

Cuba Oil Neg – NCPA

Contents

Cuba Oil Neg – NCPA.....	1
Off Case.....	3
Oil Spills CP.....	4
Oil Spills 1nc.....	5
2nc Solvency.....	7
A2 permutation – appeasement.....	9
A2 cuba not cooperate.....	10
Oil Disad.....	11
Oil Link.....	12
A2 Cuban oil inevitable.....	13
Politics.....	14
Unpopular 1nc.....	15
Bipartisanship.....	16
Case.....	17
Environment ADV.....	18
Environment 1nc.....	19
No Drilling 2nc.....	21
Squo Solves 2nc.....	22
Safe Drilling 2nc.....	23
Environment Resilient 2nc.....	24
No Extinction 2nc.....	25
A2 oil spills.....	27
A2 sanctions block US spill assistance.....	28
China ADV.....	29
China 1nc.....	30
Alt Cause – Guantanamo/Human Rights.....	32
Alt Cause – Embargo.....	33
No war – US/China.....	34
No war – US/China – economics check.....	36

No war – China/Taiwan – relations resilient..... 37

Off Case

Oil Spills CP

Oil Spills 1nc

Text: The United States federal government should amend the Cuban Democracy Act of 1992 to allow for limited, spill-related coordination and communication with the Cuban government.

President Barack Obama should issue an export-only industry-wide general license for oil spill response in Cuban waters, effective immediately.

License US oil companies for spill related coordination and clean-up – CP solves the impact to any oil spill and does not loosen the embargo – that prevents a political backlash

Melissa **Bert** (a military fellow (U.S. Coast Guard) at the Council on Foreign Relations) **and** Blake **Clayton** (fellow for energy and national security at the Council on Foreign Relations) **2012** “Addressing the Risk of a Cuban Oil Spill”, <http://www.cfr.org/cuba/addressing-risk-cuban-oil-spill/p27515>

The imminent drilling of Cuba's first offshore oil well raises the prospect of a large-scale oil spill in Cuban waters washing onto U.S. shores. Washington should anticipate this possibility by implementing policies that would help both countries' governments stem and clean up an oil spill effectively. These policies should ensure that both the U.S. government and the domestic oil industry are operationally and financially ready to deal with any spill that threatens U.S. waters. These policies should be as minimally disruptive as possible to the country's broader Cuba strategy.

The Problem¶ A Chinese-built semisubmersible oil rig leased by Repsol, a Spanish oil company, arrived in Cuban waters in January 2012 to drill Cuba's first exploratory offshore oil well. Early estimates suggest that Cuban offshore oil and natural gas reserves are substantial—somewhere between five billion and twenty billion barrels of oil and upward of eight billion cubic feet of natural gas. Although the United States typically welcomes greater volumes of crude oil coming from countries that are not members of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC), a surge in Cuban oil production would complicate the United States' decades-old effort to economically isolate the Castro regime.¶ **Deepwater drilling off the Cuban coast also poses a threat to the United States. The exploratory well is seventy miles off the Florida coast** and lies at a depth of 5,800 feet. **The failed Macondo well that triggered the calamitous Deepwater Horizon oil spill** in April 2010 **had broadly similar features**, situated forty-eight miles from shore and approximately five thousand feet below sea level. A spill off Florida's coast could ravage the state's \$57 billion per year tourism industry.¶ **Washington cannot count on the technical know-how of Cuba's unseasoned oil industry to address a spill on its own. Oil industry experts doubt that it has a strong understanding of how to prevent an offshore oil spill or stem a deep-water well blowout. Moreover, the site where the first wells will be drilled is a tough one for even seasoned response teams to operate in.** Unlike the calm Gulf of Mexico, the surface currents in the area where Repsol will be drilling move at a brisk three to four knots, which would bring oil from Cuba's offshore wells to the Florida coast within six to ten days. Skimming or burning the oil may not be feasible in such fast-moving water. The most, and possibly only, effective method to respond to a spill would be surface and subsurface dispersants. If dispersants are not applied close to the source within four days after a spill, uncontained oil cannot be dispersed, burnt, or skimmed, which would render standard response technologies like containment booms ineffective.¶ Repsol has been forthcoming in disclosing its spill response plans to U.S. authorities and allowing them to inspect the drilling rig, but the Russian and Chinese companies that are already negotiating with Cuba to lease acreage might not be as cooperative. Had Repsol not volunteered to have the Cuba-bound drilling rig examined by the U.S. Coast Guard and Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement to certify that it met international standards, Washington would have had little legal recourse.¶ **The complexity of U.S.-Cuba relations since the 1962 trade embargo complicates even limited efforts to put in place a spill response plan. Under U.S. law and with few exceptions, American companies cannot assist the Cuban government or provide equipment to foreign companies operating in Cuban territory.**¶ **Shortfalls in U.S. federal regulations governing commercial liability for oil spills pose a further problem.** The Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (OPA 90) does not protect U.S. citizens and property against damages stemming from a blown-out wellhead outside of U.S. territory. In the case of Deepwater Horizon, BP was liable despite being a foreign company because it was operating within the United States. Were any of the wells that Repsol drills to go haywire, the cost of funding a response would fall to the Oil Spill Liability

Trust Fund (OSLTF), which is woefully undercapitalized. OPA 90 limits the OSLTF from paying out more than \$50 million in a fiscal year on oil removal costs, subject to a few exceptions, and requires congressional appropriation to pay out more than \$150 million.¶ The Way Forward¶ As a first step, the United States should discuss contingency planning for a Cuban oil spill at the regular multiparty talks it holds with Mexico, the Bahamas, Cuba, and others per the Cartagena Convention. The Caribbean Island Oil Pollution Response and Cooperation Plan provides an operational framework under which the United States and Cuba can jointly develop systems for identifying and reporting an oil spill, implement a means of restricting the spread of oil, and identify resources to respond to a spill.¶ **Washington should also instruct the U.S. Coast Guard to conduct basic spill response coordination with its counterparts in Cuba.** The United States already has operational agreements in place with Mexico, Canada, and several countries in the Caribbean that call for routine exercises, emergency response coordination, and communication protocols. **It should strike an agreement with Cuba that is substantively similar but narrower in scope, limited to basic spill-oriented advance coordination and communication. Before that step can be taken, U.S. lawmakers may need to amend the Cuban Democracy Act of 1992 to allow for limited, spill-related coordination and communication with the Cuban government.**¶ Next, President Barack **Obama should issue an export-only industry-wide general license for oil spill response in Cuban waters, effective immediately. Issuing that license does not require congressional authorization.** The license should allow offshore oil companies to do vital spill response work in Cuban territory, such as capping a well or drilling a relief well. Oil service companies, such as Halliburton, should be included in the authorization.¶ Finally, Congress should alter existing oil spill compensation policy. Lawmakers should amend OPA 90 to ensure there is a responsible party for oil spills from a foreign offshore unit that pollutes or threatens to pollute U.S. waters, like there is for vessels. Senator Robert Menendez (D-NJ) and Congressman David Rivera (R-FL) have sponsored such legislation. Lawmakers should eliminate the requirement for the Coast Guard to obtain congressional approval on expenditures above \$150 million for spills of national significance (as defined by the National Response Plan). And President Obama should appoint a commission to determine the appropriate limit of liability cap under OPA 90, balancing the need to compensate victims with the desire to retain strict liability for polluters.¶ There are two other, less essential measures U.S. lawmakers may consider that would enable the country to respond more adeptly to a spill. Installing an early-response system based on acoustic, geophysical, or other technologies in the Straits of Florida would immediately alert the U.S. Coast Guard about a well blowout or other unusual activity. The U.S. Department of Energy should find out from Repsol about the characteristics of Cuban crude oil, which would help U.S. authorities predict how the oil would spread in the case of a well blowout.¶ Defending U.S. interests¶ **An oil well blowout in Cuban waters would almost certainly require a U.S. response. Without changes in current U.S. law, however, that response would undoubtedly come far more slowly** than is desirable. The Coast Guard would be barred from deploying highly experienced manpower, specially designed booms, skimming equipment and vessels, and dispersants. U.S. offshore gas and oil companies would also be barred from using well-capping stacks, remotely operated submersibles, and other vital technologies. Although a handful of U.S. spill responders hold licenses to work with Repsol, their licenses do not extend to well capping or relief drilling. The result of a slow response to a Cuban oil spill would be greater, perhaps catastrophic, economic and environmental damage to Florida and the Southeast.¶ **Efforts to rewrite current law and policy toward Cuba, and encouraging cooperation with its government, could antagonize groups opposed to improved relations with the Castro regime.** They might protest any decision allowing U.S. federal agencies to assist Cuba or letting U.S. companies operate in Cuban territory.¶ **However, taking sensible steps to prepare for a potential accident at an oil well in Cuban waters would not break new ground or materially alter broader U.S. policy toward Cuba.** For years, Washington has worked with Havana on issues of mutual concern. The United States routinely coordinates with Cuba on search and rescue operations in the Straits of Florida as well as to combat illicit drug trafficking and migrant smuggling. During the hurricane season, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) provides Cuba with information on Caribbean storms.¶ **The recommendations proposed here are narrowly tailored to the specific challenges that a Cuban oil spill poses to the United States. They would not help the Cuban economy or military. What they would do is protect U.S. territory and property from a potential danger emanating from Cuba.**¶ **Cuba will drill for oil in its territorial waters with or without the blessing of the United States. Defending against a potential oil spill requires a modicum of advance coordination and preparation with the Cuban government, which need not go beyond spill-related matters.** Without taking these precautions, the United States risks a second Deepwater Horizon, this time from Cuba.

2nc Solvency

License oil companies to provide expertise for safe drilling and response equipment

Sarah **Stephens** (Executive Director of the Center for Democracy in the Americas) and Jake **Colvin** (Vice President for Global Trade Issues at the National Foreign Trade Council) 9/29/2011 “US-Cuba policy, and the race for oil drilling” <http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/foreign-policy/184661-us-cuba-policy-and-the-race-for-oil-drilling>)

To protect the national interest — and for the sake of Florida's beaches and **the Gulf of Mexico's ecosystem — it is time to stop sticking our heels in the sand when it comes to U.S.-Cuba policy.** Before the end of the year, a Chinese-made drilling platform known as Scarabeo 9 is expected to arrive in the Gulf. Once it is there, Cuba and its foreign partners, including Spain's Repsol, will begin using it to drill for oil in waters deeper than Deepwater Horizon's infamous Macondo well. The massive rig, manufactured to comply with U.S.-content restrictions at a cost of \$750 million, will cost Repsol and other companies \$407,000 per day to lease for exploration. They are taking this financial risk because Cuba needs the oil and its partners — Spain, Norway, Russia, India, Vietnam, Malaysia, Canada, Angola, Venezuela, and possibly China — believe that drilling in waters said to contain undiscovered reserves of approximately 5 billion barrels of oil is good business. **In virtually every other country in the world, developments like these would prompt high-level discussions about how to exploit these resources safely** or to anticipate a crisis were a disaster to strike. **Experts who have studied the currents say a spill in Cuban waters would send 90 percent of the oil into the Keys and up the East Coast of Florida.** But the embargo leaves Florida's sensitive coastal resources defenseless. **Due to the fact that the drilling involves Cuba, American companies and workers cannot lend their expertise to what could be a risky operation. U.S. economic sanctions prevent our private sector from helping Cuba drill safely and paralyze the U.S. government,** which ought to be convening bilateral discussions on best practices and **coordinating disaster response. In fact, the U.S. has no emergency response** agreement **with Cuba for oil spills. While some specific licenses have been granted** to permit U.S. firms to conduct limited transactions with Cuba, **current sanctions bar the United States from deploying the kind of clean-up equipment, engineers, spare parts for blow-out prevention, chemical dispersants, and rigs to drill relief wells that would be needed to address an oil crisis involving Cuba.** One welcomed development came earlier this month, when William Reilly, a former head of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and co-chair of the Commission that investigated the Deepwater Horizon disaster, led a group of experts to Cuba to take a look at their plans. While **the administration** has done well giving permission to Mr. Reilly, as well as to other experts, to discuss the problem with Cuban counterparts, it **should move more aggressively to work with the Cuban government to cooperate on plans for safe drilling** and responding to a possible crisis. Rather than moving forward, some in the U.S. Congress would make the problem worse. Rep. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (FL-R), who criticized Mr. Reilly's visit to Cuba as “giving credibility to the regime's dangerous oil-drilling scheme,” has offered legislation to try and stop Repsol from drilling. Rep. Vern Buchanan (FL-R) would deny Repsol the right to drill in U.S. waters if it helped Cuba drill in its waters. Thirty-four members of both parties have written Repsol directly, threatening the company if it drills with Cuba. Yet this tactic can't work. Even if they could deter Repsol from drilling — which is unlikely — they cannot stop Cuba and partners from countries like China, Russia, and Venezuela, from using the rig and searching for oil. At some point, it is likely that drilling will begin and the United States ought to do what it can to prepare for that eventuality. **The U.S. government should facilitate access by Cuba and its drilling partners to the resources they need to drill safely.** President **Obama should instruct the Treasury Department to issue a blanket general license now that would allow private industry to provide what oil expert** Jorge Piñon **calls “any conceivable response” in the event of a crisis.**

Waiving embargo enforcement for oil safety solves.

Sarah **Stephens** (Executive Director of the Center for Democracy in the Americas) **2011** “As Cuba plans to drill in the Gulf of Mexico, U.S. policy poses needless risks to our national interest,” http://democracyinamericas.org/pdfs/Cuba_Drilling_and_US_Policy.pdf

Recommendations¶ Pursue Unilateral Actions¶ • The **Obama** administration **should aggressively** and comprehensively **use** its **existing licensing authority to ensure the right firms with the best equipment and expertise are in**

place to fight the effects of an oil spill. • OFAC, the Treasury Department office that administers and enforces trade sanctions, should make it clear that efforts to protect safety during drilling by U.S. entities will not be met with negative regulatory consequences. • The U.S. should ensure that comprehensive information-sharing with the Cuban government is standard operating procedure, conducted openly where possible, and without impediments in areas such as granting visas for Cuban scientists and officials to visit here Pursue Bilateral Activities and Agreements • • The U.S. should enter direct discussions with Cuba on energy and environmental cooperation. • • The U.S. should look to existing models for bilateral (such as MEXUS) and trilateral cooperation (as proposed by the National Commission on the BP Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill and Offshore Drilling) for environmental planning with Cuba.

A2 permutation – appeasement

Easing oil embargo causes appeasement. Cplan solves better

Richard **Sadowski 2011** (is a Class of 2012 J.D. candidate, at Hofstra University School of Law, NY. Mr. Sadowski is also the Managing Editor of Production of the Journal of International Business and Law Vol. XI. “Cuban Offshore Drilling: Preparation and Prevention within the Framework of the United States’ Embargo” – Sustainable Development Law & Policy Volume 12; Issue 1 Fall 2011: Natural Resource Conflicts Article 10 –

<http://digitalcommons.wcl.american.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1497&context=sdlp>

Cuba plans to drill seven exploratory oil wells in the Gulf of Mexico by 2014.¹ **Some argue that** the threat of Cuban offshore **oil drilling will increase the embargo’s costs and** that **U.S. oil companies will miss out on oil exploration** that will go to foreign countries.² In response, **some** U.S. lawmakers and U.S. oil lobbyists **have advocated for an exception to the Cuban embargo permitting energy cooperation.**³ Notwithstanding these concerns, **the long-standing Cuban embargo is an economic restriction with a significant purpose and should not so easily be forsaken.** This article argues that, despite the added pressure Cuba’s offshore oil developments have placed on U.S. policy, **the embargo’s twin goals of bringing democracy to the Cuban people and ending their oppressive rule have not been met. Thus, now is not the time to lift or ease the embargo.** The embargo itself serves to restrict Cuba’s drilling efforts⁴ and new legislation may further hamper Cuba’s exploration.⁵ Additionally, **the economic concerns of the U.S. energy industry do not warrant a change in the U.S. foreign policy toward Cuba, and those concerns can be better met by tapping U.S. resources.** **Furthermore, fears of a Cuban oil spill can be assuaged through less drastic measures, such as an oil spill emergency response agreement with Cuba,** similar to the one that the United States has enacted with Mexico.

A2 cuba not cooperate

Cuba will cooperate with a US oil spills response plan

Richard **Sadowski 2011** (is a Class of 2012 J.D. candidate, at Hofstra University School of Law, NY. Mr. Sadowski is also the Managing Editor of Production of the Journal of International Business and Law Vol. XI. "Cuban Offshore Drilling: Preparation and Prevention within the Framework of the United States' Embargo" – Sustainable Development Law & Policy Volume 12; Issue 1 Fall 2011: Natural Resource Conflicts Article 10 –

<http://digitalcommons.wcl.american.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1497&context=sdlp>

Further, **spill response planning can be implemented** before drilling begins. **The United States currently has oil spill response agreements with Mexico** and Canada,⁶⁸ **but not with Cuba**.⁶⁹ As the Deepwater Horizon spill highlighted, planning for disaster is essential. **To achieve this goal, the United States can model a Cuban plan on the Joint Contingency Plan between the United Mexican States and the United States of America Regarding Pollution of the Maritime Environment by Discharge of Hydrocarbons or Other Hazardous Substances ("MEXUS Plan")**.⁷⁰ That plan originates from an agreement between Mexico and the United States signed on July 24, 1980, and developed in accordance with the International Convention on Oil Pollution Preparedness, Response and Cooperation, adopted on November 30, 1990.⁷¹ **The Plan pre-designates** on-scene coordinators, a **joint response team**, response coordination centers, rapid notification protocols, **and communications procedures** for the event of an oil disaster.⁷² **The Plan has triumphed in test simulations**, which validates its concepts.⁷³ The United States must initiate the same level of planning with Cuba. Given the proximity of potential Cuban wells to the Florida coast, the need for a contingency plan is clear. Fortunately, **the MEXUS Plan provides a guiding framework upon which the United States and Cuba can draw. Furthermore, a recent Congressional report indicates that Cuba is open to certain bilateral agreements** with the United States, noting Raul Castro's willingness to engage with the United States where mutual interests exist.⁷⁴ **Since an oil spill agreement is of mutual interest, both countries should work to draft and implement it.** Disadvantage

Oil Disad

Oil Link

Cuban oil production trades-off with US- Mid-East oil ties

Dr. A. F. **Alhajji** (energy economist and George Patton Chair of Business and Economics at the College of Business Administration at Ohio Northern) and Terry L. **Maris** (founding executive director of the Center for Cuban Business Studies and professor of management) **2004** "The Future of Cuba's Energy Sector," Cuba Today,

<http://web.gc.cuny.edu/dept/bildn/publications/cubatodaybookcomplete.pdf#page=105>

The current economic, political, and social trends in Cuba indicate that energy consumption will increase substantially in the future. Transition to a market economy would accelerate this trend. In this article the word "transition" refers to any movement towards a market economy. It does not necessarily mean regime change. **The proximity of Cuba to the United States and the possibility of massive oil deposits in Cuban waters will have a tangible impact on political, economic, and social environments, not only in Cuba, but in the whole region. The discovery of commercial deposits of oil would affect Cuba's economy on one hand and US energy policy and energy security on the other.** If US-Cuba relations improve in the future, **discovery of large oil deposits could affect the energy trade patterns between the two countries and affect oil trade between the US and other oil producing countries, especially in the Middle East.**

US would sacrifice oil contracts from the Mid-East in exchange for Cuba – saves on transport costs

Lily **Fesler** (Research Associate) **2009** "Cuban Oil: Havana's Potential Geo-Political Bombshell," June 11, Council on Hemispheric Affairs, <http://www.coha.org/cuban-oil-havana%E2%80%99s-potential-geo-political-bombshell/#sthash.XL8uloIO.dpuf>

Cuban Offshore Oil **Desperate to end U.S. dependence on oil from the Middle East, United States' officials are certainly aware of Cuba's oil-producing potential.** In its 2004 assessment, the U.S. Geological Survey found that Cuba has 5 billion barrels of crude oil off its northern shores; Havana claims it has 20 billion. Five billion barrels would put Cuba on par with Colombia or Ecuador, while **20 billion barrels would make Cuba's oil capacity comparable to that of the United States' and place it among the top 15 oil reserves nations in the world.** Either way, Cuba's oil is attracting the attention of oil companies from around the globe. At the moment, Spain's Repsol, Brazil's Petrobras, and Norway's StatoilHydro are overseeing exploratory drilling in the Gulf of Mexico. India, Malaysia, Vietnam, and Venezuela also have signed deals with Cuba. **Havana has publicly stated that it welcomes American investment, but U.S. companies are incapable of proceeding without an official go-ahead from Washington.** As Juan Fleites, vice president of Havana's state oil company Cubapetroleo, said, "We are open to U.S. oil companies interested in exploration, production and services." U.S. oil tycoons have shown definite interest, but Kurt Glaubitz, a spokesman for Chevron, explained, "Until trade barriers are removed, Chevron is unable to do business in Cuba. Companies like us would have to see a change in U.S. policy before we evaluate whether there's interest." The aforementioned foreign companies already have contracted for 21 of the 59 offshore Cuban drilling blocks, and another 23 blocks are currently under negotiation by other foreign nations, including Russia and China. **A U.S. Stake in Cuban Oil?** It is not too late for the U.S. to develop a stake in Cuba's nascent oil output. It takes between three and five years to develop oil reserves, and as of yet, there has been no major oil discovery off the island. Repsol struck oil in 2004, but not enough to sell commercially. Several other foreign firms are currently using seismic testing, which assesses the oil content of potential deposits, after which they will probably begin exploring in 2010 or 2011. The exploration manager for Cubapetroleo, Rafael Tenreyro Pérez, has called the incoming results from seismic testing in Cuba's reserves "very encouraging." After **lifting the embargo**, U.S. oil companies could most likely work out an arrangement whereby the U.S. would exchange its reserves with nearby holdings of foreign companies, allowing the U.S. access to Cuba's oil even after all of the contracts have been signed. This **could appreciably save transportation costs, because U.S. companies wouldn't have to go halfway around the world in search of oil refineries, with Cuba only 90 miles away.** U.S. oil equipment and service companies like Halliburton, however, already have lost the opportunity to build refineries, pipelines, and ports, sacrificing tens of millions of dollars in revenue. U.S. companies' oil contracts are not just significant for their own potential profits, but also for American consumers' access to reasonably priced neighboring oil. With oil prices recovering from a December low of \$32.40 a barrel back to around \$70 a barrel, **access to more oil sources could become a matter of serious import.**

A2 Cuban oil inevitable

Cuban oil exploration will stay low in the squo.

Jorge Piñón 2013 (energy affairs researcher) Progreso Weekly – May 7th – <http://www.havanatimes.org/?p=92634>

That is the process we have conducted for the past 10 years in Cuba, which includes a study by the U.S. Geological Survey. **This study**, done for the first time in 2004, **estimates that in Cuba's geological north strip**, off shore, from Pinar del Río Province to northern Matanzas province, **there are oil reserves.** **The surveyors raise the possibility that from 4 billion to 6 billion barrels of crude are still to be found.** These geological studies are very environmental, but historically they are highly trusted by our industry. That doesn't mean that they guarantee the amount of oil, but it's the first step in that stage. ¶ We are beyond the stage of studies; now we are in the stage of exploration. Four wells have been exploited by serious international oil companies – each well has cost at least \$100 million – so, in other words, it wasn't a political "game." ¶ So far, the hoped-for results have not materialized; at least, that's what I'm told by sources I've consulted. We still have the rest of the Gulf of Mexico, the deep waters in the rest of the Gulf of Mexico, adjacent to the United States' exclusive zone. I think that there are possibilities there. ¶ In my opinion, **in the next three to five years, unfortunately, I don't see a high probability that Cuba will maintain the level of exploration in deep waters such as we've seen in the past two or three years.**

International oil companies are turning to other parts of the globe.

Mary O'Grady (is a member of the editorial board at The Wall Street Journal) WSJ – April 24, 2013 <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887324474004578442511561458392.html>

Remember all the hype about Cuba drilling for oil in Caribbean waters **and American companies missing out on the bonanza because of the U.S. embargo? Well, like all the other Cuban get-rich-quick schemes** of the past 50 years, **this one seems to have flopped too.** ¶ Last week, Florida's Sun Sentinel reported that "after spending nearly \$700 million during a decade, **energy companies from around the world have all but abandoned their search for oil in deep waters off the north coast of Cuba** near Florida." Separately, CubaStandard.com reported on Friday that "the shallow-water drilling platform used by **Russia** oil company OAO Zarubezhneft **will leave Cuban waters** June 1, to be redeployed to Asia." ¶ According to the Sun Sentinel story, Jorge Piñón, an oil-industry guru who had been cheering Cuba's exploration attempts, said "**Companies are saying, 'We cannot spend any more capital on this** high-risk exploration. We'd rather go to Brazil; we'd rather go to Angola; **we'd rather go to other places in the world where the** technological and geological **challenges are less.**"

Politics

Unpopular 1nc

Plan will get caught up in embargo debates – extremely unpopular – no risk of a link turn

Neelesh **Nerurkar** (Specialist in Energy Policy) and Mark P. **Sullivan** (Specialist in Latin American Affairs) **2011** Congressional Research Service, 2011, “Cuba’s Offshore Oil Development: Background and U.S. Policy Considerations,” <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R41522.pdf>

On the opposite side of the policy debate, a number of policy groups and **members of Congress oppose engagement with Cuba, including U.S. investment in Cuba’s offshore energy development.** **A legislative initiative** introduced in the 111th Congress, H.R. 5620, **would go further and impose visa restrictions and economic sanctions on foreign companies** and its executives **who help facilitate the development of Cuba’s petroleum resources.** **The bill asserts that offshore drilling by** or under the authorization of the **Cuban** government **poses a “serious** economic and **environmental threat to the U**nited **S**tates” because of the damage that an oil spill could cause. **Opponents of U.S. support for Cuba’s offshore oil development** also **argue that such involvement would provide an economic lifeline to the Cuban government and** thus **prolong** the continuation of **the communist regime.** They maintain that if Cuba reaped substantial economic benefits from offshore oil development, it could reduce societal pressure on Cuba to enact market-oriented economic reforms. Some who oppose U.S. involvement in Cuba’s energy development contend that while Cuba might have substantial amounts of oil offshore, it will take years to develop. They maintain that the Cuban government is using the enticement of potential oil profits to break down the U.S. economic embargo on Cuba.

Bipartisanship

Partisan divide

Jonathan P. **White** (J.D. 2010, University of Colorado Law School) Summer, **2010** – Colorado Journal of International Environmental Law and Policy – 21 COLO. J. INT'L ENVTL. L. & POL'Y 557 – lexis)

Cuba's moves to open the Florida Straits to drilling have generated a bifurcated American political response. Reminiscent of the Helms-Burton Act's effort to penalize foreign third parties, **some U.S. politicians have responded** to Cuba's moves **by calling for laws that would deny U.S. visas to employees of foreign oil**

companies doing business in Cuba. n201 Legislation by Senator Bill Nelson of Florida seeks to ban companies drilling for oil in the Florida Straits from operating in the United States. n202 **Other politicians have introduced legislation that would exempt U.S. companies from the** expansive Cuban trade **embargo** in order to allow them to compete for leases off Cuba. n203 The Cuban government, meanwhile, has encouraged American oil companies to bid for tracts in Cuban-controlled waters in the Florida Straits.

n204 **So far, neither partisan faction has prevailed in this tug-of-war.** Senator Nelson cited environmental concerns as a motivator behind his anti-drilling legislation, stating: "At risk are the Florida Keys ... not to mention the \$ 8 billion Congress is investing to restore the Everglades." n205 Advocates for rescinding the U.S. trade embargo cite the drilling controversy for evidence of the embargo's counterproductive effects on the U.S. [*588] economy. n206 In Florida itself, attitudes towards offshore drilling appear to be in flux. While Florida's federal congressional delegation continues to almost unanimously oppose offshore drilling, the Florida House of Representatives voted in April 2009 to allow drilling in state-controlled waters immediately offshore. n207 Despite the feuding in the United States over how to respond to Cuban plans to drill in the Florida Straits, if momentum in the Sunshine State itself shifts in favor of drilling offshore in state waters, then drilling in the entire Florida Straits will perhaps become less-controversial. That said, the Deepwater Horizon oil spill could change public attitudes in Florida over offshore drilling. Either way, the lingering question is whether there is any hope for a productive dialogue between the two countries over stewardship of the Florida Straits.

Partisan divide prevents any bipartisan solution

C. Adam **Lanier** (J.D. Candidate at the University of North Carolina School of Law, holds a B.A. from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill) **2013** – "In Deepwater: Cuba, Offshore Drilling, and Political Brinkmanship – North Carolina Journal of International Law & Commercial Regulation (38 N.C.J. Int'l L. & Com. Reg. 571), Winter, Lexis-Nexis

A change in the tone of U.S. policy toward Cuba is long overdue. n175 **Although there is significant bipartisan support for shifting U.S. policy toward Cuba to a more engaging model,** n176 **the sharply polarized environment in Washington seems to force legislators to remain at loggerheads.** n177 **The intransigency of the parties has led to repeated instances of brink** man **ship.** n178 which is counterproductive to the national interest. Engaging with

Cuba in the development of its energy resources is an issue that both parties should be able to agree on, even over the objections of the minority, who continue to take a hardline approach to anything related to Cuba. n179 This issue is simply too important. As Dan Whittle, director of the Environmental Defense Fund's Cuba Project, put it: "This isn't about politics. It's about protecting our beaches, our shores, our fishermen, our communities." n180

Case

Environment ADV

Environment 1nc

No drilling in the squo – all companies have bailed.

Mary **O'Grady** (is a member of the editorial board at The Wall Street Journal) WSJ – April 24, **2013**
<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887324474004578442511561458392.html>

Then came promises of an oil boom and last week **the predictable bust.** The **Brazilian** state-owned Petrobras
PETR4.BR +1.01% **had given up on deep-sea drilling in Cuba**n waters in 2011. **Repsol** REP.MC -2.46% **gave up in** May
2012. The deep water platform it was using was then passed to **Malaysia's** state-owned Petronas, which also **came up empty.**
Venezuela's PdVSA **had no luck either.** In November **Cuba announced that the rig that had been in use would**
be heading to Asia. Last week **came the end of shallow-water drilling.**

Status quo solves – US inspections of rigs

Padgett 12 (Tim, "The Oil Off Cuba: Washington and Havana Dance at Arms Length Over Spill
Prevention", 1/27, <http://www.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,2105598,00.html>)

On Christmas Eve, **a massive, Chinese-made maritime oil rig, the Scarabeo 9, arrived** at Trinidad and Tobago for
inspection. The **Spanish oil company Repsol** YPF, which keeps regional headquarters in Trinidad, **ferried it to the**
Caribbean to perform deep-ocean drilling off Cuba – whose communist government believes as much as 20 billion
barrels of crude may lie near the island's northwest coast. But **it wasn't Cuban authorities who came aboard the**
Scarabeo 9 to give it the once-over: officials from the U.S. Coast Guard and Interior Department did,
even though the rig won't be operating in U.S. waters. On any other occasion that might have raised the ire of the Cubans,
who consider Washington their imperialista enemy. But the **U.S. examination of the Scarabeo 9**, which Repsol agreed to and Cuba
abided, **was part of an unusual choreography of cooperation between the two countries.** Their otherwise bitter
cold-war feud (they haven't had diplomatic relations since 1961) is best known for a 50-year-long trade embargo and history's scariest nuclear
standoff. Now, Cuba's commitment to offshore oil exploration — drilling may start this weekend — raises a specter that haunts both nations:
an oil spill in the Florida Straits like the BP calamity that tarred the nearby Gulf of Mexico two years ago and left \$40 billion in U.S. damages. The
Straits, an equally vital body of water that's home to some of the world's most precious coral reefs, separates Havana and Key West, Florida, by
a mere 90 miles. As a result, the U.S. has tacitly loosened its embargo against Cuba to give firms like Repsol easier access to the U.S. equipment
they need to help avoid or contain possible spills. "Preventing drilling off Cuba better protects our interests than preparing for [a disaster]
does," U.S. Senator Bill Nelson of Florida tells TIME, noting the U.S. would prefer to stop the Cuban drilling — but can't. "But the two are not
mutually exclusive, and that's why we should aim to do both." **Cuba meanwhile has tacitly agreed to ensure that its**
safety measures meet U.S. standards (not that U.S. standards proved all that golden during the 2010 BP disaster) **and is**
letting unofficial U.S. delegations in to discuss the precautions being taken by Havana and the international
oil companies it is contracting. No Cuban official would discuss the matter, but Dan Whittle, senior attorney for the Environmental Defense
Fund in New York, who was part of one recent delegation, says the Cubans "seem very motivated to do the right thing."

Cuban drilling is safe – access to technology and safety standards prove

Sadowksi 12 (Richard – Managing Editor of Production of the Journal of International Business and
Law Vol. X, J.D. Candidate at Hofstra University, "Cuban Offshore Drilling: Preparation and Prevention
within the Framework of the United States' Embargo", 2012,
<http://digitalcommons.wcl.american.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1497&context=sdpl>)

Fears that Cuban offshore drilling poses serious environmental threats because of the proximity to
the United States and the prohibition on U.S. technology transfer are overblown. **Cuba has at least as**
much incentive to ensure safe-drilling practices as does the United States, and reports indicate that
Cuba is taking safety seriously. 64 Lee Hunt, President of the Houston-based International Association of Drilling Contractors, said,
"[t]he Cuban oil industry has put a lot of research, study and thought into what will be required to

safely drill," and that "they are very knowledgeable of international industry practices and have incorporated many of these principles into their safety and regulatory planning and requirements." 65
Thus, while the economic embargo of Cuba restricts American technology from being utilized, foreign sources have provided supplemental alternatives. 66

Environment is resilient

Easterbrook 95 (Gregg, Distinguished Fellow – Fullbright Foundation, A Moment on Earth, p. 25)

In the aftermath of events such as Love Canal or the Exxon Valdez oil spill, every reference to the environment is prefaced with the adjective "fragile." "Fragile environment" has become a welded phrase of the modern lexicon, like "aging hippie" or "fugitive financier." But the notion of a fragile environment is profoundly wrong. Individual animals, plants, and people are distressingly fragile. The environment that contains them is close to indestructible. The living environment of Earth has survived ice ages; bombardments of cosmic radiation more deadly than atomic fallout; solar radiation more powerful than the worst-case projection for ozone depletion; thousand-year periods of intense volcanism releasing global air pollution far worse than that made by any factory; reversals of the planet's magnetic poles; the rearrangement of continents; transformation of plains into mountain ranges and of seas into plains; fluctuations of ocean currents and the jet stream; 300-foot vacillations in sea levels; shortening and lengthening of the seasons caused by shifts in the planetary axis; collisions of asteroids and comets bearing far more force than man's nuclear arsenals; and the years without summer that followed these impacts. Yet hearts beat on, and petals unfold still. Were the environment fragile it would have expired many eons before the advent of the industrial affronts of the dreaming ape. Human assaults on the environment, though mischievous, are pinpricks compared to forces of the magnitude nature is accustomed to resisting.

No extinction

Easterbrook 3 (Gregg, Distinguished Fellow – Fullbright Foundation, "We're All Gonna Die!", Wired Magazine, July, http://www.wired.com/wired/archive/11.07/doomsday.html?pg=1&topic=&topic_set=)

If we're talking about doomsday - the end of human civilization - many scenarios simply don't measure up. A single nuclear bomb ignited by terrorists, for example, would be awful beyond words, but life would go on. People and machines might converge in ways that you and I would find ghastly, but from the standpoint of the future, they would probably represent an adaptation. Environmental collapse might make parts of the globe unpleasant, but considering that the biosphere has survived ice ages, it wouldn't be the final curtain. Depression, which has become 10 times more prevalent in Western nations in the postwar era, might grow so widespread that vast numbers of people would refuse to get out of bed, a possibility that Petranek suggested in a doomsday talk at the Technology Entertainment Design conference in 2002. But Marcel Proust, as miserable as he was, wrote Remembrance of Things Past while lying in bed.

No Drilling 2nc

No Cuban drilling now – rigs have departed.

David **LaGesse 2012** reporter, with recent articles that have appeared in National Geographic, Money, and most frequently in U.S. News & World Report – National Geographic News – November 19, 2012 – <http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/energy/2012/11/121119-cuba-oil-quest/>

An unusual high-tech oil-drilling rig that's been at work off the coast of Cuba departed last week, headed for either Africa or Brazil. **With it went the island nation's best hope**, at least in the short term, **for reaping a share of the energy treasure beneath the sea** that separates it from its longtime ideological foe. **For many** Floridians, especially in the Cuban-American community, **it was welcome news** this month **that Cuba had drilled its third unsuccessful well** this year **and was suspending**

deepwater oil **exploration**. (Related Pictures: "Four Offshore Drilling Frontiers") While **some feared an oil spill** in the Straits of Florida, some 70 miles (113 kilometers) from the U.S. coast, others were concerned that drilling success would extend the reviled reign of the Castros, long-time dictator Fidel and his brother and hand-picked successor, Raúl.

Drilling not inevitable over the long-term. No reserves in Cuba.

Mary **O'Grady** (is a member of the editorial board at The Wall Street Journal) WSJ – April 24, **2013**
<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887324474004578442511561458392.html>

Remember all the hype about Cuba drilling for oil in Caribbean waters **and American companies missing out on the bonanza because of the U.S. embargo? Well, like all the other Cuban get-rich-quick schemes** of the past 50 years, **this one seems to have flopped too**. Last week, Florida's Sun Sentinel reported that "after spending nearly \$700 million during a decade, **energy companies from around the world have all but abandoned their search for oil in deep waters off the north coast of Cuba** near Florida." Separately, CubaStandard.com reported on Friday that "the shallow-water drilling platform used by **Russian** oil company OAO Zarubezhneft **will leave Cuban waters** June 1, to be redeployed to Asia." According to the Sun Sentinel story, Jorge Piñon, an oil-industry guru who had been cheering Cuba's exploration attempts, said "**Companies are saying, 'We cannot spend any more capital on this** high-risk exploration. We'd rather go to Brazil; we'd rather go to Angola; **we'd rather go to other places in the world where the** technological and geological **challenges are less.**"

Squo Solves 2nc

US inspections of Cuban drilling equipment prevents spills – ensures compliance

WSJ 12 (Wall Street Journal, “Cuba - Repsol's Cuba drilling rig complies with safety standards”, 1/10, <http://www.bpcplc.com/media-centre/non-company-press-releases/cuba-repsol%27s-cuba-drilling-rig-complies-with-safety-standards.aspx>)

U.S. officials said Monday **a rig operated by Spain's Repsol YPF that is expected to drill offshore Cuba** in the coming months **complies with international and U.S. safety standards**. **U.S. personnel found the vessel to generally comply with existing international and U.S. standards** by which Repsol has pledged to abide,' the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement said in the press release. The agency, however, noted that the vessel review 'does not confer any form of certification or endorsement under U.S. or international law' and that the U.S. has no legal or regulatory authority over the rig. The vessel, named Scarabeo 9, was inspected off the coast of Trinidad and Tobago and it will begin drilling a deep-water oil well later this year about 100 kms off the Florida Keys. **Repsol, which does business in the U.S., had agreed to let U.S. federal regulators inspect the rig** before it enters Cuban waters. **The rig's review was aimed at minimizing the possibility of a major oil spill**, which would hurt U.S. economic and environmental interests, the regulatory agency said. While aboard the Scarabeo 9, **U.S. officials reviewed vessel construction, drilling equipment, and safety systems**—including lifesaving and firefighting equipment, emergency generators, dynamic positioning systems, machinery spaces, and the blowout preventer, according to agency. In anticipation of increased drilling activities in the Caribbean and Gulf of Mexico, **the U.S. is in discussions with** the Bahamas, **Cuba**, Jamaica and Mexico **on a broad range of issues, including drilling safety**, ocean modeling, and oil spill preparedness and response, in order to reduce the impact of a major pollution incident, the agency said.

US standards are met – solves the impact

Geman 12 (Ben, “Interior: Cuba-bound drilling rig ‘generally’ meets US standards”, 1/9, <http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/203161-interior-cuba-bound-drilling-rig-generally-meets-us-standards>)

The deepwater drilling rig that Spanish oil giant **Repsol will use for planned oil exploration off Cuba's coast is getting a clean bill of health from U.S. officials**. The United States has no regulatory authority over the drilling, but **an Interior Department and Coast Guard team was invited to inspect the Scarabeo 9 rig** by Repsol, a check-up that comes as planned drilling off Cuba's coast draws criticism from several U.S. lawmakers. **“The review compared the vessel with applicable international safety and security standards as well as U.S. standards for drilling units operating** in the U.S. Outer Continental Shelf. **U.S. personnel found the vessel to generally comply with existing international and U.S. standards** by which Repsol has pledged to abide,” the U.S. agencies said in a joint statement Monday upon completion of the review. The U.S. team reviewed drilling equipment, safety systems such as firefighting equipment and the unit's blowout preventer and other aspects of the rig. A number of U.S. lawmakers critical of the Cuban government have criticized Repsol's planned project, noting it will bring revenues to the Cuban regime and that a spill could threaten nearby U.S. shores. More on that here, here and here. **“The review is consistent with U.S. efforts to minimize the possibility of a major oil spill, which would hurt** U.S. economic and **environmental interests**,” Interior and the Coast Guard said of the inspection, which occurred off the coast of Trinidad and Tobago.

Safe Drilling 2nc

Cuban and non-US prevention efforts are sufficient now.

Richard **Sadowski 2011** (is a Class of 2012 J.D. candidate, at Hofstra University School of Law, NY. Mr. Sadowski is also the Managing Editor of Production of the Journal of International Business and Law Vol. XI. "Cuban Offshore Drilling: Preparation and Prevention within the Framework of the United States' Embargo" – Sustainable Development Law & Policy Volume 12; Issue 1 Fall 2011: Natural Resource Conflicts Article 10 –

<http://digitalcommons.wcl.american.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1497&context=sdlp>

Fears that Cuban offshore drilling poses serious environmental threats because of the proximity to the United States and the prohibition on U.S. technology transfer are overblown. Cuba has at least as much incentive to ensure safe-drilling practices as does the United States, and reports indicate that Cuba is taking safety seriously.⁶⁴ Lee Hunt, President of the Houston-based International Association of Drilling Contractors, said, "[t]he Cuban oil industry has put a lot of research, study and thought into what will be required to safely drill," and that "they are very knowledgeable of international industry practices and have incorporated many of these principles into their safety and regulatory planning and requirements."⁶⁵ Thus, while the economic embargo of Cuba restricts American technology from being utilized, foreign sources have provided supplemental alternatives.⁶⁶

Training and international regulations solve

TC 11 (Television Camaguey, "Cuban Specialists Receive Training on Safe Oil Drilling ", 6/8, <http://www.tvcamaguey.co.cu/english/index.php/science-and-technology/35-science/92-cuban-specialists-receive-training-on-safe-oil-drilling-.html>)

Cuban specialists who are going to participate in the drilling of deep-water exploratory wells in Cuban waters in the Gulf of Mexico recently participated in courses on safety and environment protection as part of preparations for such activities. A total of 120 Cubans including executives, officials and technicians of enterprises involved in the oil industry participated in three seminars on the topic taught by Norwegian experts. Manuel Marrero, chief oil and gas specialist of the Basic Industry Ministry, told ACN the several-day training is vital to undertake the deep- and ultra-deep-water drillings scheduled to begin in a few months. Current international regulations for this kind of operations are very rigorous in an effort to protect the environment and avoid accidents such as the one that recently occurred in the British Petroleum platform.

Environment Resilient 2nc

Environment resilient and improving – their authors lie

Dutton 1 (Dr. Dennis, Professor of Philosophy – University of Canterbury (New Zealand), “Greener Than You Think”, The Washington Post, 10-21, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn?pagename=article&node=&contentId=A12789-2001Oct18>)

That the human race faces environmental problems is unquestionable. That **environmental experts have** regularly **tried to scare us** out of our wits **with doomsday chants** is also beyond dispute. In the 1960s overpopulation was going to cause massive worldwide famine around 1980. A decade later we were being told the world would be out of oil by the 1990s. This was an especially chilly prospect, since, as Newsweek reported in 1975, we were in a climatic cooling trend that was going to reduce agricultural outputs for the rest of the century, leading possibly to a new Ice Age. Bjorn Lomborg, a young statistics professor and political scientist at the University of Aarhus in Denmark, knows all about the enduring appeal -- for journalists, politicians and the public -- of environmental doomsday tales, having swallowed more than a few himself. In 1997, Lomborg -- a self-described left-winger and former Greenpeace member -- came across an article in Wired magazine about Julian Simon, a University of Maryland economist. **Simon claimed** that the "litany" of the Green movement -- its **fears about** overpopulation, animal **species dying** by the hour, **deforestation** -- **was hysterical nonsense, and** that the quality of life on **the planet was radically improving**. Lomborg was shocked by this, and he returned to Denmark to set about doing the **research** that would refute Simon. He and his team of academicians **discovered** something sobering and cheering: **In every** one of his **claims, Simon was correct**. Moreover, Lomborg found **on close analysis** that **the factual foundation on which** the environmental **doomsayers stood was deeply flawed: exaggeration, prevarications, white lies and** even convenient **typographical errors** had been absorbed unchallenged into the folklore of **environmental disaster scenarios**.

No Extinction 2nc

Humans will survive despite biodiversity loss

Sagoff 97 (Mark, Senior Research Scholar @ Institute for Philosophy and Public policy in School of Public Affairs @ U. Maryland, William and Mary Law Review, "INSTITUTE OF BILL OF RIGHTS LAW SYMPOSIUM DEFINING TAKINGS: PRIVATE PROPERTY AND THE FUTURE OF GOVERNMENT REGULATION: MUDDLE OR MUDDLE THROUGH? TAKINGS JURISPRUDENCE MEETS THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT", 38 Wm and Mary L. Rev. 825, March, L/N)

Although one may agree with ecologists such as Ehrlich and Raven that the **earth stands on the brink of** an episode of **massive extinction, it may not follow** from this grim fact **that human beings will suffer** as a result. On the contrary, **skeptics such as** science writer Colin **Tudge have challenged biologists to explain why we need more than a tenth of the 10 to 100 million species that grace the earth. Noting that "cultivated systems often out-produce wild systems by 100-fold or more," Tudge declared that "the argument that humans need the variety of other species is,** when you think about it, **a theological one."** n343 Tudge observed that **"the elimination of all but a tiny minority of our fellow creatures does not affect the material well-being of humans one iota."** n344 This skeptic challenged ecologists to list more than

10,000 species (other than unthreatened microbes) that are essential to ecosystem productivity or functioning. n345 **The human species could survive just as well if 99.9% of our fellow creatures went extinct, provided only that we retained the appropriate 0.1% that we need."** n346 [*906] The monumental Global Biodiversity Assessment ("the Assessment") identified two positions with respect to redundancy of species. "At one extreme is the idea that each species is unique and important, such that its removal or loss will have demonstrable consequences to the functioning of the community or ecosystem." n347 The authors of the Assessment, a panel of eminent ecologists, endorsed this position, saying it is "unlikely that there is much, if any, ecological redundancy in communities over time scales of decades to centuries, the time period over which environmental policy should operate." n348 These eminent ecologists rejected the opposing view, "the notion that species overlap in function to a sufficient degree that removal or loss of a species will be compensated by others, with negligible overall consequences to the community or ecosystem." n349 Other **biologists believe,** however, that **species are so fabulously redundant in the ecological functions they perform that the life-support systems and processes of the planet and ecological processes in general will function perfectly well with fewer of them, certainly fewer than the millions and millions we can expect to remain even if every threatened organism becomes extinct. n350 Even the kind of sparse and miserable world depicted in** the movie **Blade Runner could provide a "sustainable" context for the human economy** as long as people forgot their aesthetic and moral commitment to the glory and beauty of the natural world. n351 The Assessment makes this point. "Although any ecosystem contains hundreds to thousands of species interacting among themselves and their physical environment, the emerging consensus is that the system is driven by a small number of . . . biotic variables on whose interactions the balance of species are, in a sense, carried along." n352 [*907] To make up your mind on the question of the functional redundancy of species, consider an endangered species of bird, plant, or insect and ask how the ecosystem would fare in its absence. The fact that the creature is endangered suggests an answer: it is already in limbo as far as ecosystem processes are concerned. **What crucial ecological services does the black-capped vireo, for example, serve? Are any of the species threatened with extinction necessary to the provision of any ecosystem service on which humans depend? If so, which ones are they?** Ecosystems and the species that compose them have changed, dramatically, continually, and

totally in virtually every part of the United States. **There is little ecological similarity, for example, between New England today and the land where the Pilgrims died. n353 In view of the constant reconfiguration of the biota, one may wonder why Americans have not suffered more as a result of ecological catastrophes.** The cast of species in nearly every environment changes constantly-local extinction is commonplace in nature-but the crops still grow. Somehow, it seems, property values keep going up on Martha's Vineyard in spite of the tragic disappearance of the heath hen. **One might argue that the sheer number and variety of creatures available to any ecosystem buffers that system against stress.** Accordingly, we should be concerned if the "library" of creatures ready,

willing, and able to colonize ecosystems gets too small. (Advances in genetic engineering may well permit us to write a large number of additions to that "library.") **In the United States as in many other parts of the world, however, the number of species has been increasing dramatically, not decreasing, as a result of human activity. This is because the hordes of exotic species coming into ecosystems in the United States far exceed the number of species that are becoming extinct.** Indeed, introductions may outnumber extinctions by more than ten to one, so that the United States is becoming more and more species-rich all the time largely as a result of human action. n354 [*908] Peter

Vitousek and colleagues estimate that over 1000 non-native plants grow in California alone; in Hawaii there are 861; in Florida, 1210. n355 In Florida more than 1000 non-native insects, 23 species of mammals, and about 11 exotic birds have established themselves. n356 Anyone who waters a lawn or hoes a garden knows how many weeds desire to grow there, how many birds and bugs visit the yard, and how many fungi, creepy-crawlies, and other odd life forms show forth when it rains. All belong to nature, from wherever they might hail, but not many homeowners would claim that there are too few of them. Now, not all exotic species provide ecosystem services; indeed, some may be disruptive or have no instrumental value. n357 This also may be true, of course, of native species as well, especially because all exotics are native somewhere. Certain exotic species, however, such as Kentucky blue grass, establish an area's sense of identity and place; others, such as the green crabs showing up around Martha's Vineyard, are nuisances. n358 Consider an analogy [*909] with human migration. Everyone knows that after a generation or two, immigrants to this country are hard to distinguish from everyone else. The vast majority of Americans did not evolve here, as it were, from hominids; most of us "came over" at one time or another. This is true of many of our fellow species as well, and they may fit in here just as well as we do. It is possible to distinguish exotic species from native ones for a period of time, just as we can distinguish immigrants from native-born Americans, but as the centuries roll by, species, like people, fit into the landscape or the society, changing and often enriching it. Shall we have a rule that a species had to come over on the Mayflower, as so many did, to count as "truly" American? Plainly not. When, then, is the cutoff date? Insofar as we are concerned with the absolute numbers of "rivets" holding ecosystems together, extinction seems not to pose a general problem because a far greater number of kinds of mammals, insects, fish, plants, and other creatures thrive on land and in water in America today than in prelapsarian times. n359 **The Ecological Society of America has**

urged managers to maintain biological diversity as a critical component in strengthening ecosystems against disturbance. n360 Yet as ^{Simon} Levin observed, "much of the detail about species composition will be irrelevant in terms of influences on ecosystem properties." n361 [*910] He added: "For net primary productivity, as is likely

to be the case for any system property, **biodiversity matters only up to a point; above a certain level, increasing biodiversity is likely to make little difference.**" n362 **What about the use of plants and animals in agriculture? There is no scarcity foreseeable. "Of an estimated 80,000 types of plants [we] know to be edible,"** a U.S. Department of the Interior document says, **"only about 150 are extensively cultivated."** n363 About twenty species, not one of which is

endangered, provide ninety percent of the food the world takes from plants. n364 Any new food has to take "shelf space" or "market share" from one that is now produced. Corporations also find it difficult to create demand for a new product; for example, people are not inclined to eat paw-paws, even though they are delicious. It is hard enough to get people to eat their broccoli and lima beans. It is harder still to develop consumer demand for new foods. This may be the reason the Kraft Corporation does not prospect in remote places for rare and unusual plants and animals to add to the world's diet. Of the roughly 235,000 flowering plants and 325,000 nonflowering plants (including mosses, lichens, and seaweeds) available, farmers ignore virtually all of them in favor of a very few that are profitable. n365 To be sure, any of the more than 600,000 species of plants could have an application in

agriculture, but would they be preferable to the species that are now dominant? **Has anyone found any consumer demand for any of these half-million or more plants to replace rice or wheat in the human diet?**

There are reasons that farmers cultivate rice, wheat, and corn rather than, say, Furbish's lousewort. There are many kinds of louseworts, so named because these weeds were thought to cause lice in sheep. How many does agriculture really require? [*911] The species on which agriculture relies are domesticated, not naturally occurring; they are developed by artificial not natural selection; they might not be able to survive in the wild. n366 This argument is not intended to deny the religious, aesthetic, cultural, and moral reasons that command us to respect and protect the natural world. These spiritual and ethical values should evoke action, of course, but we should also recognize that they are spiritual and ethical values. We should recognize that ecosystems and all that dwell therein compel our moral respect, our aesthetic appreciation, and our spiritual veneration; we should clearly seek to achieve the goals of the ESA. There is no reason to assume, however, that these goals have anything to do with human well-being or welfare as economists understand that term. These are ethical goals, in other words, not economic ones. Protecting the marsh may be the right thing to do for moral, cultural, and spiritual reasons. We should do it-but someone will have to pay the costs. In the narrow sense of promoting human welfare, **protecting nature often represents a net "cost," not a net "benefit." It is largely for moral, not economic, reasons-ethical, not prudential, reasons- that we care about all our fellow creatures.** They are valuable as objects of love not as objects of use. What is good for [*912] the marsh may be good in itself even if it is not, in the economic sense, good for mankind. The most valuable things are quite useless.

A2 oil spills

No impact – ocean current trumps proximity – oil will not reach florida keys – the biological hot spots

Emily A. **Peterson**, Daniel J. **Whittle**, J.D. and Douglas N. **Rader**, Ph.D. December **2012** “Bridging the Gulf, Finding Common Ground on Environmental and Safety Preparedness for Offshore Oil and Gas in Cuba”, http://www.edf.org/sites/default/files/EDF-Bridging_the_Gulf-2012.pdf

In assessing the potential threat to U.S. shores, many often reference that Key West, **Florida is a mere 80 miles from** the Jaguey prospect site where Repsol drilled in **Cuba’s** EEZ, north of Havana, in spring 2012.³⁷ In fact, several **other factors—such as the prevailing ocean current, wind direction and velocity, water temperature, and type of oil spilled—** also **play critical roles in determining the direction and speed of spilled oil.** Thus, **despite the geographic proximity of the** ecologically valuable **Florida Keys to** the rig site in **Cuba, scientists from** the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (**NOAA**) **estimate that the probability of oil traveling from** a potential **blowout at the Repsol rig site to the Florida Keys was comparatively low.**³⁸ Doug **Helton, operations coordinator for** the office of response and restoration at **NOAA, emphasized that the dominance of ocean currents can trump distance in influencing the direction of an oil slick.** “The currents are like a conveyor belt at the grocery store,” he told The Miami Herald.

Oil spill predictions are not accurate

Emily A. **Peterson**, Daniel J. **Whittle**, J.D. and Douglas N. **Rader**, Ph.D. December **2012** “Bridging the Gulf, Finding Common Ground on Environmental and Safety Preparedness for Offshore Oil and Gas in Cuba”, http://www.edf.org/sites/default/files/EDF-Bridging_the_Gulf-2012.pdf

While areas at risk of immediate impact appear to be those along the Straits of Florida and U.S. south Atlantic coast, **scientists are careful to note that the models are far from precise,** authoritative forecasts. NOAA specialists themselves emphasize that the models vary significantly based on weather data and location of the drilling site. **Richard Sears, who served as chief scientific advisor on** the federal commission that investigated the **Deepwater Horizon disaster, stressed there was significant uncertainty in projecting the path of the BP oil slick** in 2010, even with the combined technical expertise of federal agencies and private companies.⁴² “**There were a wide array of models surrounding the BP spill, ranging from** most of the Oil projected to come ashore to **Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and Florida—to a significant portion going out through the Straits of Florida** and up the East Coast towards North Carolina,” Sears said in a personal interview. “**Neither of those happened.**”⁴³ **Sears described the added complexity of estimating the oil’s vertical movement. “There were a lot of surprises** with Macondo about where the oil went,” Sears explained, “not only in two dimensions, but also in terms of three dimensional impacts within the water column.”⁴⁴ Preparing for a potential spill in Cuba’s EEZ highlights the underlying uncertainty in predicting the trajectory of a spill, particularly with regards to possible shoreline impacts and biological threats within the water column and on the seafloor. This lack of predictability reinforces the importance of opening lines of communication and expanding U.S.-Cuban cooperation to ensure that any containment and response strategy would be implemented effectively using the most timely incident updates.

A2 sanctions block US spill assistance

Sanctions won't block US safety response – Helix proves.

Erika **Bolstad** McClatchy Newspapers – May 10, 2012 –

<http://www.mcclatchydc.com/2012/05/10/148433/cuba-embargo-could-threaten-oil.html#.UaoUWpyADq0>

Several of the **experts** said Thursday they **are confident that** the **Treasury** Department **could react quickly in an emergency to allow U.S. oil response teams to get emergency permits to do business with** the Cuban government. **The department**, which oversees the embargo, **has authorized** an American firm, **Helix Energy Solutions, to handle spill response for Repsol**. It's a red-tape ordeal that **company officials said they'll** have to **repeat when working with the other companies that have contracted** to use the same rig next **in Cuban waters.**

China ADV

China 1nc

Multiple alt causes –

A) Political views

Hanson and Lee 13 (Stephanie and Brianna – Council on Foreign Relations, “U.S.-Cuba Relations”, 1/31, <http://www.cfr.org/cuba/us-cuba-relations/p111113>)

What is the main obstacle in U.S.-Cuban relations? A fundamental incompatibility of political views stands in the way of improving U.S.-Cuban relations, experts say. While experts say the United States wants regime change, “the most important objective of the Cuban government is to remain in power at all costs,” says Felix Martin, an assistant professor at Florida International University’s Cuban Research Institute. **Fidel Castro has been an inspiration for Latin American leftists such as Venezuelan President Hugo **Chávez and** Bolivian President Evo **Morales**, who have challenged U.S. policy in the region.**

B) Human Rights, Guantanamo, and Cuban exiles

Hanson and Lee 13 (Stephanie and Brianna – Council on Foreign Relations, “U.S.-Cuba Relations”, 1/31, <http://www.cfr.org/cuba/us-cuba-relations/p111113>)

What are the issues preventing normalization of U.S.-Cuba relations? Experts say these issues include: **Human rights violations**. In March 2003, **the Cuban government arrested seventy-five dissidents and journalists**, sentencing them to prison terms of up to twenty-eight years on charges of **conspiring with the United States** to overthrow the state. The Cuban Commission for Human Rights and National Reconciliation, a Havana-based nongovernmental group, reports that **the government** has in recent years **resorted to other tactics besides** prison --such as firings from state jobs and intimidation on the street-- to silence opposition figures. A 2005 UN Human Rights Commission vote condemned Cuba's human rights record, but the country was elected to the new UN Human Rights Council in 2006. **Guantanamo Bay**. Cuba indicated after 9/11 that it would not object if the United States brought prisoners to Guantanamo Bay. However, **experts** such as Sweig **say Cuban officials have since seized on the U.S. prison camp**--where hundreds of terror suspects have been detained--**as a “symbol of solidarity” with the rest of the world against the United States**. Although Obama ordered Guantanamo to be closed by January 22, 2010, **the facility remains open** as of January 2013, and many analysts say it is likely to stay in operation for an extended period. **Cuban exile community**. **The Cuban-American community** in southern Florida **traditionally has heavily influenced U.S. policy with Cuba. Both political parties fear alienating a strong voting bloc in an important swing state in presidential elections.**

C) The rest of the Embargo – the plan is only a fraction

Hanson 13 (Daniel – economics researcher at the American Enterprise Institute, “It's Time For The U.S. To End Its Senseless Embargo Of Cuba”, 1/16, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/realspin/2013/01/16/its-time-for-the-u-s-to-end-its-senseless-embargo-of-cuba/>)

While the embargo has been through several legal iterations in the intervening years, **the general tenor of the U.S. position toward Cuba is a hardline not-in-my-backyard approach** to communism ala the Monroe Doctrine. **The official position is outdated, hypocritical, and counterproductive**. The Cuban embargo was inaugurated by a Kennedy administration executive order in 1960 as a response to the confiscation of American property in Cuba under the newly installed Castro regime. **The current incarnation of the embargo** – codified primarily in the Helms-Burton Act – **aims at producing free**

markets and representative democracy **in Cuba through economic sanctions, travel restrictions, and international legal penalties.**

Taiwan-China relations are high

Cole 12 -- Taipei-based journalist who focuses on military issues in Northeast Asia and in the Taiwan Strait (J. Michael, 9/3, "Taiwan Hedges its Bets on China," <http://thediplomat.com/flashpoints-blog/2012/09/03/taiwan-hedges-its-bets-against-china/>)

By a number of yardsticks, relations in the Taiwan Strait today are the best they've been in years, if not ever.

But if a report released by Taiwan's Ministry of National Defense (MND) on Friday is any indication, Taiwanese government officials don't appear to be convinced that such détente will last for very long. Without doubt, **the pace of normalization in relations between Taiwan and China,** especially at the economic level, **has accelerated dramatically since Ma**

Ying-jeou of the Chinese Nationalist Party (KMT) **was elected** in 2008, a process that is expected to continue with Ma securing a second four-year term in January. In addition to the landmark Economic Cooperation Framework Agreement (ECFA) signed in June 2010, the governments on both sides have inked at least 16 agreements touching on various aspects of cross-strait relations, including an agreement reached on Friday that will allow banks in Taiwan to clear renminbi transactions, a move that obviates the need for converting the currency into U.S. dollars before a transaction can be made. Beyond trade, **visits to Taiwan by Chinese officials have become almost routine,** a limited **number of Chinese can now study at Taiwan's universities, Chinese tourism to the island has boomed,** and **joint exercises by the countries' respective coast guards are now held every other year** since 2010, mostly for the purpose of sea-rescue operations in the waters off Taiwan's Kinmen and China's Xiamen.

No US-China war – economics

Shor 12 (Francis, Professor of History – Wayne State, "Declining US Hegemony and Rising Chinese Power: A Formula for Conflict?", Perspectives on Global Development and Technology, 11(1), pp. 157-167)

While the United States no longer dominates the global economy as it did during the first two decades after WWII, **it still is the leading economic power in the world. However, over the last few decades China,** with all its internal contradictions, **has made enormous leaps until it now occupies the number two spot.** In fact, the IMF recently projected that the Chinese economy would become the world's largest in 2016. In manufacturing China has displaced the US in so many areas, including becoming the number one producer of steel and exporter of four-fifths of all of the textile products in the world and two-thirds of the world's copy machines, DVD players, and microwaves ovens. Yet, **a significant portion of this manufacturing is still owned by foreign companies, including U.S. firms like General Motors.** [5] On the other hand, **China is also the largest holder of U.S. foreign reserves, e.g. treasury bonds. This may be one of the reasons mitigating full-blown conflict with the U.S. now,** since China has such a large stake in the U.S. economy, both as a holder of bonds and as the leading exporter of goods to the U.S. Nonetheless, "the U.S. has blocked several large scale Chinese investments and buyouts of oil companies, technology firms, and other enterprises." [6] In effect, there are still clear nation-centric responses to China's rising economic power, especially as an expression of the U.S. governing elite's ideological commitment to national security.

Alt Cause – Guantanamo/Human Rights

Guantanamo bay sends a contradictory signal – prevents normalization of relations

Vinke 9 (Kira – Council on Hemispheric Affairs, “Revamping U.S.-Cuban Politics: Playing the Guantánamo Card in a Game of Constructive Diplomacy”, 2009, <http://www.coha.org/revamping-us-cuban-politics-playing-the-guantanamo-card-in-a-game-of-constructive-diplomacy/>)

An Investigative Stronghold: A Diplomatic Catastrophe **U.S. foreign policy towards Cuba has not only been ineffective, but also contradictory. The supposed purpose of the 47-year-old U.S. embargo on Cuba was to “bring democracy to the Cuban people.” However, the U.S. government itself moved suspects from detention camps like the one in Guantánamo to secret prisons** all over the world so as not to be bound by the restraints of a democratic legal system. These actions reveal the inherently duplicitous nature of U.S. policy in this regard. Although President Obama has now signed an order to close Guantánamo within the next year, he has failed to take a “moral high ground” on other American detention centers that have been havens for the U.S. to carry out unlawful, undemocratic practices. For instance, detainees at the Bagram detention center in Afghanistan were recently denied the right to challenge their case before a neutral judge; an outright inconsistency in the U.S.’ so-called restoration of democracy. This makes perfectly clear that effectively reestablishing Washington’s reputation for probity abroad will not end with the closing of the internment camp in Guantánamo. **If Obama is serious about undoing U.S. policy in the course of its war on terror**, and if he wants to again make this country into a law abiding society, **he will have to ensure fair trials for all suspects formerly detained by the U.S. at Guantánamo Bay and then return the military base to Cuba**, marking a clear break with its dark history. **Such a reconstruction of relations would be beneficial for both partners**, economically, politically and socially, especially due to the close geographic proximity of the two nations.

Guantanamo and multiple rights violations impede solvency

Sill No Date (Igor – Merton Fellow who earned his Master's Degree from Oxford University, “Viewpoints: Obama, U.S.-Cuban Relations and Guantanamo Bay”, http://www.fpa.org/topics_info2414/topics_info_show.htm?doc_id=906355)

Guantanamo Bay has resurfaced in the news once again. Once known as a notorious prison for more than 670 US enemy combatants who have been incarcerated, interrogated and some, allegedly tortured over the Bush administration's mandate on the war over global terrorism, its 240 detainees today await relocation as the facility prepares to close operations over the next few months. **Beyond the headlines**, however, **exists a deep history of unresolved issues associated with Guantanamo Bay's U.S. Naval Base**, itself merely the tip of a 47 year political iceberg. **The idea of conceding the base at Guantanamo Bay back to Cuba**, which the U.S. gained control of in the 1903 U.S.-Cuba Pact, has, as of late, **gained traction** in Latin America and throughout the world. **It would certainly stand out as an act of generous goodwill** by the US, and could potentially result in a range of reciprocal positive actions from Cuba. **However**, President **Obama is very well aware of the many complex issues arising** from such a gesture. **There are numerous considerations which Cuba would need to address** and resolve in return for the U.S. conveyance of Guantanamo Bay's facilities to Cuba. **Obama recognizes that Cuba needs to remedy its current policies on human rights**. He also realizes that Cuba will need to find a way to adopt an acceptable version of democracy in order to achieve this stature if Cuba is allowed to re-enter the Organization of American States (OAS), which it actively seeks to do. **There also remains a range of equally important issues including the release of political prisoners; restitution of outstanding Cuban confiscated property claims by former Cubans** now living in the US; **restitution of US Corporate interests and properties** confiscated by Cuba following the revolution; restitution to the families of Brothers to the Rescue over Cuba's fatal downing of two search planes in February of 1996; **and a series of other Cuban governmental misdeeds**.

Alt Cause – Embargo

Removing the whole embargo and lifting all travel restrictions is necessary – the plan is insufficient

CCS 9 (Center for Cuban Studies, “The Latest In U.S. and Cuba Relations “, 5/25, <http://www.cubaupdate.org/cuba-update/us-cuba/117-the-latest-in-us-and-cuba-relations>)

Shortly before the Organization of American States began its summit on the island of Trinidad this past April, **the media reported that the Obama administration had undertaken a significant policy shift in regards to relations with Cuba. It is**

extremely important, however, **to recognize that these changes do not mark an end to the nearly fifty year long trade embargo, nor do they signify and end to the travel restrictions that prevent most U.S. citizens from traveling to Cuba legally.** What this change essentially does is repeal the most extreme measures that tightened the embargo under the administration of George W. Bush, which limited the amount of remittances that Cubans living in the United States could send to the island, and

restricted family visits to once every three years. **While this change in policy is certainly a welcome step in the right direction, the truly necessary change would be a move to end the embargo along with travel**

restrictions for all U.S. citizens, and a normalization of relations between the two countries. The world community's desire for an end to the U.S. imposed trade embargo has been manifested in the form of several successive United Nations resolutions, each of them overwhelmingly in favor of the U.S. changing its policy toward Cuba. Opinion within the United States has shifted as well. Recently, a CNN/Opinion Research Corp. poll revealed that two thirds of U.S. citizens favor ending the travel ban, and that three quarters favor normalized relations between Cuba and the United States. Many members of Congress have also changed their positions. On March 31, 2009, a bi-partisan group of senators introduced a bill, which, if passed, will end the travel ban, allowing for all U.S. citizens to visit the island. Indiana senator Richard Lugar, ranking Republican on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and a sponsor of the bill, has stated that “the unilateral embargo on Cuba has failed to achieve its stated purpose of ‘bringing democracy to the Cuban people.’” U.S. Representative Barbara Lee (D-California), who recently met with both Raúl and Fidel Castro while travelling to Cuba with the Congressional Black Caucus, noted that “we have to remember that every country in Latin America has normal relations with Cuba; we’re the country which is isolated. **Despite these positive recent developments**, however, **there is still resistance to changing Cuba policy** within the U.S. government. The opposition from right wing Cuban-American members of congress is predictable, but it is also important to remember that now Vice President Joe Biden voted for the Helms-Burton Act in 1996, and that Secretary of State Hillary Clinton has stated that she imposes lifting the embargo. Hopefully recent developments will help these officials to reverse their previous positions.

No war – US/China

No China conflict – no military use

Aliison & Blackwill 13 -- *director of the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs and Douglas Dillon Professor at Harvard's John F. Kennedy School of Government AND **Henry A. Kissinger Senior Fellow for U.S. foreign policy at the Council on Foreign Relations (Graham and Robert, 1/28/2013, "Beijing Still Prefers Diplomacy Over Force," <http://www.cfr.org/china/beijing-still-prefers-diplomacy-over-force/p29892>)

As China has become a leading export market for its neighbours, **it expects them to be "more respectful"**, in Mr Lee's words. In public statements, China usually downplays the advantages its size begets, but in a heated moment at a 2010 regional security meeting, its foreign minister had a different message: "China is a big country and other countries are small countries and that is just a fact." Mr Lee has a phrase for this message: "Please know your place." Unlike free-market democracies, in which governments are unable or unwilling to squeeze imports of bananas from the Philippines or cars from Japan, China's government can use its economic muscle. **As tensions mount** over competing claims for contested territories, **should we expect Beijing to use military force** to advance its claims? From the perspective of the grand strategist, **the answer is no** – unless it is provoked by others. **China understands that its growth depends on imports**, including energy, and that it needs open sea lanes. **They are determined to avoid the mistakes made by Germany and Japan**, Mr Lee says. In his view, **it is highly unlikely that China would choose to confront the US military** at this point, **since it is still at a clear technological and military disadvantage**. This means that, in the near term, **it will be more concerned with using diplomacy, not force**, in foreign policy. Henry Kissinger, the western statesman who has spent most quality time with Chinese leaders in the past four decades, offers a complementary perspective. As he has written, **their approach to the outside world is best understood through** the lens of **Sun Tzu**, the ancient strategist who focused on the psychological weaknesses of the adversary. **China seeks its objectives**, Mr Kissinger says, **by careful study, patience** and the accumulation of nuances – **only rarely does China risk a winner-take-all showdown**. In Mr Lee's view, China is playing a long game driven by a compelling vision. "It is China's intention," Mr Lee says, "to be the greatest power in the world." **Success** in that quest **will require** not only sustaining historically unsustainable economic growth rates but also **exercising greater caution and subtlety than it has shown recently, in order to avoid an accident or blunder that sparks military conflict** over the Senkakus, **which would serve no one's interests**.

-- Chinese leadership will pull back

Ross 1 (Robert S., Professor of Political Science – Boston College, The National Interest, Fall, Lexis) The strategic costs to China of a war with the United States are only part of the deterrence equation. **China** also **possesses vital economic interests in stable relations with the United States**. **War would** end China's quest for modernization by **severely constraining its access to U.S. markets, capital and technology**, and by requiring China to place its economy on permanent war-time footing. **The resultant economic reversal would derail China's quest for "comprehensive national power" and great power status**. Serious economic instability would also destabilize China's political system on account of the resulting unemployment in key sectors of the economy and the breakdown of social order. Both would probably impose insurmountable challenges to party leadership. Moreover, defeat in a war with the United States over Taiwan would impose devastating nationalist humiliation on the Chinese Communist Party. **In all, the survival of the party depends on preventing a Sino-American war**.

-- History proves no risk of China war – their cards are all hype

Dyer 9 (Gwynne, Ph.D. in War Studies – University of London and Board of Governors – Canada's Royal Military College, "China Unlikely to Engage in Military Confrontation", Jakarta Post, 4-29, <http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2005/03/12/china-unlikely-engage-military-confrontation.html>)

Given America's monopoly or huge technological lead in key areas like stealth bombers, aircraft carriers, long-range sensors, satellite surveillance and even infantry body armor, **Goss's warning is misleading and self-serving. China cannot project a serious military force** even 200 miles (km) from home, **while American forces utterly dominate China's ocean frontiers**, many thousands of miles (kilometers) from the United States. **But the drumbeat** of warnings about China's "military build-up" **continues**. Just the other week U.S. Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld was worrying again about the expansion of the Chinese navy, which is finally building some amphibious landing ships half a century after Beijing's confrontation with the non-Communist regime on the island of Taiwan began. And Senator Richard Lugar, head of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, warned that if the European Union ends its embargo on arms sales to China, the U.S. would stop military technology sales to Europe. It will come as no surprise, therefore, that the major U.S. defense review planned for this year will concentrate on the rising "threat" from China, or that this year for the first time the joint U.S.-Japanese defense policy statement named China as a "security concern", or that the Taiwan government urged the "military encirclement" of China to prevent any "foreign adventures" by Beijing. It comes as no surprise -- but it still makes no sense. China's defense budget this year is 247.7 billion yuan: Around US\$30 billion at the official exchange rate. There are those in Washington who will say that it's more like \$60 billion in purchasing power, but then there used to be "experts" who annually produced hugely inflated and frightening estimates of the Soviet defense budget. Such people will always exist: to justify a big U.S. defense budget, you need a big threat. It's true that 247.7 billion yuan buys an awful lot of warm bodies in military uniform in the low-wage Chinese economy, but it doesn't actually buy much more in the way of high-tech military systems. It's also true that the Chinese defense budget has grown by double-digit increases for the past fourteen years: This year it's up by 12.6 percent. But that is not significantly faster than the Chinese economy as a whole is growing, and it's about what you have to spend in order to convert what used to be a glorified peasant militia into a modern military force. **It would be astonishing if China chose NOT to modernize its armed forces as** the rest of **the economy modernizes**, and the end result is not going to be a military machine that towers above all others. If you project the current growth rates of military spending in China and the United States into the future, China's defense budget catches up with the United States about the same time that its Gross Domestic Product does, in the late 2030s or the early 2040s. **As to China's strategic intentions, the record of the past is reassuring** in several respects. **China has** almost **never been militarily expansionist beyond the traditional boundaries** of the Middle Kingdom (which do include Tibet in the view of most Chinese), **and** its **border clashes** with India, the Soviet Union and Vietnam in the first decades of Communist rule generally **ended with a voluntary Chinese withdrawal** from the disputed territories. **The same moderation has** usually **applied in nuclear matters**. **The CIA frets that China could have a hundred nuclear missiles targeted on the United States by 2015, but that is actually evidence of China's great restraint**. The first Chinese nuclear weapons test was forty years ago, and by now China could have thousands of nuclear warheads targeted on the U.S. if it wanted. (The United States DOES have thousands of nuclear warheads that can strike Chinese targets.) The **Beijing regime is obsessed with economic stability**, because it fears that a severe downturn would trigger social and political upheaval. **The last thing it wants is a military confrontation with its biggest trading partner**, the United States. **It will go on playing the nationalist card over Taiwan to curry domestic political favor, but there is no massive military build-up and no plausible threat of impending war in East Asia.**

-- US/China war will be limited – no escalation

Record 1 (Dr. Jeffrey, Professor of Strategy and International Security – Air War College and Senior Research Fellow – Center for International Strategy, Technology, and Policy, "Thinking About China and War", Aerospace Power Journal, 12-6,

<http://www.airpower.maxwell.af.mil/airchronicles/apj/apj01/win01/record.html>)

Assuming the absence of mindless escalation to a general nuclear exchange, **a war between China and the United States would be constrained by limited military capacity and political objectives**. For openers, **neither** China nor **the United States is capable of invading** and subjugating **the other**, and even if the United States had the ability to do so, **avoidance of a land war** on the Asian mainland **has long been an injunction of American strategy**. **The objectives of a Sino-American war over Taiwan or freedom of navigation in the South China Sea would be limited—just as they were in the Sino-American war in Korea**. And since the outcome in either case would be decided by naval and air forces, with regular ground forces relegated to a distinctly secondary role, a war over Taiwan or the South China Sea would also be limited in terms of the type of force employed. This was not the case in the Korean War, in which ground combat dominated. (To be sure, the US position on the ground would have been untenable without air dominance.)

No war – US/China – economics check

Economics places multiple checks on conflict

Haixia 12 (Qi, Lecturer at Department of International Relations – Tsinghua University, “Football Game Rather Than Boxing Match: China–US Intensifying Rivalry Does not Amount to Cold War,” Chinese Journal of International Politics, 5(2), Summer, p. 105-127, <http://cjip.oxfordjournals.org/content/5/2/105.full>)

Economic globalization created a strategic need for superficial friendship between China and the United States. While scholars disagree over exactly when economic globalization began, all agree that it sped up after the end of the Cold War. This is because the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance ended after the collapse of the Soviet Union, resulting in a global market. Meanwhile, the pace of information-flow increased among states, shrinking the size of the globe and leading to popularization of the expression ‘global village’. Levels of interdependence have increased along with the growing proximity of international economic relations. That a strategy of complete confrontation can no longer effectively protect national interests is now obvious. It is for this reason that certain scholars argue that there has been a qualitative change in the nature of the security dilemma since end of the Cold War.³⁵ **Under the conditions of globalization, interdependence between China and the United States has continued to grow, and for the sake of economic interests, neither is willing to adopt a strategy of all-out**

confrontation. Economic interdependence, however, will not diffuse the political and security conflicts between the two states. Different interests in different spheres have thus created a foundation for superficial friendship between the United States and China. **Involvement in the globalization process has rapidly expanded China's involvement in international organizations in ever-growing fields, within many of which China accepts West-led international norms.**³⁶ The country has thus shifted from ‘opposing the international order’ to ‘reforming the international order’ to ‘maintaining the international order’.³⁷ **Globalization has changed not only China's but also United States’ behavioral principles. The growth of Sino–US economic interdependence has prompted the United States’ adoption of a two-pronged policy of military and political containment and of economic engagement. Its aim is to reduce the risk of a head-on conflict that could considerably damage United States’ interests.** These contradictory strands of US policy towards China are an indicator of superficial friendship. Under the context of economic globalization, **China has also developed economic interdependence with United States’ allies. This has reduced incentives to participate in containment of China and also dampened United States’ resolve to maintain a policy of complete containment.** As a result, certain scholars argue that **enhanced levels of interdependence among China and other nations have diminished the probability of China's opting to rise through forceful expansion.**³⁹

No war – China/Taiwan – relations resilient

Cross-strait relations better than ever – no conflict

Paal 12 -- vice president for studies at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (Douglas, 6/12, "Taiwan: Outlook for Cross-Strait Relations," <http://carnegieendowment.org/2012/06/12/taiwan-outlook-for-cross-strait-relations/bkih>)

With the inauguration of Taiwan President Ma Ying-jeou for his second and final four-year term in May, **cross-strait relations appear more stable than they have been in more than sixty years**. That does not mean, however, that observers should expect further big steps to improve relations between Taipei and Beijing. We are entering an era of limited aspirations and restrained expectations. On the home front, by contrast, Ma announced in his inaugural address an ambitious reform program that is already encountering some stiff resistance. Ma repeated his campaign promise calling for a "golden decade" built on five pillars of reform: economic transformation, creating employment and realizing social justice, green energy, invigorating culture, and development of Taiwan's most important resource, its human talent. In cross-strait relations, the outlook is only for incremental improvements. **Taiwan expects to expand its preferential trade arrangements with the mainland**, establish representative offices on the mainland and Taiwan to manage relations, complete an investment protection agreement, expand educational opportunities in both directions, and advance cooperation against crime. Despite their limited scope, these will be politically sensitive and tricky to implement without triggering negative reactions.