 million tons of Russian oil to be delivered over twenty years. Gazprom, Russia’s largest company, is also strapped for cash and burdened with a debt of $49.5 billion. 38 There has been questionable management of the Russian oil and gas firms in terms of their ability to sustain positive growth and return on investment in light of the country’s considerable oil and gas resources. Russia holds the world’s largest natural gas reserves, the second-largest coal reserves, and the eighth-largest oil reserves. Russia is also the world’s largest exporter of natural gas, the second-largest oil exporter, and the third-largest energy consumer.

#### Putin means a high risk of brinkmanship

Golts 2/13 (Alexander, deputy editor of the online newspaper Yezhednevny Zhurnal, “Why Putin Emulates North Korea,” http://www.themoscowtimes.com/opinion/article/why-putin-emulates-north-korea/475717.html#ixzz2NpUMlLGT)

Washington's nuclear-reduction proposal is clearly a huge gift to Russia on silver platter, yet it is all but certain that the Kremlin will ignore it. The problem is that Russian leaders see nuclear weapons as more than just a security guarantee through the threat of mutually assured destruction. The Kremlin and military brass realize that Russia's huge nuclear arsenal is the only remaining symbol of its superpower status, a trump card that they will protect at all costs. This is the main reason Moscow is opposed to cutting any further than the New START limits. Trying to convince Russia to reduce its nonstrategic nuclear weapons will be an even harder sell.

Thus, Moscow's approach is remarkably similar to that of Pyongyang. North Korean leader Kim Jong-un, who represents the third generation of the country's despots, has condemned his people to famine so that the country can become a nuclear power. Just like the Kremlin leadership, Pyongyang officials see nuclear weapons as a genie from Aladdin's lamp that is capable of magically solving all their problems. North Korean officials believe that the world will be obliged to feed and clothe North Koreans and cater to the leader's every whim in the hope that North Korea doesn't do something foolish with its nuclear weapons. In other words, North Korea employs nuclear blackmail on the world, yet by and large this trick has worked for Pyongyang.

Up until now, the same approach has never worked for Russia because nobody believed that Putin is as reckless as the North Korean leadership. But over the past year, the Duma has adopted irrational, provocative anti-U.S. laws under Putin's sponsorship. This raises two serious questions: Is Putin trying to emulate Kim Jong-un and his father, Kim Jong-il, and how far is Putin willing to take his reckless policy?

### 2AC Bioterror

#### Risk of bioterror is high---extinction

Matheny 7 Jason is a research associate at Oxford University’s Future of Humanity Institute. He previously worked at the Center for Biosecurity and holds an MBA from Duke University. “Reducing the Risk of Human Extinction,” Risk Analysis Vol. 27, No. 5, http://users.physics.harvard.edu/~wilson/pmpmta/Mahoney\_extinction.pdf

Of current extinction risks, the most severe may be bioterrorism.The knowledge needed to engineer a virus is modest compared to that needed to build a nuclear weapon; the necessary equipment and materials are increasingly accessible and because biological agents are self-replicating, a weapon can have an exponential effect on a population (Warrick, 2006; Williams, 2006). 5 Current U.S. biodefense efforts are funded at $5 billion per year to develop and stockpile new drugs and vaccines, monitor biological agents and emerging diseases, and strengthen the capacities of local health systems to respond to pandemics (Lam, Franco, & Shuler, 2006).

#### Empirics and best studies prove

Wohlforth 8 William, Daniel Webster Professor of Government in the Dartmouth College Department of Government, October, World Politics, “Unipolarity, Status Competition, and Great Power War,” www.­polisci.­wisc.­edu/­Uploads/­Documents/­IRC/­Wohlforth (2009)­.­pdf)

Despite increasingly compelling findings concerning the importance of status seeking in human behavior, research on its connection to war waned some three decades ago.38 Yet empirical studies of the relationship between both systemic and dyadic capabilities distributions and war have continued to cumulate. If the relationships implied by the status theory run afoul of well-established patterns or general historical findings, then there is little reason to continue investigating them. **The clearest empirical implication** of the theory **is that** status **competition is unlikely to cause great power military conflict in unipolar systems**. If status competition is an important contributory cause of great power war, then, ceteris paribus, unipolar systems should be markedly less war-prone than bipolar or multipolar systems. And this appears to be the case. As Daniel Geller notes in a review of the empirical literature: "**The only polar structure that appears to influence conflict probability is unipolarity**."39 In addition, a larger number of studies at the dyadic level support the related expectation that narrow capabilities gaps and ambiguous or unstable capabilities hierarchies increase the probability of war.40 These studies are based entirely on post-sixteenth-century European history, and most are limited to the post-1815 period covered by the standard data sets. Though the systems coded as unipolar, near-unipolar, and hegemonic are all marked by a high concentration of capabilities in a single state, these studies operationalize unipolarity in a variety of ways, often very differently from the definition adopted here. An ongoing collaborative project looking at ancient interstate systems over the course of two thousand years suggests that historical systems that come closest to the definition of unipolarity used here exhibit precisely the behavioral properties implied by the theory. 41 As David C. Kang's research shows, the East Asian system between 1300 and 1900 was an unusually stratified unipolar structure, with an economic and militarily dominant China interacting with a small number of geographically proximate, clearly weaker East Asian states.42 Status politics existed, but actors were channeled by elaborate cultural understandings and interstate practices into clearly recognized ranks. Warfare was exceedingly rare, and the major outbreaks occurred precisely when the theory would predict: when China's capabilities waned, reducing the clarity of the underlying material hierarchy and increasing status dissonance for lesser powers. Much more research is needed, but initial exploration of other arguably unipolar systems-for example, Rome, Assyria, the Amarna system-appears consistent with the hypothesis.43 Status Competition and Causal Mechanisms Both theory and evidence demonstrate convincingly that competition for status is a driver of human behavior, and social identity theory and related literatures suggest the conditions under which it might come to the fore in great power relations. Both the systemic and dyadic findings presented in large-N studies are broadly consistent with the theory, but they are also consistent with power transition and other rationalist theories of hegemonic war.

#### Heg sustainable---alliances, military gap and institutions

Beckley 11 Michael Beckley, Fellow at Harvard University's Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs and a Fellow at the Miller Center at the University of Virginia, September 2011, “The Unipolar Era: Why American Power Persists and China’s Rise Is Limited,” <http://michaelbeckleydotcom.files.wordpress.com/2011/09/beckley_writing-sample6.pdf>

The second assumption is that U.S. hegemony is highly consolidated. In other words, American power is entrenched to the point that other countries accept it as a fact of life they must deal with rather than a condition they can hope to change. The U.S. enjoys this status because it is the world’s first extant hegemon – it did not overturn an existing international order, rather, the existing order collapsed around it, leaving the U.S. alone at the apex of a global system of alliances and international institutions.21 As a result, the U.S. has become the “greatest superpower ever” with a more complete and dominant portfolio of economic, military, and institutional capabilities than past hegemons ever had.22

In terms of economic capabilities, the U.S. combines size with a high level of development and a low level of dependency, not only possessing the largest GDP in the world, but also the highest per-­‐capita GDP and the lowest ratio of trade to GDP among the major powers.23 The military gap between the U.S. and others is even starker. U.S. military spending constitutes nearly 50 percent of global military spending and is eight times greater than that of the number-­‐two power (China). Even before the invasions of Iraq and Afghanistan, the U.S. had over 200,000 soldiers, sailors, and airmen deployed in more than a hundred countries. As a result, the U.S. is the only country with global power projection capability. The U.S. also plays a leading role in all major international institutions. In the United Nations (UN), the U.S. is one of five permanent members of the Security Council and thus holds veto rights over all matters that come before the council. The U.S. can also ignore the Security Council, as it did in waging war in Kosovo in 1999 and Iraq in 2003, because it is capable of unilaterally deploying decisive military power. The U.S. is also the dominant power in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). The NATO Supreme Allied Commander Europe is always an American officer, and NATO allies depend on the U.S. for security much more than the other way around. Moreover, American contributions to the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank are sufficient to give the U.S. veto power over any major policy change, and U.S. market power makes it the most influential member of the World Trade Organization (WTO).

These dominant capabilities translate into influence. Most obviously, they provide the U.S. with an array of tools with which to reward and punish other states. The United States can provide, restrict, or deny access to the American market, technology, foreign aid, political support in international organizations, bribes, and White House visits. These tit-­‐for-­‐tat bargains with individual states, however, are not as consequential as America’s power over aspects of the international system. Hegemony is not just preponderant power, it is “structural power.”24 It is the power to set agendas, to shape the normative frameworks within which states relate to each other, and to change the range of choices open to others without putting pressure directly on them. It is, at once, less visible but more profound than brute force.25

In past bipolar and multipolar eras, U.S. structural power was constrained by the twin risks of “abandonment” and “entrapment.”26 Because other great powers were around to provide vital services and protection for weaker states, the United States had to go to great lengths to attract and retain allies. During the Cold War, for example, medium powers, such as Egypt and India, played the superpowers off against each other, extracting concessions from one by threatening to abandon it and align with the other.27 Even nominal American allies frequently pursued strategies that ran counter to U.S. interests: France defected from NATO’s military command and attempted to undermine the Bretton Woods system by purchasing large amounts of gold from the U.S. treasury; Germany and Japan resisted U.S. demands to devalue their currencies; and many states rebuffed American requests for military and financial assistance in the war in Vietnam. Some weaker states also entrapped the U.S., dragging it into conflicts, such as the wars in Korea and Vietnam, it might have avoided if not for the need to enlist allies in the struggle against another major power.

Traditional theories assume that hegemons inevitably get bogged down and suffer from strategic overextension.28 But I argue this scenario does not apply in a world in which hegemony is backed by a unipolar distribution of power. Today, with no superpower rival, the U.S. has less need for staunch allies and is therefore more insulated from abandonment and entrapment.29 Allied threats to abandon America are not as consequential as they once were because the U.S. can provide for its own security and cobble together “coalitions of the willing” to accomplish many of its aims. This reduced dependency also means the U.S. is less likely to be dragged into conflicts by its alliance commitments.30 Weaker states, on the other hand, face heightened risks of abandonment and entrapment by the United States. With no alternative superpower patron to turn to, weaker states face a choice of participating in the American-­‐led order or risking exclusion from the international community. In order to maintain good relations with the United States, weaker states may follow it into conflicts that do not directly serve their own national interests.31 In short, the U.S. now has more leverage vis-­‐à-­‐vis weaker states than before. As a result, it can demand a higher price for its support and privilege its own interests with greater impunity.

This is not to say that the U.S. can completely shirk its alliance commitments and force weaker states to bear the costs of maintaining international order. Indeed, America’s influence stems in part from its globe-­‐girdling network of alliances and institutions, a system that is extremely expensive to maintain and requires sustained U.S. engagement. Rather, I argue that the United States is both “system-­‐maker and privilege-­‐taker” – it pays a significant share of system-­‐maintenance costs, but takes a disproportionate share of the benefits.32

For example, the U.S. bears major military burdens. 33 It formally guarantees the security of over 50 countries, has fought twice as many wars after the Cold War as during it, and spends 25 percent more (in real dollars) on defense today than it did in 1968 at the height of combat in Vietnam.34 On the other hand, by maintaining robust military capabilities, the U.S. is able to employ “force without war,” pressuring other countries into concessions by simply shifting U.S. military units around or putting them on alert.35 Military dominance also allows the U.S. to run a protection racket, garnering influence through the provision of security. As Joseph Nye explains:

Even if the direct use of force were banned among a group of countries, military force would still play an important political role. For example, the American military role in deterring threats to allies, or of assuring access to a crucial resource such as oil in the Persian Gulf, means that the provision of protective force can be used in bargaining situations. Sometimes the linkage may be direct; more often it is a factor not mentioned openly but present in the back of statesmen’s minds.36

### 2AC Restrictions T

#### We meet---the Eastern Gap is restricted from oil production now

MMS 6 – Minerals Management Service, now known as the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, February 2006, “Report to Congress: Comprehensive Inventory of U.S. OCS Oil and Natural Gas Resources,” http://www.boem.gov/uploadedFiles/BOEM/Oil\_and\_Gas\_Energy\_Program/Resource\_Evaluation/Resource\_Assessment/2006-FinalInventoryReportDeliveredToCongress.pdf

2. Restrictions on Access to the OCS for Oil and Gas Exploration and Development: International Boundary Issues ¶ The United States needs international boundary agreements with neighboring countries—with Cuba and Mexico for the Eastern Gap, or with Canada for portions of the eastern Beaufort Sea and southern Gulf of Alaska— before any oil and gas leasing and development can occur in these areas. ¶ In order to gain access to any disputed areas, the United States would have to enter into discussions with Mexico and Cuba, or Canada, to forge a continental shelf boundary agreement similar to what was done by Mexico and the United States for the Western Gap area in the GOM. The process would involve the Department of the Interior (DOI) and the Department of State (DOS), and the U.S. Congress would have to ratify any agreement. ¶ Eastern Gap: The Eastern Gap is an area of the GOM OCS that is bordered by, but beyond, the Exclusive Economic Zones of Mexico, Cuba and the United States. The northern portion of the Eastern Gap is included in the Central and Eastern GOM OCS Planning Areas. Unlike the situation with the Western Gap between Mexico and the United States, the three nations adjacent to the Eastern Gap have not agreed on a continental shelf boundary in this area. In the absence of such a boundary agreement, the MMS has not offered any blocks in the northern portion of the Eastern Gap, not even those located in the Central GOM Planning Area, which is offered for areawide leasing annually. In fact, this area was excluded from the multi-sale Call for Information and Nominations for GOM sales in the 5-Year Program for 2002-2007, making it unavailable for any sales in the current program. Industry interest in this area is expressed through their bidding activity on blocks within ten miles of the Eastern Gap. Resources in the Eastern Gap are expected to reflect the geologic plays that extend into this area. Data for the Eastern Gap is minimal and additional information is needed to evaluate the potential.

#### The Eastern Gap is a unique area with joint claims by the U.S. and Cuba---it’s restricted now

Nick Miroff 9, Washington Post, 5/16/9, “Cuba's Undersea Oil Could Help Thaw Trade With U.S.,” http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/05/15/AR2009051503416\_pf.html

"Until trade barriers are removed, Chevron is unable to do business in Cuba," said Chevron spokesman Kurt Glaubitz. "Companies like us would have to see a change in U.S. policy before we evaluate whether there's interest."

Robert Dodge, a spokesman for the American Petroleum Institute, said his organization is not lobbying for access to Cuba, and Texas congressional representatives with ties to the oil industry said they are focused on opening U.S. territorial waters to drilling. But observers of U.S.-Cuba relations say American companies haven't been sitting on their hands and remain in conversations with Cuban counterparts.

At the 2006 Mexico energy conference, U.S. oil companies "all had plans to move forward as soon as the U.S. government gives them the go-ahead," said Benjamin-Alvarado, who attended the conference.

If that go-ahead is granted, American companies would be entering a drilling contest crowded with foreign competitors. Several global firms, including Repsol (Spain), Petrobras (Brazil) and StatoilHydro (Norway) are exploring in the Gulf of Mexico through agreements with the Castro government, and state companies from Malaysia, India, Vietnam and Venezuela have also signed deals.

Sherritt International, a Canadian company, has had oil derricks pumping heavy crude along Cuba's north coast for more than a decade, extracting about 55,000 barrels a day, mostly for Cuba's domestic energy consumption.

But most of Cuba's undiscovered reserves are thought to be in two offshore areas. The oil and gas that make up the USGS estimate lie in an area known as the North Cuba Basin, a short distance off the island's northwest coast.

The larger deposit is thought to be in a section of the gulf known as the Eastern Gap, to which Mexico and the United States also have a claim. Cuban officials believe there are 10 billion to 15 billion barrels of crude stored there under more than 5,000 feet of seawater and 20,000 feet of rock-- costly to extract but accessible with existing technology. By comparison, U.S. proven reserves total 21 billion barrels.

#### No exclusive sovereignty in the Eastern Gap---the U.S.-Mexico agreement for the Western Gap proves enabling joint ventures reduces restrictions

Daniel Noll 12, Graduate Research Assistant at The University of Texas at Austin - Energy Institute, 2/26/12, “Uncharted Waters,” <http://webberenergyblog.wordpress.com/2012/02/26/uncharted-waters/>

On Monday, an article in the New York Times noted a recent agreement between U.S. and Mexico to cooperate on deepwater oil and gas exploration in the Gulf of Mexico. What this really amounts to is an agreement between our two countries on how to partition part of the Gulf of Mexico that lies outside of the exclusive economic zone of either country. Figure 1 shows two holes in the ownership of the sea where no country has a sovereign claim—a claim over the sea and the resources underneath [2]. These legal “doughnut holes”, each about 7,000 square miles, have until now been ignored because there was no pressing interest in fighting over how the ownership rights of these [3]. In fact an agreement of the territorial dispute over the Western gap had already been reached in 2010 (amounting to a 60/40 split in Mexico’s favor), and this week’s announcement relates to an early expiration of the moratorium on oil exploration and production within that area. As such, both U.S. companies and PEMEX (Mexico’s national oil company) will have the opportunity to develop deepwater wells within the area where large hydrocarbon deposits are suspected in the Perdido Fold Belt [4]. What’s at stake in the Western gap? According to PEMEX, about 2,500 billion barrels of oil equivalent (bboe) [5].

I took two things away from this. First, we should be concerned about PEMEX’s technical ability to operate the complex task of drilling at well below 6, 7 or 10 thousand feet of water. As figure 2 shows, the technical challenges are immense [6]. Mexico has much less experience than U.S. companies in operating these wells, having only drilled about a dozen to date compared to thousands drilled by U.S. companies. Second, we should expect an announcement soon about what will be done with the Eastern Gap that obfuscates the sovereign boundary between Mexico, the United States and Cuba. I would speculate that these negotiations are already underway, and that there is significant political benefit to announcing another breakthrough in domestic drilling before November’s election. But make no mistake: ultradeepwater exploration will bring significant risk. We should ask ourselves if keeping gas below $4 is a good thing at all.

#### The embargo is a restriction on oil production

Edward J. Markey 11, Ranking Member, House Committee on Natural Resources, 11/2/11, “NORTH AMERICAN OFFSHORE ENERGY: MEXICO AND CANADA BOUNDARY TREATIES AND NEW DRILLING BY CUBA AND BAHAMAS,” http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CHRG-112hhrg71116/html/CHRG-112hhrg71116.htm

But who are the companies that are planning to drill in the waters off of Cuba, a mere 80 miles from Florida? They are the state-owned oil companies of Malaysia, Vietnam, Venezuela, and China.¶ Because of a relic of the cold war, the Cuban embargo, American oil companies cannot drill in this area that could contain as much as 5 billion barrels of oil. ¶ The Majority has been so focused on a make-believe moratorium on drilling in the Gulf, that they've apparently missed the actual decades-long moratorium on American companies drilling off of Cuba that is the result of the embargo.

#### We meet---it’s FUNCTIONALLY a total ban---no companies can drill with US tech---that’s Benjamin

#### Counter-interp---restrictions are conditions on action

Plummer 29 J., Court Justice, MAX ZLOZOWER, Respondent, v. SAM LINDENBAUM et al., Appellants Civ. No. 3724COURT OF APPEAL OF CALIFORNIA, THIRD APPELLATE DISTRICT100 Cal. App. 766; 281 P. 102; 1929 Cal. App. LEXIS 404September 26, 1929, Decided, lexis

The word "restriction," when used in connection with the grant of interest in real property, is construed as being the legal equivalent of "condition." Either term may be used to denote a limitation upon the full and unqualified enjoyment of the right or estate granted. The words "terms" and "conditions" are often used synonymously when relating to legal rights. "Conditions and restrictions" are that which limits or modifies the existence or character of something; a restriction or qualification. It is a restriction or limitation modifying or destroying the original act with which it is connected, or defeating, terminating or enlarging an estate granted; something which defeats or qualifies an estate; a modus or quality annexed by him that hath an estate, or interest or right to the same, whereby an estate may be either defeated, enlarged, or created upon an uncertain event; a quality annexed to land whereby an estate may be defeated; a qualification or restriction annexed to a deed or device, by virtue of which an estate is made to vest, to be enlarged or defeated upon the happening or not happening of a particular event, or the performance or nonperformance of a particular act.

### Rels CP

#### Oil is the only thing that generates support for cooperation with Cuba

Moise 06 (Hilary, Research associate for the Council on Hemispheric Affairs, “U.S. Embargo against Cuba under Growing Siege,” http://www.coha.org/cuba-embargo-under-growing-siege/)

The reportedly steadfast intention of the president to veto any legislation containing language weakening the embargo against Cuba may prove no match for the allure of oil riches; much like the environmental integrity of the Alaskan wilderness, the ideological hegemony behind the Cuba embargo may be sacrificed to feed America’s oil hunger. History has shown that human-rights records and democratic failings have not in any way prevented favorable economic relations—the U.S. buys oil from Saudi Arabia and Russia—and Cuba’s substantial oil reserves may be the perfect carrot to entice the U.S. government away from its automatic condemnation of the Cuban government’s actions.

### 2AC Courts CP

#### Perm do both – shields politics

Perine 8 (Katherine, Staff – CQ Politics, “Congress Unlikely to Try to Counter Supreme Court Detainee Ruling”, 6-12, http://www.cqpolitics.com/wmspage.cfm?docID=news-000002896528&cpage=2)

Thursday’s decision, from a Supreme Court dominated by Republican appointees, gives Democrats further cover against GOP sniping. “This is something that the court has decided, and very often the court gives political cover to Congress,” said Ross K. Baker, a Rutgers Universitiy political science professor. “You can simply point to a Supreme Court decision and say, ‘The devil made me do it.’ ”

#### Court oil decisions are unpredictable---wreck solvency

Neese 5 Angela – Candidate for Juris Doctor, University of Colorado School of Law, 2005; B.S.B.A., University of Denver, “THE BATTLE BETWEEN THE COLORADO OIL AND GAS CONSERVATION COMMISSION AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS: A CALL FOR A NEW AND COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH”, 2005, 76 U. Colo. L. Rev. 561, Lexis

These two leading Colorado Supreme Court decisions, Bowen/Edwards and Voss, were decided over a decade ago, and yet these cases "leave many questions unanswered." n185 For example, the court did not adequately define "operational conflict," n186 and "it left to speculation the type of local regulation which will offend the principles articulated in those cases." n187 What these Colorado Supreme Court decisions did, in effect, was create a regime in which each occurrence of stringent local regulation of the oil and gas industry must be examined by the courts on a case-by-case basis. Because the court held that state preemption of local regulation is not total, "each provision of a local oil and gas regulation must be examined to determine whether it presents a conflict." n188 For the past decade, the Colorado Supreme Court has declined to hear any further cases on the issue of state preemption of local government oil and gas regulation, thereby foreclosing any possibility of providing more direct guidelines for the COGCC and local governments. As a result, this case-by-case system of preemption analysis has led to more than a decade worth of costly litigation, with no end in sight. The case-by-case regime leads to a high degree of unpredictability and puts natural gas developers and local governments constantly at odds. n189 The litigation that often results, when the industry and the local governments are forced to look to the courts to determine which regulations are controlling, is costly to the industry (and thus to natural gas consumers) and to local governments (and thus to the taxpayers). n190 The lack of predictability, the high costs of litigation, and the resulting delays in production are proof that the Colorado Supreme Court has done the state a disservice by not providing a workable framework on the issue of state preemption of oil and gas regulation. n191 Bowen/Edwards is considered the determinative case as to preemption, yet both sides cite this case in their briefs and point to the same language as suggestive that they will prevail. n192 The lack of clear guidelines under the current Colorado [\*585] case law results in a number of unanswered questions that will likely lead to future legal battles.

#### Perm do the CP – plan says USFG and not enforcing a restriction removes it even if it remains on the books

Berger 1 - Justice for the Supreme Court of Delaware - Opinion, INDUSTRIAL RENTALS, INC., ISAAC BUDOVITCH and FLORENCE BUDOVITCH, Appellants Below, Appellants, v. NEW CASTLE COUNTY BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT and NEW CASTLE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF LAND USE, Appellees Below, Appellees. No. 233, 2000SUPREME COURT OF DELAWARE776 A.2d 528; 2001 Del. LEXIS 300April 10, 2001, Submitted July 17, 2001, Decided lexis

We disagree. HN2 Statutes must be read as a whole and all the words must be given effect. 3 HN3 The word "restriction" means "a limitation (esp. in a deed) placed on the use or enjoyment of property." 4 HN4 If a deed restriction has been satisfied, and no longer limits the use or enjoyment of the property, then it no longer is a deed restriction -- even though the paper on which it was written remains. [\*\*6] Thus, the phrase "projects containing deed restrictions requiring phasing…," in Section 11.130(A)(7) means presently existing deed restrictions. As of June 1988, the Acierno/Marta Declaration contained no remaining deed restrictions requiring phasing to coincide with improvements to the transportation system. As a result, the Acierno/Marta projects should not have been included in the scope of the Budovitches' TIS.

#### Courts link to politics

Mr. Mirengoff 10 is an attorney in Washington, D.C. A.B., Dartmouth College J.D., Stanford Law School, June 23 The Federalist Society Online Debate Series, http://www.fed-soc.org/debates/dbtid.41/default.asp

The other thing I found interesting was the degree to which Democrats used the hearings to attack the "Roberts Court." I don't recall either party going this much on the offensive in this respect during the last three sets of hearings. What explains this development? My view is that liberal Democratic politicians (and members of their base) think they lost the argument during the last three confirmation battles. John Roberts and Samuel Alito "played" well, and Sonia Sotomayor sounded like a conservative. The resulting frustration probably induced the Democrats to be more aggressive in general and, in particular, to try to discredit Roberts and Alito by claiming they are not the jurists they appeared to be when they made such a good impression on the public. I'm pretty sure the strategy didn't work. First, as I said, these hearings seem not to have attracted much attention. Second, Senate Democrats are unpopular right now, so their attacks on members of a more popular institution are not likely to resonate. Third, those who watched until the bitter end saw Ed Whelan, Robert Alt and others persuasively counter the alleged examples of "judicial activism" by the Roberts Court relied upon by the Democrats -- e.g., the Ledbetter case, which the Democrats continue grossly to mischaracterize. There's a chance that the Democrats' latest **partisan innovation** will **come back to haunt them**. Justice Sotomayor and soon-to-be Justice Kagan are on record having articulated a **traditional, fairly minimalist view of the role of judges**. If a liberal majority were to emerge -- or even **if the liberals prevail in a few high profile cases** -- the charge of "deceptive testimony" could be turned against them. And if Barack **Obama** is still president at that time, he likely **will receive** some of **the blame**.

#### Cuba is key to Obama’s cred on engagement with non-democratic regimes

Dickerson 10 – Lieutenant Colonel Sergio M. Dickerson, 2010, "United States Security Strategy Towards Cuba," Strategy Research Project, [www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf&AD=ADA518053](http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf&AD=ADA518053)

**Conclusion**¶ Today, 20 years have passed since the fall of the Berlin Wall – it’s time to chip away at the diplomatic wall that still remains between U.S. and Cuba. As we seek a new foreign policy with Cuba it is imperative that we take into consideration that distrust will characterize negotiations with the Cuban government. On the other hand, consider that loosening or lifting the embargo could also be mutually beneficial. Cuba’s need and America’s surplus capability to provide goods and services could be profitable and eventually addictive to Cuba. Under these conditions, diplomacy has a better chance to flourish.¶ If the Cuban model succeeds **President** Obama will be seen as a true leader for multilateralism**.** **Success in Cuba could afford the international momentum and** credibility to solve other seemingly “wicked problems” like the Middle East and Kashmir. President Obama could leverage this international reputation with other rogue nations like Iran and North Korea **who might associate their plight with Cuba. 35 The U.S. could begin to lead again and** reverse its perceived decline **in the greater global order bringing true peace for years to come.**

#### Solves war

Charles Kupchan 11, professor of international affairs at Georgetown University and Whitney Shepardson Senior Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, June 2011, “The false promise of unipolarity: constraints on the exercise of American power,” Cambridge Review of International Affairs, Vol. 24, No. 2, p. 165-173

These examples aside, Brooks and Wohlforth also fail to address another important pathway through which norms and rules constrain the exercise of US power. They focus exclusively on the costs to the United States of its own failure to comply with the institutions and rules that Washington took the lead in crafting after the close of World War II. But in the aftermath of the global ﬁnancial crisis that began in 2008 and amid the ongoing ascent of China, India, Brazil, and other rising states, change in ordering norms may well be driven by the preferences and policies of emerging powers, not by those of the United States. Moreover, the impressive economic performance and political staying power of regimes that practice non-democratic brands of capitalism—such as China, Russia, and Saudi Arabia—call into question the durability of the normative order erected during America’s watch. Well before emerging powers catch up with America’s material resources, they will be challenging the normative commitment to open markets and liberal democracy that has deﬁned the Western order.¶ The substantive gap between the norms of the Western order and those that inform the domestic and foreign policies of rising powers has not gone unnoticed (Kupchan and Mount 2009). Nonetheless, many scholars have offered an illusory response: that the United States and its democratic allies should dedicate the twilight hours of their primacy to universalizing Western norms. According to G John Ikenberry (2008, 37, 25), ‘the United States’ global position may be weakening, but the international system the United States leads can remain the dominant order of the twenty-ﬁrst century’. The West should ‘sink the roots of this order as deeply as possible’ to ensure that the world continues to play by its rules even as its material preponderance wanes. Such conﬁdence in the universality of the Western order is, however, based on wishful thinking about the likely trajectory of ascending powers, which throughout history have sought to adjust the prevailing order in ways that advantage their own interests. Presuming that rising states will readily embrace Western norms is not only unrealistic, but also dangerous, promising to alienate emerging powers that will be pivotal to global stability in the years ahead (Gat 2007).¶ Brooks and Wohlforth do not address this issue—presumably because they believe that US preponderance is so durable that they need not concern themselves with the normative orientations of rising powers. But facts on the ground suggest otherwise. China is, as of 2010, the world’s second largest economy, holds massive amounts of US debt, and is strengthening its economic and strategic presence in many quarters of the globe; the G-8 has given way to the G-20; the prime minister of democratic India has called for ‘new global “rules of the game”’ and the ‘reform and revitalization’ of international institutions (Mahbubane 2008, 235); the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank have increased the voting weight of developing countries; and the United Nations Security Council is coming under growing pressure to enlarge the voices of emerging powers. All of these developments come at the expense of the inﬂuence and normative preferences of the United States and its Western allies. By the numbers, Brooks and Wohlforth are correct that unipolarity persists. But rising powers are already challenging the pecking order and guiding norms of the international system. If the next international system is to be characterized by norm-governed order rather than competitive anarchy, the West will have to make room for the competing visions of rising powers. A new order will have to be based on great-power consensus and toleration of political diversity rather than the normative hegemony of the West.

### 2AC Immigration

#### EPA is proposing new emission standards TODAY --- it’s Obama’s biggest environmental initiative in the 2nd term and will cause a massive fight

Reuters, 3/29/13, “EPA to propose rules slashing unhealthy emissions from cars”, <http://uk.reuters.com/article/2013/03/29/us-usa-epa-gasoline-idUKBRE92R14C20130329>

(Reuters) - The Obama administration will propose on Friday long-awaited rules to slash smog-forming emissions from gasoline that have been linked to lung and heart ailments, health groups and an environmental regulator source said on Thursday.

The Environmental Protection Agency will propose the so-called Tier 3 rules that will require refiners to reduce the sulfur content of gasoline to 10 parts per million by 2017 from the current standard of 30 ppm, an agency source said on condition of anonymity.

Reducing sulfur in fuel helps cars burn cleaner and reduces emissions of tiny particles, volatile organic compounds, and nitrogen oxides that can cause lung and heart illnesses

Oil industry groups, Republicans, and some conservative Democrats have opposed the rules saying they would make gasoline more expensive for consumers still struggling in the recovering economy.

Refinery groups say the rules could cost that industry $14 billion to $15 billion a year. In addition, the American Petroleum Institute, the main energy industry lobbying group, has said the rules could increase refinery operating costs by up to 9 cents per gallon.

But health groups say the rules will cut billions in doctors' bills. A study released by Navigant Consulting last year said the rules could cut healthcare costs for lung and heart diseases by $5 billion to $6 billion a year by 2020 and by double that amount by 2030.

"This is the first big environmental initiative in the Obama administration's second term," said Frank O'Donnell, president of Clean Air Watch, who was briefed on Thursday. "It is the most effective tool available to reduce smog."

#### Obama’s spending capital on gun control --- incites GOP and Democratic opposition --- and it’s the top of the agenda

WaPo 3-28, “Obama, pushing gun-control agenda, says ‘shame on us if we’ve forgotten’ Newtown,” http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/obama-pushing-gun-control-agenda-says-shame-on-us-if-weve-forgotten-newtown/2013/03/28/e2060b54-97be-11e2-b68f-dc5c4b47e519\_story.html

President Obama delivered a forceful and emotional plea to lawmakers Thursday to pass his gun-control agenda, saying “shame on us if we’ve forgotten” the elementary school massacre in Newtown, Conn.¶ Frustrated by the slow pace of progress on Capitol Hill, Obama urged passage of universal background checks and other gun-control measures while flanked by mothers of shooting victims in the East Room of the White House. He also repeatedly invoked the Dec. 14 shooting at Sandy Hook Elementary School as a cause for action.¶ “Less than 100 days ago that happened,” Obama said. “And the entire country was shocked. And the entire country pledged we would do something about it and this time would be different. Shame on us if we’ve forgotten. I haven’t forgotten those kids. Shame on us if we’ve forgotten.”¶ Obama — who spoke alongside Vice President Biden, the administration’s point person on guns — is attempting to pressure wavering lawmakers in advance of an expected Senate vote next month on his guns agenda. He urged Americans to “raise your voices and make yourselves unmistakably heard” so that lawmakers “don’t get squishy.”¶ “We need everybody to remember how we felt 100 days ago and make sure that what we said at that time wasn’t just a bunch of platitudes, that we meant it,” Obama said.¶ But the fate of gun legislation on Capitol Hill is murky amid GOP opposition and wavering among conservative Democrats. Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.), widely viewed as a 2016 presidential contender, announced Thursday that he was joining three other Senate GOP conservatives — Ted Cruz (Texas), Mike Lee (Utah) and Rand Paul (Ky.) — in threatening to filibuster Democratic gun-control legislation.

#### Obama’s focused on deficits --- facing partisan backlash and gridlock --- makes compromise impossible

Reuters 3-28, “Obama makes impassioned plea for gun control legislation,” http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/03/28/us-usa-obama-agenda-idUSBRE92R11J20130328

Obama's attempt to negotiate a "grand bargain" aimed at reducing the U.S. budget deficit is facing old-fashioned political gridlock and could collapse into a partisan sinkhole.¶ In a fresh round of schmoozing to discuss this and other legislative items, Obama will dine with a dozen Republican senators on April 10, the second such meeting he will have held in his attempts to engage his political opponents.¶ TAXING THE RICH¶ Lawmakers are still bruised from a fight over $85 billion in automatic spending cuts that went into effect a month ago despite Obama's attempt to head them off.¶ Obama still wants what Republicans refused to give him in that budget fight, an increase in taxes on the wealthy by eliminating some deductions and loopholes. Republicans instead want to cut spending.¶ The White House struck a pessimistic note this week on the prospects for success given the Republican leadership's refusal to agree to raise more tax revenues.¶ "As long as Republicans are saying we're not going to ask the wealthiest and well-connected to pay a single dime to reduce our deficit, then it is hard to imagine that we're going to reach a compromise," White House deputy press secretary Josh Earnest said Wednesday.

#### Oil companies massively support the plan and lobby for it---determines Congressional sentiment

Sadowski 11 – Richard Sadowski 11, J.D., Hofstra University School of Law, Fall 2011, “IN THIS ISSUE: NATURAL RESOURCE CONFLICT: CUBAN OFFSHORE DRILLING: PREPARATION AND PREVENTION WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE UNITED STATES' EMBARGO,” Sustainable Development Law & Policy, 12 Sustainable Dev. L. & Pol'y 37, p. lexis

A U.S. Geological Survey estimates that Cuba's offshore oil fields hold at least four and a half billion barrels of recoverable oil and ten trillion cubic feet of natural gas. n29 Cupet, the state-owned Cuban energy company, insists that actual reserves are double that of the U.S. estimate. n30 One estimate indicates that Cuba could be producing 525,000 barrels of oil per day. n31 Given this vast resource, Cuba has already leased offshore oil exploration blocks to operators from Spain, Norway, and India. n32 Offshore oil discoveries in Cuba are placing increasing pressure for the United States to end the embargo. First, U.S. energy companies are eager to compete for access to Cuban oil reserves. n33 [\*38] Secondly, fears of a Cuban oil spill are argued to warrant U.S. investment and technology. n34 Finally, the concern over Cuban offshore drilling renews cries that the embargo is largely a failure and harms human rights.¶ ECONOMICS: U.S. COMPANIES WANT IN¶ For U.S. companies, the embargo creates concern that they will lose out on an opportunity to develop a nearby resource. n35 Oil companies have a long history of utilizing political pressure for self-serving purposes. n36 American politicians, ever fearful of high energy costs, are especially susceptible to oil-lobby pressures. n37 This dynamic was exemplified in 2008, when then-Vice President Dick Cheney told the board of directors of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce that "oil is being drilled right now sixty miles off the coast of Florida. But we're not doing it, the Chinese are, in cooperation with the Cuban government. Even the communists have figured out that a good answer to high prices is more supply" n38¶ This pressure for U.S. investment in oil is exacerbated by America's expected increase in consumption rates. n39 Oil company stocks are valued in large part on access to reserves. n40 Thus, more leases, including those in Cuban waters, equal higher stock valuation. n41 "The last thing that American energy companies want is to be trapped on the sidelines by sanctions while European, Canadian and Latin American rivals are free to develop new oil resources on the doorstep of the United States." n42

#### Perception that the U.S. is losing out determines debates

Curry L. Hagerty 11, Specialist in Energy and Natural Resources Policy, Congressional Research Service, 5/6/11, “Outer Continental Shelf Moratoria on Oil and Gas Development,” http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R41132.pdf

Global economic factors play a major role in deliberations about OCS drilling activity. At the end of FY2008, annual moratoria expired amid global economic turmoil and calls for greater stability in the national economy.17 From this perspective, economic arguments—specifically claims that other coastal countries are allowing greater access to offshore resources and that the United States should not fall behind in the international race to develop offshore resources—influenced moratorium policy. **Economic events are a significant part of how moratoria are considered as a tool for OCS policy development.**

#### The Secretary of the Treasury does the plan

Huddleston 9 (Vicki Huddleston, deputy assistant secretary of defense for Africa at the Department of Defense, visiting fellow at Brookings and co-director of the Brookings Project on U.S. Policy Toward a Cuba in Transition from 2007 to 2009, Carlos Pascual, U.S. ambassador to Mexico, He was vice president and director of Foreign Policy at Brookings from 2006 to 2009, “Use "Smart Power" to Help Cubans,” http://www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/2009/02/24-cuba-huddleston)

Executive authority¶ Again and again we hear that the embargo can't be changed because the Helms-Burton law codified it. Nothing could be further from the truth. Whether you agree or disagree with the current commercial embargo, the president can effectively dismantle it by using his executive authority. Helms-Burton codified the embargo regulation, but those regulations provide that ``all transactions are prohibited except as specifically authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury by means of regulations, rulings, instructions, and licenses.''¶ This means that the president's power remains unfettered. He can instruct the secretary to extend, revise or modify embargo regulations. The proof of this statement is that President Bill Clinton issued new regulations for expanded travel and remittances in order to help individuals and grow civil society.¶ Obama will have to modify Office of Foreign Assets Control regulations to fulfill his campaign promise to increase Cuban-American travel and remittances. If he wants to reproduce the more open conditions in Cuba that led to the ''Cuban Spring'' of 2002 and Oswaldo Payá's Varela Project, he could reinstate people-to-people and educational travel. By a simple rule change, he could also speed the entry of life-saving medicines from Cuba, rather than subjecting them to delays from cumbersome OFAC licensing procedures.¶ Since 1992, U.S. law -- the Cuban Democracy Act -- has sought to expand access to ideas, knowledge and information by licensing telecommunications goods and services. Yet, in practice, regulations are so strictly interpreted that the United States in effect is imposing a communications embargo on Cuba. To lift it, the president can authorize a general license for the donation and sale of radios, televisions and computers. In addition, rather than helping Cuban state security keep Yoani Sánchez and others off the Internet, the Obama administration could make Internet technology readily available so that any barriers to communications would be clearly the fault of the Cuban government, and not ours.¶ Environmental concerns rate high with the Obama administration. So it might open bilateral discussions, exchange information and license the provision of scientific equipment to improve the health of the ocean and success of commercial fisheries.¶ The United States Geological Survey estimates that the North Cuba Basin holds 5.5 billion barrels of oil and 9.8 trillion cubic feet of natural gas reserves. If the president wishes, he can instruct the secretary of the treasury to license U.S. companies to explore, exploit and transport these resources that we and the region so badly need.¶ Failed policy¶ After a half-century of failed policy, there is enormous support in the Cuban-American community for initiatives that will improve the well being and independence of the Cuban people. What they didn't know -- but know now -- is that there is no reason they can't reach out to the Cuban people and still retain the embargo as symbol of their concern about the Cuban government's failure to live up to international norms of human rights, democracy and transparency.

#### Winner’s win---prefer recent and qualified evidence

Hirsh 2/7 Michael, chief correspondent for National Journal; citing Ornstein, a political scientist and scholar at the American Enterprise Institute and Bensel, gov’t prof at Cornell, "There's No Such Thing as Political Capital", 2013, [www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207](http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207)

But the abrupt emergence of the immigration and gun-control issues illustrates how suddenly shifts in mood can occur and how political interests can align in new ways just as suddenly. Indeed, the pseudo-concept of political capital masks a larger truth about Washington that is kindergarten simple: You just don’t know what you can do until you try. Or as Ornstein himself once wrote years ago, “Winning wins.” In theory, and in practice, depending on Obama’s handling of any particular issue, even in a polarized time, he could still deliver on a lot of his second-term goals, depending on his skill and the breaks. Unforeseen catalysts can appear, like Newtown. Epiphanies can dawn, such as when many Republican Party leaders suddenly woke up in panic to the huge disparity in the Hispanic vote.¶ Some political scientists who study the elusive calculus of how to pass legislation and run successful presidencies say that political capital is, at best, an empty concept, and that almost nothing in the academic literature successfully quantifies or even defines it. “It can refer to a very abstract thing, like a president’s popularity, but there’s no mechanism there. That makes it kind of useless,” says Richard Bensel, a government professor at Cornell University. Even Ornstein concedes that the calculus is far more complex than the term suggests. Winning on one issue often changes the calculation for the next issue; there is never any known amount of capital. “The idea here is, if an issue comes up where the conventional wisdom is that president is not going to get what he wants, and he gets it, then each time that happens, it changes the calculus of the other actors” Ornstein says. “If they think he’s going to win, they may change positions to get on the winning side. It’s a bandwagon effect.”

#### Obama PC fails now---action on OCS drilling’s a key olive branch that generates GOP support for other priorities like immigration

CSM 1-20 – Christian Science Monitor, 1/20/13, “Obama’s second term: Can he work with Congress? (+video),” http://www.csmonitor.com/layout/set/print/USA/DC-Decoder/2013/0120/Obama-s-second-term-Can-he-work-with-Congress-video

“The president has been criticized by many people for his inability or unwillingness to spend a lot of time stroking members of Congress,” says Ross Baker, a congressional historian at Rutgers University who is writing a book on bipartisanship in the US Senate. “I think a lot of this is based upon the widely-accepted theory [that the] power of a presidency is the power to persuade – which is perfectly plausible, and it was certainly plausible in the 1950s.... The problem is, there are no persuadables" today. ¶ But by focusing on issues of common ground with the GOP, Washington could generate some bipartisan successes in the next four years. ¶ Immigration and Energy¶ For one, the president could team up with Republican moderates and much of the party’s leadership on immigration reform. ¶ “We believe that immigration reform is different in that it has a past, present, and future of bipartisan support,” said Ali Noorani, executive director of the National Immigration Forum. “What we’ve seen over the last two years is conservatives, moderates, and liberals want this president and this Congress to act, and that’s different from any other issue.” ¶ And the president could perhaps turn down the bellicosity on the Hill by working with some of his loudest critics (though risking the ire of environmentalists in his political base) in one area that the deeply-red right and the president could agree: energy policy. ¶ “We were encouraged by President Obama’s 2012 campaign comments supporting an all-of-the-above agenda on energy, and his statements outlining support for oil and natural gas,” said Jack Gerard, president of the American Petroleum Institute, the oil and gas industry’s powerful trade association, in his annual State of American Energy address in Washington earlier this month. ¶ But Republicans rage about a disconnect between what the president and members of his administration say they favor and what Republicans say is foot-dragging in building the Keystone XL pipeline, exporting natural gas, or freeing up more offshore areas for energy exploration. If the president were to get behind any of these initiatives he’d likely have plenty of GOP support – but that remains a large “if.”

#### No resource wars

Tetrais 12—Senior Research Fellow at the Fondation pour la Recherche Stratgique (FRS). Past positions include: Director, Civilian Affairs Committee, NATO Assembly (1990-1993); European affairs desk officer, Ministry of Defense (1993-1995); Visiting Fellow, the Rand Corporation (1995-1996); Special Assistant to the Director of Strategic Affairs, Ministry of Defense (1996-2001).(Bruno, The Demise of Ares, csis.org/files/publication/twq12SummerTertrais.pdf)

The Unconvincing Case for ‘‘New Wars’’ ¶ Is the demise of war reversible? In recent years, the metaphor of a new ‘‘Dark Age’’ or ‘‘Middle Ages’’ has flourished. 57 The rise of political Islam, Western policies in the Middle East, the fast development of emerging countries, population growth, and climate change have led to fears of ‘‘civilization,’’ ‘‘resource,’’ and ‘‘environmental’’ wars. We have heard the New Middle Age theme before. In 1973, Italian writer Roberto Vacca famously suggested that mankind was about to enter an era of famine, nuclear war, and civilizational collapse. U.S. economist Robert Heilbroner made the same suggestion one year later. And in 1977, the great Australian political scientist Hedley Bull also heralded such an age. 58 But the case for ‘‘new wars’’ remains as flimsy as it was in the 1970s.¶ Admittedly, there is a stronger role of religion in civil conflicts. The proportion of internal wars with a religious dimension was about 25 percent between 1940 and 1960, but 43 percent in the first years of the 21st century. 59 This may be an effect of the demise of traditional territorial conflict, but as seen above, this has not increased the number or frequency of wars at the global level. Over the past decade, neither Western governments nor Arab/Muslim countries have fallen into the trap of the clash of civilizations into which Osama bin Laden wanted to plunge them. And ‘‘ancestral hatreds’’ are a reductionist and unsatisfactory approach to explaining collective violence. Professor Yahya Sadowski concluded his analysis of post-Cold War crises and wars, The Myth of Global Chaos, by stating, ‘‘most of the conflicts around the world are not rooted in thousands of years of historythey are new and can be concluded as quickly as they started.’’ 60¶ Future resource wars are unlikely. There are fewer and fewer conquest wars. Between the Westphalia peace and the end of World War II, nearly half of conflicts were fought over territory. Since the end of the Cold War, it has been less than 30 percent. 61 The invasion of Kuwaita nationwide bank robberymay go down in history as being the last great resource war. The U.S.-led intervention of 1991 was partly driven by the need to maintain the free flow of oil, but not by the temptation to capture it. (Nor was the 2003 war against Iraq motivated by oil.) As for the current tensions between the two Sudans over oil, they are the remnants of a civil war and an offshoot of a botched secession process, not a desire to control new resources.¶ China’s and India’s energy needs are sometimes seen with apprehension: in light of growing oil and gas scarcity, is there not a risk of military clashes over the control of such resources? This seemingly consensual idea rests on two fallacies. One is that there is such a thing as oil and gas scarcity, a notion challenged by many energy experts. 62 As prices rise, previously untapped reserves and non-conventional hydrocarbons become economically attractive. The other is that spilling blood is a rational way to access resources. As shown by the work of historians and political scientists such as Quincy Wright, the economic rationale for war has always been overstated. And because of globalization, it has become cheaper to buy than to steal. We no longer live in the world of 1941, when fear of lacking oil and raw materials was a key motivation for Japan’s decision to go to war. In an era of liberalizing trade, many natural resources are fungible goods. (Here, Beijing behaves as any other actor: 90 percent of the oil its companies produce outside of China goes to the global market, not to the domestic one.) 63 There may be clashes or conflicts in regions in maritime resource-rich areas such as the South China and East China seas or the Mediterranean, but they will be driven by nationalist passions, not the desperate hunger for hydrocarbons.
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### Russia

#### Russian nuclear materials are secure

Matthews and Nemtsova 11 [Owen Matthews, Newsweek and The Daily Beast’s bureau chief in Moscow and Istanbul, and Anna Nemtsova, a correspondent for Newsweek and The Daily Beast based in Moscow; “A New Nuclear Scare Rocks Eastern Europe,” June 30 2011, http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2011/06/30/uranium-smuggling-arrests-in-moldova-revive-security-debate.html]

At the same time, Russian nuclear specialists have been quick to pour cold water both on suggestions that the material was in fact HEU and on claims by Moldovan police that the material may ultimately be traceable to Russia. For one, the €20 million price tag quoted by the smugglers is way too low for real HEU, says Sergey Novikov, spokesman for Russia’s nuclear-energy corporation, Rosatom. Moreover, Rosatom claims that security in Russia’s nuclear installations is now so tight that “not even low-grade uranium has appeared on the black market” in more than a decade. Novikov says, “This Moldovan story is grandmother’s fairy tales.”

Experts in the U.S. agree that Russia has come a long way from the scary days of the early 1990s, when nuclear scientists went unpaid for months and guards at nuclear facilities left their posts to go foraging in the forests for food. Declassified documents from 1994 released earlier this month paint a disturbing picture of post-Soviet Russia, a place where “no system of nuclear accounting existed” and stolen nuclear materials began showing up on the black market in Leningrad, Istanbul, and Munich.

Since then, in large part thanks to billions in assistance from the U.S. government, Russia seems to have cleaned up its act. Harvard’s Matthew Bunn produced a landmark report last year that gave Moscow high marks for nuclear security. A revived Russian economy “has largely eliminated the 1990s-era desperation that created unique incentives and opportunities for nuclear theft,” Bunn wrote. And the “strengthened central control and the renewed strength of the FSB, the successor to the KGB, undoubtedly also contribute to deterring attempts at nuclear theft.” He concluded, “Overall, the risk of nuclear theft in Russia has been reduced to a fraction of what it was a decade ago.”

### 1AR XT---UQ---Oil Shortage

#### Collapse of Russia oil/gas production inevitable---decreased Europe use and US shale revolution

Rapoza 10-3 – Kenneth Rapoza, writer for Forbes, October 3rd, 2012, "Is Russia Ready For Life After Oil?" www.forbes.com/sites/kenrapoza/2012/10/03/is-russia-ready-for-life-after-oil/

Earlier this year, as in April 2012, major oil producers had their worst month in a year. **Oil production is flat to declining** for companies like Rosneft and Lukoil. All told, for the roughly 10 companies drilling for oil and gas in Russia, production rose 0.9 percent on the year back in April. It’s not much better now.¶ Oil exports are in decline, as are gas exports to Europe. Oil production at traditional fields is in decline. Same with gas. New fields won’t make up for it with their average one to two percent growth rate, said Maxim Oreshkin, chief Russian economist at VTB Capital in Moscow.¶ “We clearly see that in the government,” said Andrey Belousov, Minister of Economic Development. ”**There is a deteriorating situation in Europe and that impacts natural gas sales for us**. In the not so distant future, we see natural gas playing a tiny role in Russia, and maybe even a negative one because of Europe.”¶ Moreover, the U.S. doesn’t need Russian natural gas anymore. We have our own. As the world also looks for sources of renewable energy and transport, such as electric cars, demand will stabilize. Russia needs to figure out what to do with itself before time runs out.¶ Last year, oil production in Russia reached 511.3 million tons, or 10.26 million barrels per day. It was the highest level since the collapse of the Soviet Union and the highest in the world together with Saudi Arabia. Russia’s declared goal in its oil policy is to maintain annual output at around 505 million tons over the next few years and increase it to 535 million tons by 2030.¶ However, despite the fact that proven Russian oil reserves are still vast, and that Russia probably has very large undiscovered deposits, it will be practically impossible to achieve this goal because of structural deficiencies in the market structure (taxation on revenue instead of profit).¶ A significant fall of Russian oil production is inevitable. The degree of the decline will depend on the actions the government takes in its fiscal policy and the investment climate in general.

### court

#### He’s politicized the court --- means liberal rulings cause GOP backlash

James R. **Copland 9** Copland is the Director of the Center for Legal Policy at the Manhattan Institute where his work focuses on litigation reform, “Why Politicized Judges Spark Rancorous Confirmations,” July 15 http://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/miarticle.htm?id=5077

No one following this process seriously doubts its outcome. As Sen. Lindsey Graham (R-SC) noted, President Obama’s pick for the Supreme Court, Appeals Court Judge Sonia Sotomayor, will be confirmed unless she has “a complete meltdown.” But notwithstanding the near-certainty that the theatrical confirmation hearings are irrelevant to the Senate’s ultimate vote, the process opens a public window onto a very real **conflict over the proper role of the courts** and the rule of law. These disagreements are hardly new: The judiciary’s power to overturn congressional statutes as unconstitutional is itself far from clear in the plain text of the Constitution, and the Supreme Court’s decision to this effect in the seminal 1803 case Marbury v. Madison was anything but uncontroversial. In the last century, President Franklin D. Roosevelt flirted with a constitutional crisis when he threatened to “pack” the Supreme Court with new justices after the Court rejected various elements of his New Deal on constitutional grounds. The early twentieth-century critiques of judicial overreach thus came from the Left, who only turned away from their democratic-populist message in the civil rights era. This history helps to expose the opening statements of some Senate Democrats, including Franken, which caricatured conservative critiques of “judicial activism.” The senators’ arguments run essentially as follows: Republican-appointed justices have proven as likely, or more likely, to overturn the “will of the people” as expressed through laws enacted by Congress; thus, “activism” is merely in the eye of the beholder. This argument only makes sense if one defines judicial activism as the “counter-majoritarian difficulty” in overturning the majority will, an implicit critique of the power of judicial review itself. But while some of the liberal philosopher-kings of the legal academy have wrestled mightily with the counter-majoritarianism inherent in judicial review, this has never been the concern of serious conservatives. Instead, the conservative critique of judicial activism is rooted in concern for the rule of law, i.e., the application of known principles to resolve cases, without arbitrary discretion. Written constitutionalism with judicial review necessarily implies that the courts police the political branches, but such policing should flow from the written text; when courts instead venture into “penumbras” and “emanations,” they turn themselves into but another political branch and undermine their legitimacy and the rule of law itself. Deconstructing the rule of law has been the major project of leftists in the legal academy over the last century. The legal realists rejected the notion of objectivity in judging and purposely sought to de-legitimatize judicial constraints on Progressiveand New Deal-era government expansion. Later, various scholars under the “critical legal studies” umbrella specifically embraced raceand gender-conscious interpretations of the law. When President Obama advocates “empathy” in judging and Judge Sotomayor flirts with race and gender as acceptable drivers of judicial outcomes, they **echo these leftist academic movements** and thus understandably **provoke conservative reaction**. No one questions that legal ambiguities abound, and mainline conservatives differ over the proper decision rules for resolving such cases, but tipping the scales of justice for a particular party in litigation is antithetical to the rule of law as traditionally understood. In deconstructing the rule of law, however, the Left has openly embraced the notion that judging is merely an **extension of the political process**. It should hardly be surprising, then, that the judicial confirmation process has devolved into little more than **politically charged theater.**

### ptx

#### The Hill 3/29

Obama also warned that the United States risked losing jobs and commerce to nations with superior infrastructure if Congress failed to act.¶ “What are we waiting for? There's work to be done, there's workers that are ready to do it,” Obama said. “Let's prove to the world that there's no better place to be than the United States of America.”¶ Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) said in January that he favored infrastructural improvements but questioned how they would be funded.¶ “It's easy to go out there and be Santa Claus and talk about all the things you want to give away, but at some point somebody has to pay the bill,” Boehner said.

#### FUNDING Key issue

Ehl 3/24 http://www.transportationissuesdaily.com/will-congress-enact-senates-proposed-100-million-for-transportation-in-2014/

Unfortunately for transportation interests, it is very unlikely the entire $100 billion will make it into the final 2014 funding bill. It’s possible that parts of it could sneak into a negotiated bill. The House budget bill is starkly different, and House Republicans will strongly oppose the $100 million stimulus proposal. The two budgets will almost certainly not be reconciled through traditional Senate-House negotiations. A 2014 spending bill could come from White House-Congress negotiations to raise the debt limit.

#### They’re key to the agenda

Dan Froomkin 11 is the Senior Washington Correspondent for the Huffington Post "How The Oil Lobby Greases Washington's Wheels" 4/6 www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/04/06/how-the-oil-lobby-greases\_n\_845720.html?page=4

Clout in Washington isn't about winning legislative battles -- it's about making sure that they never happen at all. The oil and gas industry has that kind of clout.¶ Despite astronomical profits during what have been lean years for most everyone else, the oil and gas industry continues to benefit from massive, multi-billion dollar taxpayer subsidies. Opinion polling shows the American public overwhelmingly wants those subsidies eliminated. Meanwhile, both parties are hunting feverishly for ways to reduce the deficit.¶ But when President Obama called on Congress to eliminate about $4 billion a year in tax breaks for Big Oil earlier this year, the response on the Hill was little more than a knowing chuckle. Even Obama's closest congressional allies don't think the president’s proposal has a shot.¶ "I would be surprised if it got a great deal of traction," Senator Jeff Bingaman (D-N.M.), chairman of the Senate energy committee, told reporters at the National Press Club a few days after Obama first announced his plan.¶ Rep. Earl Blumenauer (D-Ore.), co-author of a House bill that closely resembles Obama's proposal, nevertheless acknowledges that it has slim chances of passing. "It will be a challenge to get anything through the House that includes any tax increase for anyone under any circumstance," he told The Huffington Post.¶ The list goes on: "It's not on my radar," said Frank Maisano, a spokesman for Bracewell Giuliani, a lobbying firm with several oil and gas industry clients. "It's old news and it's never going to happen in this Congress. It couldn't even happen in the last Congress."¶ Indeed, the oil and gas industry's stranglehold on Congress is so firm that even when the Democrats controlled both houses, repeal of the subsidies didn't stand a chance. Obama proposed cutting them in his previous two budgets as well, but the Senate -- where Republicans and consistently pro-oil Louisiana Democrat Mary Landrieu had more than enough votes to block any legislation -- never even took a stab at it.¶ Now that the House is controlled by the GOP, Obama's proposal is deader than an oil-soaked pelican. Over the last decade in particular, the Republican Party's anti-tax policies and pro-drilling campaign rhetoric have become nearly indistinguishable from those of Big Oil.¶ "Obama's been proposing to get rid of these subsidies since his first budget in February 2009," said Tyson Slocum, director of the energy program for the consumer watchdog group Public Citizen. "The obstacle has been the petroleum industry. The American Petroleum Institute has dug in their heels and is fighting tooth and nail to retain these subsidies."¶ The American Petroleum Institute (API) is the industry's enormously powerful lobbying and trade association.¶ "API is very focused on making sure that we have a voice in policy debates," said Martin Durbin, the organization's executive vice president for government affairs. "Certainly I hope we're having some role in the debate here."¶ Is he pleased at the industry's success in heading off this particular debate? "I feel that we are successfully getting the point across, successfully educating policy-makers about the importance of our industry throughout the economy," he said.¶ Even before Obama's 2011 State of the Union address, API president Jack Gerard used his "State of American Energy" speech to cast the repeal attempt as a tax increase and a job-killer. "The way I see it, our policy-makers are at a crossroads," Gerard said. "They face two choices: One leads us forward and promotes jobs, investments, revenue and growth -- or one that takes us backward, threatening the progress we've made and closing the door on future opportunities."¶ Gerard was speaking to a receptive audience. As Time noted, "Republican Fred Upton, the new chairman of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, was in the front row of the audience for Gerard's speech." Upton did not return calls for comment.¶ A PAMPERED INDUSTRY¶ In January, Obama previewed his 2012 budget proposal during his State of the Union address. "I'm asking Congress to eliminate the billions in taxpayer dollars we currently give to oil companies," he said. "I don't know if you've noticed, but they're doing just fine on their own."¶ The line got a laugh, and then Obama pointed out the trade-offs of giving public support to a powerful private interest: "Instead of subsidizing yesterday's energy, let's invest in tomorrow's." he said.¶ With the actual budget proposal came more details: a list of tax breaks that, if eliminated, would generate $43.6 billion of additional revenue over the next 10 years. Two of the biggest breaks date back nearly a century, to a time when a young, untested industry needed incentives to drill.¶ The API, after adding in the cost of some other proposed measures (including reinstating Superfund taxes and repealing two accounting gimmicks that would affect other industries as well), concluded that Obama's FY 2012 proposed budget could cost the oil and gas industry $90 billion over the next decade.¶ The loss of subsidies would affect the industry's bottom lines, but would hardly, as Rep. Joe Barton (R-Tex), recently suggested, start driving companies out of business.¶ That's because Obama was right; the oil companies are doing just fine. The big five -- BP, Chevron, ConocoPhillips, ExxonMobil and Shell -- made a combined total profit of nearly $1 trillion over the past decade, with ExxonMobil clearing $31 billion in profits this past year alone.¶ And it's hardly the case that the oil industry needs added incentives to drill. Former oilman George W. Bush made that point as clearly as anyone when he leveled with members of the American Society of Newspaper Editors in a 2005 address: "I will tell you with $55 [a barrel] oil we don't need incentives to oil and gas companies to explore," he said. "There are plenty of incentives."¶ Slocum, of Public Citizen, concurs: "With prices around $100 a barrel, it is asinine to suggest that $4 to $6 billion a year collectively is driving decisions about whether or not to pursue extraction opportunities in the U.S.," he said. "It is market prices that are driving investment decisions."¶ While the oil industry warns that repealing the subsidies -- in addition to costing jobs -- would lead to higher gas prices, that too is hardly evident. Fuel costs largely reflect the price of oil, and that price has little to do with how much it costs to produce it. According to a U.S. Energy Information Administration survey, between 2007 and 2009, major U.S.-based oil companies spent an average of $29.31 to produce a barrel of oil. About one third of that amount went for extraction and taxes, and two thirds for exploration and development -- precisely why those companies are making such a killing when prices are $100 a barrel or more.¶ Rather than production costs, the price of oil is set by the global market, and is affected by multiple factors. Those can include financial speculation and geopolitical fears that lately have been causing wild price swings. The repeal of a few billion dollars in subsidies isn't enough to make more than a small ripple in an approximately $3 trillion-a-year global market.¶ Blumenauer argues that subsidies aren't appropriate for any well-established industry. Instead, he says, they should be used to support developing ones. "What's happened over the years, as the oil industry matured, as the giants consolidated into global players, and as the price of oil has been on a pretty steady upward trajectory -- with some hiccups along the way -- is that there ceased to be any rationale for providing these tax subsidies other than they were in the code and they benefited some of these companies."¶ By contrast, he points out: "The rationale for providing tax subsidies for emerging technologies and energy sources now makes perfect sense for solar, wind, and geothermal -- where helping them come to scale would help provide a better balance to our energy choices."¶ Oil and gas subsidies don't appear to wash with the general public, either. In a February NBC/Wall Street Journal poll that proffered suggestions for things that might be cut or eliminated as a way to reduce the current federal budget deficit, "eliminating tax credits for the oil and gas industries" was considered acceptable by a whopping 74 percent of Americans. Nearly 50 percent called it "totally acceptable." The only policy proposals that were more popular were raising taxes on the rich, eliminating earmarks, and canceling unnecessary weapons systems.¶ The API says it has gotten very different signals from people.. Durbin said API's own polls show otherwise. "If you ask people, 'Should we take away unfair advantages to Big Oil,' then of course they'll say yes," he said. "If you ask a straight question, as we do... you get a much different answer." API's poll question asked "Do you support or oppose increased taxes on America's oil and natural gas industry?"¶ ENERGY GIANTS ANTE UP¶ With so much public opposition, why do subsidies remain? You might as well ask why there is no carbon tax, or why there was no significant reform legislation passed after the BP oil spill.¶ The answer is that one of the many things the industry can do with its fat pocketbook is hire a veritable army of sharp lobbyists and back them up with big wads of cash in the form of campaign donations and spending. The end result is that the industry has a remarkable ability to get its way on Capitol Hill.¶ According to the Center for Responsive Politics' website, the oil and gas industry has spent more than $1 billion on lobbying since 1998, including a jaw-dropping $147 million just last year.¶ For comparison's sake, $147 million is about equivalent to the total budget of 100 congressional offices. That's more than the $103 million spent in 2010 by the financial service industry, another potent lobbying force -- but considerably less than the $240 million spent by the pharmaceutical industry. Among major industries, Opensecrets.org ranked Big Oil fifth in terms of lobbying dollars spent, behind only Big Pharma, electric utilities, business associations and insurance.¶ The oil and gas industry used its $147 million to employ 788 individual lobbyists in 2010 -- some 500 (or almost two thirds) of whom, according to Opensecrets.org, are former federal employees who came through the revolving door particularly well versed in the ways of government.¶ All told, that's well more than one oil and gas lobbyist per member of Congress out there on the Hill arming allies with talking points and briefing books, spinning the undecided and pressuring the opposition.¶ And there's more of them every year. Consider the trendlines. As recently as 2004, the oil and gas industry spent about $52 million a year in lobbying; by 2009, that figure was up to $175 million -- or a 300 percent increase in just five years.¶ The industry backs up its extraordinary lobbying effort with lavish spending on political campaigns. Candidates associated with oil and gas companies made about $15 million in direct campaign donations during the 2010 mid-term election cycle ($26 million during the 2008 presidential cycle).¶ The industry was also responsible for more than $10 million in donations through its political action committees, or PACs, in the 2010 cycle.¶ The trendlines are notable here, as well. In the early ’90s, oil and gas campaign spending favored Republicans over Democrats by about a 2 to 1 margin: For every $1 the industry gave to Democrats, it gave Republicans $1.78. But starting in the 1996 election cycle (think Al Gore), that changed dramatically. Now, for every $1 the industry gives Democrats, it gives Republicans about $3.35.¶ Among the top oil and gas industry donors in the 2010 cycle, Koch Industries and ExxonMobil head the list. And Opensecrets.org's top 20 list of oil and gas money recipients is 4 to 1 Republican.¶ In addition to contributions to individuals and PACs, there's the whole new world of spending opportunities opened up by recent Supreme Court rulings that essentially blew a hole through the post-Watergate campaign finance laws.¶ Super PACs are groups that can now accept unlimited contributions, though they must disclose their contributors. Opensecrets.org calculates that companies with interests in the energy sector combined to give more than $5.6 million to Super PACs in the 2010 cycle.¶ Former Bush political guru Karl Rove's American Crossroads group, for one such Super PAC. It spent $21 million on political advertising in the 2010 cycle; oil and gas interests contributed just over $3 million of that amount.¶ The recent court rulings also opened the way for nonprofit groups to spend unlimited amounts of money on political campaigns -- and unlike the Super PACs, they don't have to disclose their donors. All they have to do is report how much they spent.¶ These groups, led by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, reported $140 million in campaign spending in the 2010 cycle, the vast majority of which went to support conservative causes. There's no way to know how much of that money came from Big Oil.¶ Adding yet more firepower to its lobbyists’ arsenal, API announced last month that it will start funding political campaigns directly through a new PAC of its own -- in addition to what its member organizations give already.¶ "API is very focused on making sure that we have a voice in policy debates," said its spokesman, Durbin. "We're always looking at ways to improve the way we do our jobs here. This just adds one more tool to leverage our ability to get the point across about the critical nature of this industry."¶ One more thing: According to another study by the Center for Responsive Politics, oil and gas industry holdings are some of the most popular investments among lawmakers and their spouses, and in recent years have grown in value, offering a bundle of potential conflicts of interest problems.¶ "Without question, among all the different industries that lobby the federal government, that make campaign contributions, oil and gas is right at the top of the top," said CRP's Dave Levinthal. "They can invest incredible resources into the political process that make so much of a difference in Washington, at the cost of a fraction of a faction of their haul."¶ And it's not just the breadth of their efforts -- it's the ferocity and the effectiveness.¶ Last month, one of the House's nine freshmen Democrats, Rep. William Keating of Massachusetts, tried to tack a subsidy repeal onto a continuing budget resolution. He failed, by a 73 vote margin, with not a single Republican voting in favor and 13 Democrats voting against the measure.¶ Keating said he considers that vote a testament to the power of the oil and gas lobby. "It's incredible to me. It would be my Exhibit A," he said. "Because we're sitting here in the midst of a budget deadlock, we're sitting here cutting Head Start programs, police, fire, border security, reading teachers -- we're sitting here cutting the basics, and there's just this refusal to even consider subsidies for the oil companies."¶ There's no business or economic argument for them, Keating said. "These are profitable businesses right now. This isn't a situation where you're trying to provide capital for businesses that need it, or trying to provide assistance to get a small business off the ground. It's not for economic development. It's not for job creation. It's not to enhance the middle class. So why is it there?"¶ The answer, Keating said, has to be the industry's political clout. "I used to be a district attorney. Many times you begin an investigation by eliminating everything else. So I've been trying to eliminate every other possible reason, and I'm left with that."¶ The money the industry spends influencing legislation and elections looks enormous -- until you compare it with what it buys. "If you look at $4 billion [in subsidies] annually, compared to say $200 million for lobbying and campaign spending," said Daniel J. Weiss, director of climate strategy for the Center for American Progress Action Fund, "that is a 20-to-1 payoff."