Nuclear war destroys the ozone layer

Martin 82

[Brian Martin professor of social sciences at the University of Wollongong Journal of Peace Research, 1982, http://www.uow.edu.au/arts/sts/bmartin/pubs/82jpr.html]

(b) Ozone. Nuclear war would cause an increase in ultraviolet light from the sun which reaches the earth's surface, due to reductions in stratospheric ozone caused by its catalytic destruction by nitrogen oxides produced in nuclear explosions. This would increase the incidence of skin cancer (which is mostly non-lethal) and possibly alter agricultural productivity, but would be most unlikely to cause widespread death.[7]

**Economic decline emboldens adversaries --- causes Iran and North Korea to become aggressive**

**Green and Schrage ‘9** (Michael J Green is Senior Advisor and Japan Chair at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) and Associate Professor at Georgetown University, Steven P Schrage is the CSIS Scholl Chair in International Business and a former senior official with the US Trade Representative's Office, State Department and Ways & Means Committee, March 26, “It’s Not Just the Economy, Asia Times, http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Asian\_Economy/KC26Dk01.html)

Dangerous states It is noteworthy that North Korea, Myanmar and Iran have all intensified their defiance in the wake of the financial crisis, which has distracted the world's leading nations, limited their moral authority and sown potential discord. With Beijing worried about the potential impact of North Korean belligerence or instability on Chinese internal stability, and leaders in Japan and South Korea under siege in parliament because of the collapse of their stock markets, leaders in the North Korean capital of Pyongyang have grown increasingly boisterous about their country's claims to great power status as a nuclear weapons state. The junta in Myanmar has chosen this moment to arrest hundreds of political dissidents and thumb its nose at fellow members of the 10-country Association of Southeast Asian Nations. Iran continues its nuclear program while exploiting differences between the US, UK and France (or the P-3 group) and China and Russia - differences that could become more pronounced if economic friction with Beijing or Russia crowds out cooperation or if Western European governments grow nervous about sanctions as a tool of policy. It is possible that the economic downturn will make these dangerous states more pliable because of falling fuel prices (Iran) and greater need for foreign aid (North Korea and Myanmar), but that may depend on the extent that authoritarian leaders care about the well-being of their people or face internal political pressures linked to the economy. So far, there is little evidence to suggest either and much evidence to suggest these dangerous states see an opportunity to advance their asymmetrical advantages against the international system.

# 1NC

### 1NC – Kritik

The 1AC’s Orthodox IR’s atomistic approach to global problems makes extinction inevitable

Ahmed 12 Dr. Nafeez Mosaddeq Ahmed is Executive Director of the Institute for Policy Research and Development (IPRD), an independent think tank focused on the study of violent conflict, he has taught at the Department of International Relations, University of Sussex "The international relations of crisis and the crisis of international relations: from the securitisation of scarcity to the militarisation of society" Global Change, Peace & Security Volume 23, Issue 3, 2011 Taylor Francis 3. From securitisation to militarisation 3.1 Complicity

This analysis thus calls for a broader approach to environmental security based on retrieving the manner in which political actors construct discourses of 'scarcity' in response to ecological, energy and economic crises (critical security studies) in the context of the historically-specific socio-political and geopolitical relations of domination by which their power is constituted, and which are often implicated in the acceleration of these very crises (historical sociology and historical materialism). Instead, both realist and liberal orthodox IR approaches focus on different aspects of interstate behaviour, conflictual and cooperative respectively, but each lacks the capacity to grasp that the unsustainable trajectory of state and inter-state behaviour is only explicable in the context of a wider global system concurrently over-exploiting the biophysical environment in which it is embedded. They are, in other words, unable to address the relationship of the inter-state system itself to the biophysical environment as a key analytical category for understanding the acceleration of global crises. They simultaneously therefore cannot recognise the embeddedness of the economy in society and the concomitant politically-constituted nature of economics. Hence, they neglect the profound irrationality of collective state behaviour, which systematically erodes this relationship, globalising insecurity on a massive scale - in the very process of seeking security.85 In Cox's words, because positivist IR theory 'does not question the present order [it instead] has the effect of legitimising and reifying it'.86 Orthodox IR sanitises globally-destructive collective inter-state behaviour as a normal function of instrumental reason -thus rationalising what are clearly deeply irrational collective human actions that threaten to permanently erode state power and security by destroying the very conditions of human existence. Indeed, the prevalence of orthodox IR as a body of disciplinary beliefs, norms and prescriptions organically conjoined with actual policy-making in the international system highlights the extent to which both realism and liberalism are ideologically implicated in the acceleration of global systemic crises. By the same token, the incapacity to recognise and critically interrogate how prevailing social, political and economic structures are driving global crisis acceleration has led to the proliferation of symptom-led solutions focused on the expansion of state/regime military-political power rather than any attempt to transform root structural causes.88 It is in this context that, as the prospects for meaningful reform through inter-state cooperation appear increasingly nullified under the pressure of actors with a vested interest in sustaining prevailing geopolitical and economic structures, states have resorted progressively more to militarised responses designed to protect the concurrent structure of the international system from dangerous new threats. In effect, the failure of orthodox approaches to accurately diagnose global crises, directly accentuates a tendency to 'securitise' them - and this, ironically, fuels the proliferation of violent conflict and militarisation responsible for magnified global insecurity. 'Securitisation' refers to a 'speech act' - an act of labelling - whereby political authorities identify particular issues or incidents as an existential threat which, because of their extreme nature, justify going beyond the normal security measures that are within the rule of law. It thus legitimises resort to special extra-legal powers. By labelling issues a matter of 'security', therefore, states are able to move them outside the remit of democratic decision-making and into the realm of emergency powers, all in the name of survival itself. Far from representing a mere aberration from democratic state practice, this discloses a deeper 'dual' structure of the state in its institutionalisation of the capacity to mobilise extraordinary extra-legal military-police measures in purported response to an existential danger. The problem in the context of global ecological, economic and energy crises is that such levels of emergency mobilisation and militarisation have no positive impact on the very global crises generating 'new security challenges', and are thus entirely disproportionate.90 All that remains to examine is on the 'surface' of the international system (geopolitical competition, the balance of power, international regimes, globalisation and so on), phenomena which are dislocated from their structural causes by way of being unable to recognise the biophysically-embedded and politically-constituted social relations of which they are comprised. The consequence is that orthodox IR has no means of responding to global systemic crises other than to reduce them to their symptoms. Indeed, orthodox IR theory has largely responded to global systemic crises not with new theory, but with the expanded application of existing theory to 'new security challenges' such as 'low-intensity' intra-state conflicts; inequality and poverty; environmental degradation; international criminal activities including drugs and arms trafficking; proliferation of weapons of mass destruction; and international terrorism.91 Although the majority of such 'new security challenges' are non-military in origin - whether their referents are states or individuals - the inadequacy of systemic theoretical frameworks to diagnose them means they are primarily examined through the lenses of military-political power.92 In other words, the escalation of global ecological, energy and economic crises is recognised not as evidence that the current organisation of the global political economy is fundamentally unsustainable, requiring urgent transformation, but as vindicating the necessity for states to radicalise the exertion of their military-political capacities to maintain existing power structures, to keep the lid on.93 Global crises are thus viewed as amplifying factors that could mobilise the popular will in ways that challenge existing political and economic structures, which it is presumed (given that state power itself is constituted by these structures) deserve protection. This justifies the state's adoption of extra-legal measures outside the normal sphere of democratic politics. In the context of global crisis impacts, this counter-democratic trend-line can result in a growing propensity to problematise potentially recalcitrant populations - rationalising violence toward them as a control mechanism. Consequently, for the most part, the policy implications of orthodox IR approaches involve a redundant conceptualisation of global systemic crises purely as potential 'threat-multipliers' of traditional security issues such as 'political instability around the world, the collapse of governments and the creation of terrorist safe havens'. Climate change will serve to amplify the threat of international terrorism, particularly in regions with large populations and scarce resources. The US Army, for instance, depicts climate change as a 'stress-multiplier' that will 'exacerbate tensions' and 'complicate American foreign policy'; while the EU perceives it as a 'threat-multiplier which exacerbates existing trends, tensions and instability'.95 In practice, this generates an excessive preoccupation not with the causes of global crisis acceleration and how to ameliorate them through structural transformation, but with their purportedly inevitable impacts, and how to prepare for them by controlling problematic populations. Paradoxically, this 'securitisation' of global crises does not render us safer. Instead, by necessitating more violence, while inhibiting preventive action, it guarantees greater insecurity. Thus, a recent US Department of Defense report explores the future of international conflict up to 2050. It warns of 'resource competition induced by growing populations and expanding economies', particularly due to a projected 'youth bulge' in the South, which 'will consume ever increasing amounts of food, water and energy'. This will prompt a 'return to traditional security threats posed by emerging near-peers as we compete globally for depleting natural resources and overseas markets'. Finally, climate change will 'compound' these stressors by generating humanitarian crises, population migrations and other complex emergencies.96 A similar study by the US Joint Forces Command draws attention to the danger of global energy depletion through to 2030. Warning of ‘the dangerous vulnerabilities the growing energy crisis presents’, the report concludes that ‘The implications for future conflict are ominous.’97 Once again, the subject turns to demographics: ‘In total, the world will add approximately 60 million people each year and reach a total of 8 billion by the 2030s’, 95 per cent accruing to developing countries, while populations in developed countries slow or decline. ‘Regions such as the Middle East and Sub-Saharan Africa, where the youth bulge will reach over 50% of the population, will possess fewer inhibitions about engaging in conflict.’98 The assumption is that regions which happen to be both energy-rich and Muslim-majority will also be sites of violent conflict due to their rapidly growing populations. A British Ministry of Defence report concurs with this assessment, highlighting an inevitable ‘youth bulge’ by 2035, with some 87 per cent of all people under the age of 25 inhabiting developing countries. In particular, the Middle East population will increase by 132 per cent and sub-Saharan Africa by 81 per cent. Growing resentment due to ‘endemic unemployment’ will be channelled through ‘political militancy, including radical political Islam whose concept of Umma, the global Islamic community, and resistance to capitalism may lie uneasily in an international system based on nation-states and global market forces’. More strangely, predicting an intensifying global divide between a super-rich elite, the middle classes and an urban under-class, the report warns: ‘The world’s middle classes might unite, using access to knowledge, resources and skills to shape transnational processes in their own class interest.’99 Thus, the securitisation of global crisis leads not only to the problematisation of particular religious and ethnic groups in foreign regions of geopolitical interest, but potentially extends this problematisation to any social group which might challenge prevailing global political economic structures across racial, national and class lines. The previous examples illustrate how secur-itisation paradoxically generates insecurity by reifying a process of militarization against social groups that are constructed as external to the prevailing geopolitical and economic order. In other words, the internal reductionism, fragmentation and compartmentalisation that plagues orthodox theory and policy reproduces precisely these characteristics by externalising global crises from one another, externalising states from one another, externalising the inter-state system from its biophysical environment, and externalising new social groups as dangerous 'outsiders\*. Hence, a simple discursive analysis of state militarisation and the construction of new "outsider\* identities is insufficient to understand the causal dynamics driving the process of 'Otherisation'. As Doug Stokes points out, the Western state preoccupation with the ongoing military struggle against international terrorism reveals an underlying 'discursive complex", where representations about terrorism and non-Western populations are premised on 'the construction of stark boundaries\* that 'operate to exclude and include\*. Yet these exclusionary discourses are 'intimately bound up with political and economic processes', such as strategic interests in proliferating military bases in the Middle East, economic interests in control of oil, and the wider political goal of 'maintaining American hegemony\* by dominating a resource-rich region critical for global capitalism.100 But even this does not go far enough, for arguably the construction of certain hegemonic discourses is mutually constituted by these geopolitical, strategic and economic interests — exclusionary discourses are politically constituted. New conceptual developments in genocide studies throw further light on this in terms of the concrete socio-political dynamics of securitisation processes. It is now widely recognised, for instance, that the distinguishing criterion of genocide is not the pre-existence of primordial groups, one of which destroys the other on the basis of a preeminence in bureaucratic military-political power. Rather, genocide is the intentional attempt to destroy a particular social group that has been socially constructed as different. As Hinton observes, genocides precisely constitute a process of 'othering\* in which an imagined community becomes reshaped so that previously 'included\* groups become 'ideologically recast' and dehumanised as threatening and dangerous outsiders, be it along ethnic, religious, political or economic lines — eventually legitimising their annihilation.102 In other words, genocidal violence is inherently rooted in a prior and ongoing ideological process, whereby exclusionary group categories are innovated, constructed and 'Otherised' in accordance with a specific socio-political programme. The very process of identifying and classifying particular groups as outside the boundaries of an imagined community of 'inclusion\*, justifying exculpatory violence toward them, is itself a political act without which genocide would be impossible.1 3 This recalls Lemkin's recognition that the intention to destroy a group is integrally connected with a wider socio-political project - or colonial project — designed to perpetuate the political, economic, cultural and ideological relations of the perpetrators in the place of that of the victims, by interrupting or eradicating their means of social reproduction. Only by interrogating the dynamic and origins of this programme to uncover the social relations from which that programme derives can the emergence of genocidal intent become explicable. Building on this insight, Semelin demonstrates that the process of exclusionary social group construction invariably derives from political processes emerging from deep-seated sociopolitical crises that undermine the prevailing framework of civil order and social norms; and which can, for one social group, be seemingly resolved by projecting anxieties onto a new 'outsider' group deemed to be somehow responsible for crisis conditions. It is in this context that various forms of mass violence, which may or may not eventually culminate in actual genocide, can become legitimised as contributing to the resolution of crises.105

Reject the affirmatives securitized discourse – rejection of securitized rhetoric is necessary to foster change

Lal 8 (Prerna P. Lal, J.D. in law, freelance writer, “Deconstructing the National Security State: Towards a New Framework of Analysis,” POSC 4910: Senior Seminar, <http://prernalal.com/wp-content/uploads/2008/10/css-deconstructing-the-nat-sec-state.pdf> , KENTUCKY)

Critical theory does not offer simple one-shot solutions to the problems created by the neo-realist state and elitist conception of security. To give simple answers would be a performativity contradiction, especially after criticizing realism for being intellectually rigid for believing in objective truth. In other words, there are no alternatives; just alternative modes of understanding. However, using the poststructuralist Foucaultian analysis that discourse is power, we can move towards deconstructing the power of the state and elites to securitize using their own tool: discourse. The elites who control the meaning of security and define it in terms that are appropriate to their interests hold tremendous power in the national security state. As Foucault astutely observed, “the exercise of power is always deeply entwined with the production of knowledge and discourse” (Dalby 1998, 4). For too long, language has been used against us to create our reality, thereby obfuscating our lens of the world, depriving us from an objective search for truth and knowledge. The history of colonized people shows how the construction of language defined and justified their oppressed status. In a way, we are colonized through discursive practices and subjected to the reality that the state wants us to see. However, definitions belong to the definer, and it is high time that we questioned and defined our own reality. Thus, citizen action is critical to questioning and deconstructing the national security state and taking away its power to define our security. In On Security, Pearl Alice Marsh (1995, 126) advances the idea of a grassroots statecraft that is defined as “challenging foreign policy of government through contending discursive and speech acts.” This calls for pitting the values of civil society against the state establishment and challenging the American statecraft’s freedom to cast issues and events in a security or militarized framework. The United States has not always been a national security state and neither does it have to maintain that hegemonic and oppressive status in order to exist. It is critical to remember that fundamental changes in our institutions and structures of power do not occur from the top; they originate from the bottom. History is case in point. Citizen action was critical to ending the Red Scare and the Vietnam War, as the American people realized the ludicrousness of framing Vietnam as a security issue, which led to the fall of the Second New Deal, the deaths of thousands of American soldiers and a financial cost that we are still shouldering. In the end, what they need to be secured from and how, is a question best left up to individual Americans and subsequently, civil society. Thus, grassroots citizen action performatively makes individuals the referent subject of security as people would call for the demilitarization and desecuritization of issues that are contrary and irrelevant to human security. There is hope for the future and practical application of critical theory ininternational relations. As Robert Lipschutz (2000, 61) concludes in After Authority:War, Peace, and Global Politics in the 21st Century, “it was the existence of the Otheracross the border that gave national security its power and authority; it is thedisappearance of the border that has vanquished that power.” Britain, France andGermany set aside their historical enmities and became part of a European community,which has formed a new collective identity and security across borders. Cold War rivals that almost annihilated the world are now friends in the “war against terror.” The apartheid regime in South Africa did collapse eventually. In the past two years, India and Pakistan have been moving towards a more peaceful future that also includes fighting the “war against terror” together. While nation-states that were previously hostile to each other have united to be hostile towards other states, it is not overly idealist to suggest that with each new friendship and alliance, there is one less foe and one less Other. The world is not stable and stagnant, existing in an anarchic, nasty and brutish framework in which states have to endlessly bargain for their self-interest, as realists would like us to believe.On the contrary, international relations and the boundaries constructed by the state are subject to change and ever-transitioning, which presents a compelling case for critical theory as a more realistic framework through which we can view international relations.Therefore, our ultimate search for security does not lie in securing the state from the threat of the enemy across the border, but in removing the state as the referent object of security and moving towards human emancipation.

### 1NC – Counterplan

#### Text – United States federal government should lift the moratorium on oil and natural gas drilling in the Outer Continental Shelf’s Alaska region and offer to jointly drill in the Alaska region with Petróleos Mexicanos.

#### Solves energy independence and the US economy – Arctic has enough energy resources

Cunningham, Policy Analyst for Energy and Climate at the American Security Project, 2012 (Nicholas, August, “Offshore Oil Drilling in the Arctic” http://americansecurityproject.org/ASP%20Reports/Ref%200076%20-%20Offshore%20Oil%20Drilling%20in%20the%20Arctic.pdf)

The Arctic region represents the next frontier for oil and gas development. The U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) predicts that the Arctic region surrounding Alaska has huge deposits of technically recoverable crude oil. Estimates of crude oil reach as high as 29.96 billion barrels near Alaska compared to a total estimate of 89.98 billion barrels for the entire Arctic region as a whole.2 This means the waters surrounding Alaska hold about 33% of all technically recoverable oil in the Arctic, the largest of any other Arctic country. The technically recoverable reserves in Alaska also represent about one third of the total technically recoverable reserves on the U.S. outer continental shelf.

#### PEMEX has set up a new partner company for exactly this purpose – solves expertise and tech-sharing

De Cordoba and Iliff, Wall Street Journal, 8-18-’13 (Jose and Lawrence, “Mexico's Pemex Looks to Tap U.S. Shale” http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887323608504579020791384328888.html)

Petroleos Mexicanos, Mexico's state oil monopoly, will set up a new company to explore and produce shale gas and deep-water oil in the U.S. as part of an ambitious plan by its rookie CEO to turn around years of falling production. The proposal, outlined by Chief Executive Emilio Lozoya in an interview, would push Pemex into complicated drilling techniques where it has no experience. It is a bold move abroad for the inward-looking company, which is the world's fifth-largest crude producer but has never faced competition nor ventured far beyond its borders. "Pemex will be starting a new company that will work on the shale-gas and shale-oil fields in the U.S. and in the deep-water side of the U.S.," said Mr. Lozoya, a 38-year-old former investment banker tapped last year by Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto to run the oil giant. "The geology is similar and we can benefit from numerous areas of collaboration with international oil companies." The move dovetails with the energy-overhaul proposed last week by Mr. Peña Nieto that will allow private companies to share in oil profits for the first time in 75 years. The legislation aims to reverse a slide in Mexico's energy production and open up largely untapped oil and gas fields in deep waters off the Gulf of Mexico and in shale-rock formations, both areas where oil majors have seen a boom while Pemex has sat on the sidelines. Analysts say the baby-faced Mr. Lozoya faces a difficult challenge in remaking Pemex. It is considered by experts to be inefficient, and its only venture outside of Mexico is a joint-venture refinery with Shell Oil Co. in Texas. "You remember the myth of Sisyphus?" asks George Grayson, a Mexico expert at the College of William and Mary in Virginia. "Pemex is a big stone that directors of the company keep pushing up the hill." Nevertheless it makes sense for Pemex to start a "creative joint venture" with an international partner, especially in deep-water exploration and production where Pemex has no experience, Mr. Grayson said. Mr. Lozoya said the new company should be created by the end of the year and will represent Pemex's first step in its quest to eventually become an international oil company. "We are already exploring numerous projects," said Mr. Lozoya, speaking in his office at Pemex headquarters. Pemex is setting up a fertilizer division to begin operations by the end of next year and exploit cheap natural-gas supplies, said Mr. Lozoya. The U.S. government and many experts put Mexico's potential shale-rock resources at the fourth-largest in the world. Pemex has been the embodiment of Mexico's nationalism since the country nationalized private oil companies in 1938. But for years, the company has been plagued by corruption scandals, deadly industrial accidents, failing production and rising costs. Its union, controlled by wealthy bosses, has played a key role in Mexican politics, financing political campaigns mostly for Mr. Peña Nieto's Institutional Revolutionary Party, or PRI, which has ruled Mexico for 71 of the last 83 years. In the past decade, Mexico's oil production has fallen from a high of 3.4 million barrels per day to 2.5 million barrels even as Mexico has quintupled investment spending in Pemex to $20 billion. Even as production has plummeted, employment in the state oil giant has soared, rising to 160,000 employees from about 110,000. "There's a contradiction in that," Mr. Lozoya, acknowledges, referring to the growth in employee numbers. The son of a former energy minister, Mr. Lozoya has no prior experience in the energy field. He holds a master's degree in economic development from Harvard. Before his appointment as Pemex president, Mr. Lozoya managed investment funds in New York. Previously, he was regional director for Latin America with the World Economic Forum. In the interview, Mr. Lozoya treaded lightly around the issue of Pemex's notorious featherbedding. "We believe that in the next years the industry and also Pemex will grow substantially and we will need the best human capital," he said. Workers recently received a pay hike. The union's president, Carlos Romero Deschamps, whose family's lavish displays of wealth have been a constant topic in the Mexican media, is a senator in the ruling PRI party. Mr. Grayson believes one reason for the government's generous treatment of the union is that it fears labor unrest in the oil fields could be fanned by leftist leader Andrés Manuel López Obrador and could cause problems for the reform program. For Mr. Lozoya, the inefficiency that permeates Pemex has a silver lining in that it provides plenty of opportunities to implement more efficient practices that he says will result in billions of dollars both in savings and business opportunities for Pemex, private Mexican companies as well as Mexican consumers. "Pemex lags behind in so many areas of efficient management, that the areas of opportunity to create value just from efficiencies are huge," he said. For instance, he said, there is only one airport in the country—Mexico City's international airport—which receives jet fuel by pipeline. All the other airports in the country receive jet fuel by truck—a process that Mr. Lozoya says is 13 times more expensive than piping fuel. Aside from cost-cutting, there are business opportunities as well. Finishing a gas pipeline from the Gulf of Mexico to the Pacific Ocean will provide Mexico the opportunity to sell natural gas to Asia at a big profit while providing cheap energy to Mexican industry in the country's economically backwards southwest. Currently, Mexico is a net importer of natural gas, and Pemex has suffered critical shortages in its gas pipelines, forcing industry to cut back on its use. That's among the reasons why analysts say that Mexico either passes an oil-industry overhaul that is attractive to oil majors, or becomes a net hydrocarbon importer in coming years. "The energy reform is no longer about extracting cheap oil and selling it expensively," Mr. Lozoya said. "It offers our country a unique opportunity to produce competitive and abundant energy." Mr. Lozoya said he was determined to make Pemex into a more competitive and transparent company, a process that if history is a guide, should sharply increase Mexico's oil production. The reform of state-owned oil companies in Colombia and Brazil, for instance, has doubled and tripled the respective oil production of the two countries, he said. Mexico can draw on the experiences of other countries. "Being the last country in the world to modernize its energy sector has its advantages," he said.

### 1NC – Disad

#### Natural gas production decreasing in the Gulf

**EIA, 6/20 –** (EIA, short term energy outlook. June 20, 2013. “Natural gas production declines in the GOM strong on the mainland,” <http://www.cattlenetwork.com/cattle-news/212212781.html)//SDL>

Natural gas marketed production is projected to increase from 69.2 Bcf/d in 2012 to 70.0 Bcf/d in 2013, and to 70.4 Bcf/d in 2014. Onshore production increases over the forecast period, while federal Gulf of Mexico production declines. Natural gas pipeline gross imports, which have fallen over the past five years, are projected to remain near their 2012 level over the forecast. LNG imports are expected to remain at minimal levels of around 0.4 Bcf/d in both 2013 and 2014.¶ Mexico's domestic natural gas consumption is rising faster than domestic production, leading to both record pipeline gas imports from the United States and growth in the country's imports of liquefied natural gas (LNG). Natural gas trade between Mexico and the United States has been growing; daily net exports from the United States to Mexico so far in 2013 (January 1-May 6) are estimated to average 1.6 billion cubic feet per day (Bcf/d), up almost 29 percent over the same period in 2012.¶ The NOAA Atlantic Hurricane Season Outlook predicts that the Atlantic Basin likely will experience above-normal tropical weather activity during the current hurricane season. EIA estimates that the median outcome for shut-in natural gas production in the federally administered Gulf of Mexico as a result of disruptions during the 2013 hurricane season is 46 Bcf (see the 2013 Outlook for Hurricane-Related Production Outages in the Gulf of Mexico). EIA's simulation results indicate a 58-percent probability of offshore natural gas production experiencing outages during the current hurricane season that are equal to or larger than the 32 Bcf of production shut in during the 2012 hurricane season.

#### Plan increases natural gas exports

Snow, 13 – (Nick Snow, OGJ Washington Editor. June 7, 2013. “Witnesses describe benefits from expanding OCS activity,” http://www.ogj.com/articles/2013/06/witnesses-describe-benefits-from-expanding-ocs-activity.html)//SDL

Expanded oil and gas activity on the US Outer Continental Shelf would produce substantial economic and energy security benefits, three witnesses told a US House Natural Resources subcommittee. But a fourth witness said alternative energy and other offshore industries should also be allowed to grow.¶ Most of the witnesses at the Energy and Minerals Subcommittee’s June 6 hearing applauded the goals of HR 2231, which US Rep. Doc Hastings (R-Wash.), the full committee’s chairman, introduced on June 4. The measure would expand federal offshore oil and gas leasing beyond areas that are part of the 2012-17 OCS program.¶ “It would safely open up new areas that were previously under moratoria—such as the Mid-Atlantic, Southern Pacific, and Arctic,” Hastings said in his opening statement. “This would create over a million new American jobs and generate hundreds of millions of dollars in new revenue to the federal treasury.”¶ John C. Felmy, American Petroleum Institute chief economist, testified, “If offshore energy production were extended to new areas, it could generate a bounty of job creation and new revenues to the government while improving America’s energy security.”¶ He added, “Earlier this year, a single lease sale in the Gulf of Mexico generated $1.2 billion in revenue for the federal government. As wells are drilled and the leases begin to produce, the revenue impact will only grow, along with the prospects for employment in the region and around the country.”¶ Christopher Guith, vice-president for policy at the US Chamber of Commerce’s Institute for 21st Century Energy, said in his written statement that HR 2231 is necessary because more than 86% of the US OCS is presently off-limits to oil and gas activity.¶ Systematic increase¶ “By increasing access to the OCS and establishing long-term production targets for the [US} Department of the Interior to plan around when formulating oil and gas leasing programs, the country can begin to systematically increase its energy security and reap the economic benefits that entails,” Guith suggested in his written testimony.

**Increased natural gas exports displaces Russia, crushing their economy**

**Ratner, 13** (Michael Ratner, Specialist in Energy Policy. April 8, 2013. “U.S. Natural Gas Exports:

New Opportunities, Uncertain Outcomes”, http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R42074.pdf)//SDL

Many of the projected projects in Figure 5 are targeting the Asian LNG demand centers. Although the locations of most of the proposed U.S. export terminals are on the U.S. Gulf Coast and the East Coast, Asia may be the target market for U.S. LNG as it tends to pay higher prices for its natural gas imports. The widening of the Panama Canal, scheduled to be completed in 2015, would contribute to U.S. competitiveness in Asia. Europe has a lot of LNG import capacity U.S. Natural Gas Exports: New Opportunities, Uncertain Outcomes Congressional Research Service 12 and growing demand, but needs to continue to improve its infrastructure connections to transport gas to markets.18 Russia, the main supplier of natural gas to Europe, may be put under increasing pressure by U.S. export projects to further delink its natural gas prices from oil. U.S. LNG exports could also provide options for some countries that are highly dependent on one supplier

#### Russian economic decline causes nuclear war

**Filger 9** (Sheldon, Author – Huffington Post, “Russian Economy Faces Disastrous Free Fall Contraction”, <http://www.globaleconomiccrisis.com/blog/archives/356>)

**In Russia**, historically, **economic** health **and** political **stability are intertwined** to a degree that is rarely encountered in other major industrialized economies. It was the economic stagnation of the former Soviet Union that led to its political downfall. Similarly, Medvedev and Putin, both intimately acquainted with their nation's history, are unquestionably alarmed at the prospect that Russia's economic crisis will endanger the nation's political stability, achieved at great cost after years of chaos following the demise of the Soviet Union. Already, strikes and protests are occurring among rank and file workers facing unemployment or non-payment of their salaries. Recent polling demonstrates that the once supreme popularity ratings of Putin and Medvedev are eroding rapidly. Beyond the political elites are the financial oligarchs, who have been forced to deleverage, even unloading their yachts and executive jets in a desperate attempt to raise cash. Should the Russian economy deteriorate to the point where economic collapse is not out of the question, the impact will go far beyond the obvious accelerant such an outcome would be for the Global Economic Crisis. There is a geopolitical dimension that is even more relevant then the economic context. Despite its economic vulnerabilities and perceived decline from superpower status, Russia remains one of only two nations on earth with a nuclear arsenal of sufficient scope and capability to destroy the world as we know it. For that reason, it is not only President Medvedev and Prime Minister Putin who will be lying awake at nights over the prospect that a national economic crisis can transform itself into a virulent and destabilizing social and political upheaval. It just may be possible that U.S. President Barack Obama's national security team has already briefed him about the consequences of a major economic meltdown in Russia for the peace of the world. After all, the most recent national intelligence estimates put out by the U.S. intelligence community have already concluded that the Global Economic Crisis represents the greatest national security threat to the United States, due to its facilitating political instability in the world. During the years Boris Yeltsin ruled Russia, security forces responsible for guarding the nation's nuclear arsenal went without pay for months at a time, leading to fears that **desperate personnel would** illicitly **sell nuclear weapons to terrorist organizations**. If the current economic crisis in Russia were to deteriorate much further, how secure would the Russian nuclear arsenal remain? It may be that the financial impact of the Global Economic Crisis is its least dangerous consequence.

### 1NC – Disad

#### **Exports prove improving bilat – only the US can change the squo**

Jingjie 4/9 – Yang Jingjie, Reporter for The Global Times, (“Increase in Mexican oil exports indicates thawing ties”, 4/9/13, <http://www.globaltimes.cn/content/773515.shtml#.Ugq3o2Qadkw>, AW)

Observers say Mexican state oil company Pemex's decision to significantly boost oil exports to China will help optimize the imbalanced bilateral trade structure and indicates thawing ties following their leadership transitions. On the sidelines of the Boao Forum for Asia on Saturday, Pemex Chief Executive Emilio Lozoya said the company would begin increasing exports to China by 30,000 barrels a day starting this month, according to a two-year agreement between Pemex and China's Sinopec, Reuters reported. The level of exports to China could increase over time as part of the agreement, he added. Mexico, the seventh largest oil producer in the world, exports nearly 80 percent of its oil to the US and only some 50,000 barrels to China each month, according to China Radio International. Lin Boqiang, director of the China Center for Energy Economics Research at Xiamen University, told the Global Times that the increase stemmed from China's potential for growth in demand, against the backdrop of shrinking US imports as a result of its shale boom. A report released by OPEC last week expected China to overtake the US as the world's largest oil importer by 2014. This would also diversify China's sources of oil imports, "as only about 9 percent of the imports came from Latin America last year," Lin added. Data from the China Petroleum and Chemical Industry Federation showed last year nearly half of China's oil imports came from the Middle East. Yang Zhimin, a researcher with the Institute of Latin American Studies at the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, told the Global Times that the supply of oil is not solely decided by market demands, given its strategic nature. "We can't rule out the possibility of US influence in Mexico's decision, but the current president Enrique Pena Nieto won't follow the US as closely as his predecessor did." Pena Nieto, who is from the center-left Institutional Revolutionary Party, last year replaced rightist Felipe Calderon as president. Yang noted that the visit by Pena Nieto, which was paid just weeks after Xi became president, was a move aimed at mending bilateral ties. His predecessor Calderon met the Dalai Lama in 2011, drawing discontent and objection from Beijing. Yang said the new oil deal would also help narrow the bilateral trade imbalance. Mexico said its trade deficit with China reached $51.2 billion in 2012.

#### The US will use energy policy to crowd out China

Wallwork 13 – (Lucy [graduate of Durham University and currently works as a research associate at Berlin-based OpenOil]; What Chinese investment in Latin America means for the US energy sector; www.multibriefs.com/briefs/exclusive/what\_does\_chinese\_investment\_us\_energy.html#.UdMpS\_nviSo)

So what of the operations of U.S.-based multinationals in South America? According to a briefing by the Inter-American Dialogue, Western multinationals still enjoy comparatively strong positions where they operate, so the extent of damage felt by the U.S. as a result of Chinese investment in Latin America is "limited at best." But the latest multiweek series by Today in Energy (an EIA bulletin) on ongoing Mexico-U.S. trade relations hints that the relations built up over years by the U.S. in its "backyard" won't be given up easily. The U.S. may be on the path to energy independence, but the Chinese companies scrabbling around at the bottom of the garden is unlikely to go unnoticed.

#### Chinese needs access to foreign oil to drive its economy

Herberg 11 – [China’s Energy Rise and the Future of U.S.-China Energy Relations, By Mikkal Herberg, Research Director, Energy Security Program The National Bureau of Asian Research

<http://newamerica.net/publications/policy/china_s_energy_rise_and_the_future_of_us_china_energy_relations>]

China is gradually emerging as a new superpower in global energy markets and energy geopolitics. This reflects the enormous scale of China’s current and future energy and oil consumption, Beijing’s growing energy investments abroad and expanding energy diplomacy, its rising carbon emissions, and China’s emergence as a global leader in clean energy technology development. The scale of China’s energy expansion is quite breathtaking. For example, in the decade to 2010, the increase in China’s energy consumption added the equivalent of two Latin Americas to global energy demand.1 China is now the world’s largest energy consumer exceeding U.S. energy consumption which had led the world for over half a century. China’s oil consumption doubled in the decade of the 1990s and doubled again in the decade to 2010, making it the second largest oil consumer and importer after the U.S. In 2000, China represented only 6% of global oil demand but it has accounted for nearly one-half of global oil demand growth over this past decade and is now the largest vehicle market by annual sales. It is by far the largest coal-based economy, in 2009 consuming three times as much coal annually as the U.S., the second largest coal user. The increase in China’s coal consumption over just the past five years added the equivalent of another U.S. to world coal demand. Not surprisingly China recently surpassed the U.S. as the largest greenhouse gas emitter. On a more positive note, China also is now by far the leader in investment in clean energy and renewables, in 2010 accounting for roughly one-half of global investment in clean energy.2 Hence, China is on a trajectory to potentially reshape the global energy and oil landscape in the same way its broader “peaceful development” seems likely to transform the global economic and strategic landscape. This growing energy importance is a product of the convergence of the scale of its expanding impact on global energy markets with its broader economic and political rise. Growing dependence on imported energy and Beijing’s efforts to secure those supplies and transportation routes to deliver them are accelerating China’s international political and economic engagement and influence and, at the same time, are reshaping Beijing’s vital global economic and energy interests. The last time this happened was in the early postwar period when the rise of American oil demand and import dependence converged with America’s growing strategic power to thrust the U.S to the forefront of global energy markets and geopolitics. ¶ China’s “energy rise” poses similar dilemmas for the U.S. and the established Western-dominated energy institutions and market structures as its broader economic rise poses for global strategic and economic relations. In energy terms, will China emerge as a status quo or as a “revisionist” power? And what does this mean for long-term U.S. energy security and global energy interests? The U.S. has been the superpower of global energy just as it has been in strategic and economic affairs. The U.S. consumes nearly one-quarter of daily world oil production, is the third largest oil producer, the largest electricity and total vehicle market. The U.S. is home to many of the largest, most powerful and sophisticated global oil companies. The U.S. has been the dominant strategic power in the key petroleum exporting regions, most importantly, the Persian Gulf and the U.S. Navy and military dominate the sea lanes and airspace that are vital to global oil production and transportation. The current structure of global energy institutions and energy security arrangements have been established under the U.S.-led post-war liberal order and energy “Pax Americana”.¶ ¶ China’s growing global energy clout will evolve in the context of these existing global oil and energy market structures, institutions of multilateral energy cooperation, and U.S. strategic power created under U.S. leadership over the past 50 years. So the question is will China use its growing market power and diplomatic influence to support the existing open and flexible global oil and energy market arrangements, support western efforts to stabilize key exporting regions, and join in multilateral energy governance institutions like the IEA established under U.S. leadership? Or will it continue along its “go-it-alone” path of seeking privileged access to energy supplies through close collaboration with its national oil companies (NOCs), bilateral rather than multilateral energy and financial diplomacy, and a politicized approach to securing oil supplies? In short, will Beijing’s energy path be through markets or mercantilism?¶ ¶ Broadly speaking, energy decisions made in Beijing will be influential along five important dimensions of the global energy outlook. First, China has replaced the U.S. as the engine of global oil demand growth and, therefore, Beijing’s decisions on future oil use, vehicle efficiency, the growth of its mushrooming vehicle industry, and managing its growing oil import dependence are now deeply consequential for world oil prices and the energy security of the U.S. and other major oil importing countries. Second, Beijing’s strong instinct for a statist and political approach to ensuring its energy security and oil import needs through national ownership of “equity oil” and promotion of its national oil companies (NOCs) is strongly at odds with the west’s focus since the oil shocks of the 1970s on increased oil investment globally and a more flexible and integrated global oil market as the basis for energy security rather than a national competition to control supplies. Third, China’s global energy geopolitical footprint and potential influence is expanding with its large petroleum investments, long-term supply deals and huge state bank loans, and active energy and pipeline diplomacy. China has become or is likely to become a key diplomatic player in most major oil and gas exporting regions of the world. How will China use its growing capability to influence developments in these critical regions? Fourth, China has become a central player in carbon emissions and global climate negotiations. Beijing’s choices on its future coal use, on finding a successor to the Kyoto Protocol or instead to pursue a strictly national approach to carbon and climate is central to future climate change outcomes. Finally, China has emerged as the global leader in future renewable energy technologies through its huge investments and development incentives. Beijing’s decisions on cooperation in developing these industries, control of those technologies, and their potential role as a new “strategic industry” will have important renewable energy trade and technology implications.¶ U.S. Energy Primacy is Coming to an End ¶ As the dominant oil market driving force, rule-maker, institution-builder, strategic power, and technology leader in global energy, the U.S. has major stakes along all these dimensions of rising Chinese energy power and influence. As noted energy expert John Mitchell has written, “For every issue on the energy geopolitical agenda, there is at least one telephone line to Washington.” However, China’s growing role in global energy affairs, particularly oil markets and governance, means that the U.S. will no longer be the unipolar energy power.

#### CCP Collapse causes nuclear and biological warfare

Renxing 5 (San, Epic Times Staff Member, The CCP’s Last-ditch Gamble: Biological and Nuclear War, 8/5/5, The Epoch Times,<http://english.epochtimes.com/news/5-8-5/30975.html>)

As *The Epoch Times*’ *Nine Commentaries on the Communist Party* spreads ever wider in China, the truth it speaks is awakening Chinese people to the true nature of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) and inspiring them to cancel their Party memberships. With the number of people quitting the Party growing rapidly by the day, the Communist Party sees that the end is near. In a show of strength to save itself from demise, the CCP has brought out a sinister plan that it has been preparing for years, a last-ditch gamble to extend its life. This plan is laid out in two speeches written by Chi Haotian, Minster of Defense and vice-chairman of China’s Central Military Commission, and posted on the Internet. The background surrounding the speeches is still shrouded in mystery. The titles of the two speeches are “[War Is Approaching Us](http://english.epochtimes.com/news/5-8-4/30974.html" \t "_blank)” [[1]](http://english.epochtimes.com/news/5-8-5/30975.html#1) and “[War Is Not Far from Us and Is the Midwife of the Chinese Century](http://english.epochtimes.com/news/5-8-4/30974.html" \t "_blank).” The two, judging from their similar contexts and consistent theme, are indeed sister articles. These speeches describe in a comprehensive, systematic, and detailed way the CCP’s nearly 20 years of fear and helplessness over its doomed fate, and its desperate fight to extend its life. In particular, the speeches lay uncharacteristically bare what is really on the CCP’s mind and hide nothing from the public—a rare confession from the CCP that can help people understand its evil nature. If one truly understands what is said in this confession, one will immediately catch on to the CCP’s way of thinking. In short, the speeches are worth reading, and I would like to comment on them. I. A Gangster Gambles with the World as His Stake, and the Lives of People in this Global Village Become Worthless What, then, is the gist of this wild, last-ditch gamble? To put it in a few words: A cornered beast is fighting desperately to survive in a battle with humanity. If you don’t believe me, read some passages directly from the speeches. 1) “We must prepare ourselves for two scenarios. If our biological weapons succeed in the surprise attack [on the US], the Chinese people will be able to keep their losses at a minimum in the fight against the U.S. If, however, the attack fails and triggers a nuclear retaliation from the U.S., China would perhaps suffer a catastrophe in which more than half of its population would perish. That is why we need to be ready with air defense systems for our big and medium-sized cities. Whatever the case may be, we can only move forward fearlessly for the sake of our Party and state and our nation’s future, regardless of the hardships we have to face and the sacrifices we have to make. The population, even if more than half dies, can be reproduced. But if the Party falls, everything is gone, and forever gone!” 2) “In any event, we, the CCP, will never step down from the stage of history! We’d rather have the whole world, or even the entire globe, share life and death with us than step down from the stage of history!!! Isn’t there a ‘nuclear bondage’ theory? It means that since the nuclear weapons have bound the security of the entire world, all will die together if death is inevitable. In my view, there is another kind of bondage, and that is, the fate our Party is tied up with that of the whole world. If we, the CCP, are finished, China will be finished, and the world will be finished.” 3) “It is indeed brutal to kill one or two hundred million Americans. But that is the only path that will secure a Chinese century, a century in which the CCP leads the world. We, as revolutionary humanitarians, do not want deaths. But if history confronts us with a choice between deaths of Chinese and those of Americans, we’d have to pick the latter, as, for us, it is more important to safeguard the lives of the Chinese people and the life of our Party. That is because, after all, we are Chinese and members of the CCP. Since the day we joined the CCP, the Party’s life has always been above all else!” Since the Party’s life is “above all else,” it would not be surprising if the CCP resorts to the use of biological, chemical, and nuclear weapons in its attempt to extend its life. The CCP, which disregards human life, would not hesitate to kill two hundred million Americans, along with seven or eight hundred million Chinese, to achieve its ends. These speeches let the public see the CCP for what it really is. With evil filling its every cell the CCP intends to wage a war against humankind in its desperate attempt to cling to life. *That* is the main theme of the speeches. This theme is murderous and utterly evil. In China we have seen beggars who coerced people to give them money by threatening to stab themselves with knives or pierce their throats with long nails. But we have never, until now, seen such a gangster who would use biological, chemical, and nuclear weapons to threaten the world, that they will die together with him. This bloody confession has confirmed the CCP’s nature: That of a monstrous murderer who has killed 80 million Chinese people and who now plans to hold one billion people hostage and gamble with their lives.

#### Collapse of the Chinese government causes border conflict with Russia

Lo and Rothman 6 [Bobo Lo and Andy Rothman, May 2006, Asian Geopolitics, special report http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_7057/is\_2\_9/ai\_n28498825/pg\_17/]

The second scenario for strategic conflict is predicated on a general collapse of law and order in China. With no effective central authority to contain the anarchy, millions of Chinese could cross the border into the Russian Far East. This would lead to tensions and clashes, at first sporadic and random, but subsequently escalating into interstate conflict.

#### Nuclear winter

Sharavin 01[Alexander, What the Papers Say, 10-3-01, The Third Threat]

Russia may face the “wonderful” prospect of combating the Chinese army, which, if full mobilization is called, is comparable in size with Russia’s entire population, which also has nuclear weapons (even tactical weapons become less strategic if states have common borders) and would be absolutely insensitive to losses (even a loss of a few million of the servicemen would be acceptable for China). Such a war would be more horrible than the World War II. It would require from our state maximal tension, universal mobilization and complete accumulation of the army military hardware, up to the last tank or a plane, in a single direction (we would have to forget such “trifles” like Talebs and Basaev, but this does not guarantee success either). Massive nuclear strikes on basic military forces and cities of China would finally be the only way out, what would exhaust Russia’s armament completely. We have not got another set of intercontinental ballistic missiles and submarine-based missiles, whereas the general forces would be extremely exhausted in the border combats. In the long run, even if the aggression would be stopped after the majority of the Chinese are killed, our country would be absolutely unprotected against the “Chechen” and the “Balkan” variants both, and even against the first frost of a possible nuclear winter.

### 1NC – Disad

#### No government shutdown in the squo – republicans are being pressured by Obama

ABC News 9/26 [John Parkinson and Jeff Zeleny, “Despite Showdown, Boehner Doesn’t Expect Government Shutdown,” 2013, http://abcnews.go.com/blogs/politics/2013/09/despite-showdown-boehner-doesnt-expect-government-shutdown/]

As the Senate finalizes making its imprint on a stop-gap government spending bill, House Republicans today continued to press Democrats for partisan changes to the legislation that could ultimately lead to the first government shutdown in nearly 20 years.¶ While the Senate’s tweaks to the House-passed continuing resolution won a full endorsement from the White House today, House Speaker John Boehner told reporters he does not intend to accept the bill as amended by the Senate.¶ “The American people don’t want the president’s health care bill, and they don’t want the government to shut down,” Boehner, R-Ohio, said. “Republicans are listening. We passed a bill last week that would do just what the American people have asked. It’s time for the Senate to listen and pass the bill that we’ve sent over there.”¶ Given the political risks that come with a prolonged political ping pong match, Boehner was questioned whether he concedes that the government is headed for a shutdown next week.¶ “No, I do not,” he insisted. “No, I do not expect that to happen.”¶ Asked whether he is prepared to accept a clean continuing resolution from the Senate in order to avoid a government shutdown, Boehner hinted that more changes are coming from the House.¶ “I made it clear now for months and months and months, we have no interest in seeing a government shutdown, but we’ve got to address the spending problem that we have in this town,” Boehner said. “There will be options available to us. There are not going to be any speculation about what we’re going to do or not do until the Senate passes their bill.”¶ While Republicans maintain that their next move has not been decided, GOP insiders say the options being privately discussed are plentiful.¶ With just four days remaining until the government runs out of funding Oct. 1, some Republicans are said to be pushing for a short-term continuing resolution – even as brief as one week – to enable lawmakers to pursue a bipartisan agreement.¶ Another option that could be gaining favor as the House GOP’s next move on the continuing resolution: delaying the individual mandate in the Affordable Care Act for one year. That plan was initially discussed as a leading preference for the GOP’s game plan on the debt limit, but with the Senate finishing its first crack at the continuing resolution a few days earlier than first expected, some House Republicans continue to press for Obamacare’s destruction.¶ Rep. Paul Ryan, chairman of the Budget Committee, however, believes the bigger budget fight and any discussion over whether to delay the Affordable Care Act should come on the debt limit debate. The former running mate of Mitt Romney said he believes the House will send an altered bill back to the Senate, but would act quickly enough to keep the government funded.¶ “We’re in a good place. We’re unified and feel like we have a good strategy,” Ryan, R-Wis., told ABC News following a meeting with the House Republican Conference. “No one is interested in shutting the government down. We don’t see what is accomplished with that.”¶ Rep. Mo Brooks said House Republicans do not want to be pushed into a corner by Senate Democrats on the budget resolution. He said Democrats should bear the blame for any potential government shutdown.¶ “We’ve agreed on funding 99 percent of the federal government. Let’s fund that 99 percent and then fight over the remaining 1 percent,” Brooks, R-Ala., told ABC News. “But Harry Reid and Barack Obama insist on a scenario that results in a government shutdown if they don’t get everything that they demand.”¶ Rep. Sean Duffy, who was critical of Sen. Ted Cruz a week ago, said the Texas Republican “fought a good fight” during his 21-hour marathon speech in the Senate this week.¶ “I thought he did a great job,” Duffy, R-Wis., said. “But the bottom line is, Do we really think the president is going to go along with defunding Obamacare? I don’t think he will, but there are some issues that we can do, like delay or opt-out for states.”¶ Current government funding runs out at the end of the day on Sept. 30. The House could act as soon as Saturday to send the continuing resolution back to the Democrat-led Senate, leaving a precarious amount of time for the upper chamber to decide whether to send the legislation on to the president. If Democrats reject the House’s next move, the prospects of a government shutdown become even more likely than any fiscal battle Congress has faced the past three years.¶ “I’ll personally be surprised if we have a government shutdown,” Brooks added. “And if we do, I’ll be extraordinarily surprised if it lasts anything beyond hours or days as opposed to weeks or months.”

#### The plan sparks backlash over the process of ratification, and requires Presidential involvement

Phil Taylor 13, E&E Reporter, 1/9/13, “E&E: U.S.-Mexico transboundary agreement mired in Congress,” http://www.bromwichgroup.com/2013/01/ee-offshore-drilling-u-s-mexico-transboundary-agreement-mired-in-congress/

It is unclear who in the Senate objected to the agreement’s passage, but sources say it was likely out of concern for the process by which it was being passed rather than the substance of the agreement. ¶ That may stem in part from lingering uncertainty over whether the agreement is a treaty, which would require a two-thirds majority for Senate ratification, or an executive agreement, which would require implementing legislation to be passed by a majority in both chambers. ¶ Regardless, its failure was a surprise to staff on the ENR Committee who had crafted a news release in preparation for its passage but had to delete it after the agreement was blocked. ¶ According to the report by Foreign Relations Republicans, the Obama administration has yet to say whether the agreement is a treaty or an executive agreement but appears to prefer the latter. Mexico’s Senate ratified the agreement, suggesting it was interpreted as a treaty. ¶ If it is a treaty, a formal communication would need to be sent from the president to the Foreign Relations Committee, which would trigger hearings on the matter and allow Congress to interpret any ambiguous language in the agreement. ¶ That is important, because several provisions in the treaty “invite scrutiny and clarification,” according to the committee report. ¶ “The treaty doesn’t have every detail worked out,” said Neil Brown, a former adviser to Sen. Richard Lugar (R-Ind.) who was ranking member of the committee until his retirement earlier this month. ¶ For example, one section of the agreement calls for “common standards,” but it is unclear whether that requires companies to adopt U.S. safety and environmental standards or Mexico’s, which are considered less developed. Another area of the agreement creates a dispute resolution process without saying whether the arbitration is binding, the report said. ¶ The agreement would allow joint inspections by Interior’s BSEE and the Mexican government to ensure compliance with applicable laws. ¶ Some on the Foreign Relations Committee said they were miffed that the administration did not consult with them before pushing the agreement through in the lame duck.

#### Obama singularly focused on the fiscal crisis—his political capital will resolve it before shutdown and default

Jonathan Allen, Politico, 9/19/13, GOP battles boost President Obama, dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=17961849-5BE5-43CA-B1BC-ED8A12A534EB

There’s a simple reason President Barack Obama is using his bully pulpit to focus the nation’s attention on the battle over the budget: In this fight, he’s watching Republicans take swings at each other.

And that GOP fight is a lifeline for an administration that had been scrambling to gain control its message after battling congressional Democrats on the potential use of military force in Syria and the possible nomination of Larry Summers to run the Federal Reserve.

If House Republicans and Obama can’t cut even a short-term deal for a continuing resolution, the government’s authority to spend money will run out on Oct. 1. Within weeks, the nation will default on its debt if an agreement isn’t reached to raise the federal debt limit.

For some Republicans, those deadlines represent a leverage point that can be used to force Obama to slash his health care law. For others, they’re a zero hour at which the party will implode if it doesn’t cut a deal.

Meanwhile, “on the looming fiscal issues, Democrats — both liberal and conservative, executive and congressional — are virtually 100 percent united,” said Sen. Charles Schumer (D-N.Y.).

Just a few days ago, all that Obama and his aides could talk about were Syria and Summers. Now, they’re bringing their party together and shining a white hot light on Republican disunity over whether to shut down the government and plunge the nation into default in a vain effort to stop Obamacare from going into effect.

The squabbling among Republicans has gotten so vicious that a Twitter hashtag — #GOPvsGOPugliness — has become a thick virtual data file for tracking the intraparty insults. Moderates, and even some conservatives, are slamming Texas Sen. Ted Cruz, a tea party favorite, for ramping up grassroots expectations that the GOP will shut down the government if it can’t win concessions from the president to “defund” his signature health care law.

“I didn’t go to Harvard or Princeton, but I can count,” Sen. Bob Corker (R-Tenn.) tweeted, subtly mocking Cruz’s Ivy League education. “The defunding box canyon is a tactic that will fail and weaken our position.”

While it is well-timed for the White House to interrupt a bad slide, Obama’s singular focus on the budget battle is hardly a last-minute shift. Instead, it is a return to the narrative arc that the White House was working to build before the Syria crisis intervened.

And it’s so important to the president’s strategy that White House officials didn’t consider postponing Monday’s rollout of the most partisan and high-stakes phase even when a shooter murdered a dozen people at Washington’s Navy Yard that morning.

The basic storyline, well under way over the summer, was to have the president point to parts of his agenda, including reducing the costs of college and housing, designed to strengthen the middle class; use them to make the case that he not only saved the country from economic disaster but is fighting to bolster the nation’s finances on both the macro and household level; and then argue that Republicans’ desire to lock in the sequester and leverage a debt-ceiling increase for Obamacare cuts would reverse progress made.

The president is on firm ground, White House officials say, because he stands with the public in believing that the government shouldn’t shut down and that the country should pay its bills.

#### That spills-over to government shutdown and US default—that kills the economy and US credibility

Norm Ornstein, resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, 9/1/13, Showdowns and Shutdowns, www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2013/09/01/showdowns\_and\_shutdowns\_syria\_congress\_obama

Then there is the overload of business on the congressional agenda when the two houses return on Sept. 9 -with only nine legislative days scheduled for action in the month. We have serious confrontations ahead on spending bills and the debt limit, as the new fiscal year begins on Oct. 1 and the debt ceiling approaches just a week or two thereafter. Before the news that we would drop everything for an intense debate on whether to strike militarily in Syria, Congress-watchers were wondering how we could possibly deal with the intense bargaining required to avoid one or more government shutdowns and/or a real breach of the debt ceiling, with devastating consequences for American credibility and the international economy.

Beyond the deep policy and political divisions, Republican congressional leaders will likely use both a shutdown and the debt ceiling as hostages to force the president to cave on their demands for deeper spending cuts. Avoiding this end-game bargaining will require the unwavering attention of the same top leaders in the executive and legislative branches who will be deeply enmeshed in the Syria debate. The possibility -even probability -of disruptions caused by partial shutdowns could complicate any military actions. The possibility is also great that the rancor that will accompany the showdowns over fiscal policy will bleed over into the debate about America and Syria.

#### Extinction

Kemp 10

Geoffrey Kemp, Director of Regional Strategic Programs at The Nixon Center, served in the White House under Ronald Reagan, special assistant to the president for national security affairs and senior director for Near East and South Asian affairs on the National Security Council Staff, Former Director, Middle East Arms Control Project at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2010, The East Moves West: India, China, and Asia’s Growing Presence in the Middle East, p. 233-4

The second scenario, called Mayhem and Chaos, is the opposite of the first scenario; everything that can go wrong does go wrong. The world economic situation weakens rather than strengthens, and India, China, and Japan suffer a major reduction in their growth rates, further weakening the global economy. As a result, energy demand falls and the price of fossil fuels plummets, leading to a financial crisis for the energy-producing states, which are forced to cut back dramatically on expansion programs and social welfare. That in turn leads to political unrest: and nurtures different radical groups, including, but not limited to, Islamic extremists. The internal stability of some countries is challenged, and there are more “failed states.” Most serious is the collapse of the democratic government in Pakistan and its takeover by Muslim extremists, who then take possession of a large number of nuclear weapons. The danger of war between India and Pakistan increases significantly. Iran, always worried about an extremist Pakistan, expands and weaponizes its nuclear program. That further enhances nuclear proliferation in the Middle East, with Saudi Arabia, Turkey, and Egypt joining Israel and Iran as nuclear states. Under these circumstances, the potential for nuclear terrorism increases, and the possibility of a nuclear terrorist attack in either the Western world or in the oil-producing states may lead to a further devastating collapse of the world economic market, with a tsunami-like impact on stability. In this scenario, major disruptions can be expected, with dire consequences for two-thirds of the planet’s population.

### 1NC – Amazon

#### **The aff is not inherent—Mexico just recently proposed legislation to amend their Constitution to allow more oil and gas drilling—solves the entirety of the case**

Wile 8/16 (Rob Wile, Energy and Economics for Business Insider, Columbia and Northwestern University, “Mexico's Newly Proposed Oil Law Would Cement The Americas As The World's Most Important Source Of Supply”, 8/16/13, <http://www.businessinsider.com/ubs-new-mexico-law-cements-americas-growth-2013-8>, zs)

Mexico recently announced it would probably begin opening its oil fields to private foreign investment for the first time in 75 years. A proposed change to Mexico's constitution would upend the country's defacto nationalization of its fossil fuel reserves. UBS analyst Jon Rigby thinks this only adds to the bullish oil story that continues to develop in the Americas. The bill will have to be approved by Mexico's senate, but it's believed President Enrique Pena Nieto has enough votes to push it through. The hope is that new investment would grow oil output 20% to 3 million barrels a day and gas output 38% to 8 billion cubic feet per day by 2018. On the surface, that's a lot for Mexico, but not for overall global balances. However, Rigby argues there is actually an immediate impact: It will accelerate shifting the center of gravity for global fossil fuel production from the Middle East to the Americas: In terms of long-term balances and the effect on the global outlook, an opening up of the Mexican upstream would further cement the Americas as the most important source of supply growth in years to come. In our outlook, we expect the US, Canada and Brazil to make up the bulk of new oil production this decade, driven by shale oil, oil sands and pre-salt barrels respectively. The only other truly major source of new oil is expected to be Iraq. Rigby pulls data showing production rates when Mexico went through its first big ramp up in the '70s: They write: ...on the basis of what are expected to be substantial unmapped reserves in both Mexico’s deepwater and in shale formations onshore, there is significant potential for further growth in subsequent years. Indeed, a look at Mexico’s original ramp-up in oil production in throughout the 1970s show that strong growth rates were achieved, albeit not nearly as strong as seen in the recent growth spurt in US shale oil, for instance. So, it's a significant development that is likely to become an even bigger deal down the line.

#### No impact bioaccumulation

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.

#### No deforestation-rapidly decreasing

BBC 12

http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/magazine-16295830

In the decade between 1996 and 2005, 19,500 sq km (7,530 sq miles) of jungle was lost on average every single year. The comparison is overused, but that really is an area about the size of Wales or New Jersey each year. It reached a peak in 2004 when more than 27,000 sq km was lost. Then, in 2004 Brazil declared war - it said it would cut deforestation by 80% by 2020. Why are ecologists setting fire to the Amazon? Seven years later and it has almost reached its goal. The latest figures, released just weeks ago, show that 2011 had the lowest rates of deforestation since records began three decades ago - just over 6,200 sq km was cut. That's 78% down on 2004, still a lot of trees - an area the about the size of Devon, or Delaware - but a huge improvement.

### 1NC – Oil

#### ≠ ! terror

Fettweis 10 Professor of national security affairs @ U.S. Naval War College.

(Christopher J. Fettweis, “Threat and Anxiety in US Foreign Policy,” [\_\_Survival\_\_](http://www.informaworld.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/smpp/title~db=all~content=t713659919), Volume [\_\_52\_\_](http://www.informaworld.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/smpp/title~db=all~content=t713659919~tab=issueslist~branches=52#v52), Issue [\_\_2\_\_](http://www.informaworld.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/smpp/title~db=all~content=g920313969) April 2010 , pages 59 – 82//informaworld) KENTUCKY

Even terrorists equipped with nuclear, biological or chemical weapons would be incapable of causing damage so cataclysmic that it would prove fatal to modern states. Though the prospect of terrorists obtaining and using such weapons is one of the most consistently terrifying scenarios of the new era, it is also highly unlikely and not nearly as dangerous as sometimes portrayed. As the well-funded, well-staffed Aum Shinrikyo cult found out in the 1990s, workable forms of weapons of mass destruction are hard to purchase, harder still to synthesise without state help, and challenging to use effectively. The Japanese group managed to kill a dozen people on the Tokyo subway system at rush hour. While tragic, the attack was hardly the stuff of apocalyptic nightmares. Super-weapons are simply not easy for even the most sophisticated non-state actors to use.[31](http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/section?content=a920295991&fulltext=713240928#EN0031) If terrorists were able to overcome the substantial obstacles and use the most destructive weapons in a densely populated area, the outcome would of course be terrible for those unfortunate enough to be nearby. But we should not operate under the illusion that doomsday would arrive. Modern industrialised countries can cope with disasters, both natural and man-made. As unpleasant as such events would be, they do not represent existential threats.

#### No impact

Simon and Stevenson, 10 - \* senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations AND \*\* professor of strategic studies at the U.S. Naval War College (Steven and Jonathan, “Focus on thwarting 'simpler' attacks,” 5/4, http://www.statesman.com/opinion/simon-stevenson-focus-on-thwarting-simpler-attacks-669676.html)

But the attempt to bring a less destructive terrorist technique to bear in New York may put the lie to that explanation. While we have not seen a single attack as horrific as the collapse of the twin towers, al Qaeda and its followers have killed far more people — Americans and other nationalities — using various forms of improvised explosive devices in war zones and ostensibly peaceful locales. Some 65 percent of the military casualties in Iraq and Afghanistan have been from improvised explosive devices, the Army Times reported last year. Many of them, like the Times Square device, are activated by or packed in vehicles; several of al Qaeda's most devastating attacks since 2001 — such as bombings that killed 202 people, mainly tourists, in Bali in 2002 — involved such devices. Terrorist tactics spread by virtue of success. Consider the number of airline hijackings in the 1960s and 1970s. These days, vehicle-borne IEDs are suited to urban spaces, in which cars are commonplace and inconspicuous and dense populations mean relatively high numbers of casualties. These points would not be lost on jihadist leaders and aspiring acolytes, who tend to be students of their craft. While many questions remain about the bombing attempt — though U.S. officials have deemed it terrorist activity, and a key leader of the Taliban in Pakistan has claimed credit — we do know that al Qaeda is pragmatic and adaptive. However precious al Qaeda may deem the "stun value" of the next big attack on America, the effectiveness of U.S. actions to thwart such an incident was eventually likely to compel it to downgrade expectations. Now, perhaps, al Qaeda has. The attempted Christmas bombing on a U.S. airliner was certainly a less complex and ambitious operation than Sept. 11 — or, for that matter, the 2004 Madrid attacks, the 2005 London subway bombings or the 2006 Heathrow plot. Even if the core group has not given up on the grand apocalyptic attack, anti-terrorist activity in Pakistan has compelled it to devolve operational authority to regional affiliates and homegrown terrorist aspirants who are free — if not encouraged — to use less operationally demanding methods. And that sort of urban warfare was long ago introduced and developed in places such as Belfast and Bilbao, then refined and expanded in Iraq and Afghanistan, with the advent of explosively formed penetrators (EFPs) and "sticky bombs," which are smaller and more precise than car bombs and may be harder to detect. It would be a mistake for al Qaeda's targets to regard that tactical adjustment as any kind of victory. Old techniques such as car and bus bombs, though not as massively lethal as the new ones — such as turning a hijacked airplane into a guided missile, or detonating a "dirty bomb" or even a small atomic device — would signify mainly that jihadists are starting to consider more frequent terrorist attacks that are far easier to execute and get away with. That kind of approach won favor with Northern Ireland's Provisional Irish Republican Army in its drive to unite Ireland, and with the Basque separatist group Euskadi ta Askatasuna (ETA) in Spain. These groups, which evolved into highly capable and professional organizations, challenged civil order and palsied society for decades, claiming roughly 2,200 and 1,000 lives, respectively.

#### Alt cause to Mexico instability—migration barriers

Littlefield 09 **–** (Edward, Council on Hemispheric Affairs, "As Mexico’s Problems Mount: The Impact of the Economic Recession on Migration Patterns from Mexico")

As migration from, and remittances to, Mexico have decreased as a result of the current recession, the Mexican economy ominously worsens - Migration, remittances, and the national economy should be considered as integral components in the debate over whether Mexico deserves to be classified as a “failed state,” and what should be United States policy The Mexican economy and many of its national institutional structures may be on the brink of collapse. While drug war violence has dominated the recent news about the possible irreversible status as a society beyond remediation, the topic of immigration has been either marginalized or used to further promote fears that the conflict may spread to the United States. Drugs, national security, and economic recession have replaced immigration reform on the United States’ policy agenda. However, the current financial crisis, and its impact south of the border, is intricately linked to matters of immigration, security, and Mexico’s very cohesion.

#### Mexican economy is no longer as dependent on oil

Timothy Aeppel 6-28**-**13 (staff writer @Wall Street Journal; Bloomberg News “Mexico Manufacturing Looks to Gain Competitive Edge on China”, <http://blogs.wsj.com/economics/2013/06/28/mexico-manufacturing-looks-to-gain-competitive-edge-on-china/>)

Mexico’s competitive edge over China in some types of manufacturing is set to keep growing. Bloomberg News: That’s the assessment of the Boston Consulting Group, which in a new report estimates Mexican factory wages will be nearly 30% lower than China’s by 2015, when adjusted for productivity differences. Mexican workers typically produce more per hour than their Chinese counterparts. By that same measure, Mexico already last year became a less expensive place than China to make some products, according to BCG’s estimates. **Mexico’s strengthening factory sector is helping boost that nation’s economy**. BCG estimates that within five years, Mexico’s factories will churn out **up to $60 billion a year more** in goods — much of it destined for export. About two-thirds of Mexico’s exports currently go to the U.S. “We know there’s a lot of work leaving China for Mexico, because it’s cheaper,” saysHarold L. Sirkin, a BCG senior partner. He says Mexico’s gains will help U.S. manufacturers as well, “since products made in Mexico contain four times as many U.S.-made parts, on average, as those made in China.” Mr. Sirkin says **four industries in particular are getting a boost: electronics, automobiles, appliances, and machinery.** Besides having relatively low wages, Mexico is also benefiting from its close proximity to the U.S. and low energy costs. Mexico also has more free trade agreements — 44 — than any other country. That makes it an attractive place to make goods destined for many markets.

# 2NC

#### Mexican oil bilat high – US demand is shrinking – recent meetings prove – both sides have promised increased interdependence – that’s Jinjie

#### **Mexico oil bilat high – recent contracts**

Reuters 4/6 – Reuters Magazine, (“Mexico's Pemex to increase oil exports to China”, 4/6/13, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/04/06/mexico-china-oil-idUSL2N0CT0CH20130406>, AW)

The two-year agreement between Pemex and China's Sinopec was signed in January, Pemex Chief Executive Emilio Lozoya said at a press conference in Sanya, China. "This represents a landmark in the history of Pemex, since it is the first long-term contract of its kind signed with a Chinese company," Lozoya said. The level of exports to China could increase over time as part of the agreement, he added. Pemex sends most of its oil to Mexico's largest trade partner, the United States. The oil company in 2012 exported an average of 1.256 million barrels a day, of which 85,000 barrels a day went to Asia. Lozoya was at a press conference with Mexico's President Enrique Pena Nieto, who is on an official visit in China. Pena Nieto and Pemex signed two separate agreements with Xinxing Cathay International Group and China National Petroleum Company for academic and technological cooperation. At the same event, China's government signed an agreement of understanding with Mexican steel company Altos Hornos de Mexico . The agreement between Pemex and the Chinese companies comes as Pena Nieto prepares to launch a major overhaul of the Mexican energy sector this year, aimed at making Pemex more efficient. The Mexican oil industry has been hampered by under-investment and legal prohibitions on private participation.

#### **Oil cooperation coming – revamp in relations**

AP 6/03 – Associated Press, (“Oil likely on agenda as Chinese leader visits Mexico”, 6/03/13, <http://azstarnet.com/news/world/oil-likely-on-agenda-as-chinese-leader-visits-mexico/article_3bfe1f5d-670b-5f91-8bb3-4f6ca1ec7f7f.html>, AW)

China has invested heavily in resource-rich Latin America in recent years, striking major trade deals with governments from Venezuela to Argentina. Now its president is reaching out to one of the few countries in the region where ties have been slow to develop: Mexico. President Xi Jinping's three-day visit starting Tuesday comes as Mexico debates opening its highly regulated energy sector to more foreign investment. China's president has said he plans to address Mexico's large trade deficit with the Asian power and discuss ways to increase Mexican exports. Analysts say that could mean oil, which Mexico has and China needs to fuel its expanding economy and the cars of its growing middle class. "Access to strategic raw materials is key to understanding the dynamic of relations with China," said Hugo Beteta, director for Mexico and Central America of the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean. "Clearly there is an interest by China in Mexican oil." The trip is part of a four-country regional tour that ends in the United States. Xi started in Trinidad and Tobago, where he also met with leaders of other Caribbean countries, and he arrives Sunday night in Costa Rica. China and Trinidad have had diplomatic ties for almost 40 years, and Trinidad is a major trading partner in the Caribbean for China. Costa Rica is the only country in Central America to have diplomatic relations with China. U.S. trade still dwarfs China's for the three countries Xi is visiting. But China's trade with Costa Rica and with Mexico has tripled since 2006, according to the International Monetary Fund. Relations with Mexico had been chilly in the past, especially when former President Felipe Calderón hosted the Dalai Lama in 2011, something China's Foreign Ministry said "hurt the feelings of the Chinese people and harmed Chinese-Mexican relations." President Enrique Peña Nieto, who took office in December, has been aggressive so far about changing that, and the two new presidents reportedly hit if off on a personal level when Peña Nieto visited China and met with Xi in April. That resulted in an unusually quick diplomatic follow-up, just two months into Xi's presidency. During the April talks, Xi said he is "committed to working with Mexican authorities to help Mexico export more," Mexico's vice minister of foreign relations, Carlos de Icaza, told The Associated Press. That's key for Mexico, because its trade deficit with China is exploding, far surpassing that of any other Latin American nation. While China is looking to assure supplies of raw materials, Mexico is looking to diversify its trade and investment, which have long been dominated by its superpower neighbor to the north.

#### **Engagement with China benefit LAs countries – structural factors check competition**

Chen and Chen 6/17, Kayla Chen, Colby College in 2012 with a BA in Global Studies with concentrations in Latin America and Development Policy, and a minor in East Asian Studies, Xiangming Chen, Founding Dean and Director of the Center for Urban and Global Studies and Paul Raether Distinguished Professor of Global Urban Studies and Sociology at Trinity College in Hartford, Connecticut and Distinguished Guest Professor in the School of Social Development and Public Policy at Fudan University, (“The Global Rise of China”, 6/17/13, <http://www.eurasiareview.com/17062013-china-and-latin-america-connected-and-competing-analysis/>, AW)

China’s stronger economic ties with Latin America are generating concerns in some Latin American countries that the Asian superpower is quickly outcompeting them. In the short term though, China’s demand for raw materials helps to raise direct exports from Latin America. Since Latin American countries and China have different export structures, the former is not as threatened by China’s rapid market penetration as assumed, with the clear exception of Mexico. According to Kevin Gallagher, a specialist on international economic development, “Mexico is the only country in Latin America whose comparative advantage has been moving in the same direction as the comparative advantage of [India and China],” and faces strong commercial competition.11 Interestingly though, the head-to-head economic competition between China and Mexico has shifted around to either’s favor in turns. Once upon a time, Mexico saw China as a seemingly unmatchable competitor in producing the same kinds of cheap manufactured goods at a fraction of the cost. Now, for the first time in a decade, Latin America’s second largest economy has become a credible challenger to China in manufacturing. According to figures from the United Nations Commodity Trade Statistics Database, Mexico accounted for 12.3 percent of all US non-oil imports in 2010. In 1999, prior to China’s emergence as the “world’s factory,” its share was just 10.6 percent.12 The result of this shifting landscape can seem counter-intuitive. Today, Chrysler is using Mexico as a base to supply some of its Fiat 500s to the Chinese market. To mark the company’s $500 million investment in Mexico last year, former president, Felipe Calderon, remarked, “I think it is the first time that a Mexican vehicle, at least in recent times, is to be exported to China…we always thought it was going to be the other way around.”13 Other changes have taken place and paved the way for Mexico’s new important role as a global manufacturer. Its free trade agreements with 44 countries – more than twice as many as China, and four times as many as Brazil – have allowed companies based in Mexico to source external inputs, often duty-free. Another significant shift improving Mexico’s competitive status is China’s rising labor costs. For example, wages in southern China have gone up by 20 percent a year over the last four years, and up 14 percent annually in Shanghai from 2002 to 2009, relative to increases of 8 percent in the Philippines and only 1 percent in Mexico.14 As a result, Mexican wages, which were 2.4 times those of China in 2002, are 14 percent higher now, and will be lower than China’s faster rising wages in five more years.15 Mexico is clearly back in the game of labor-intensive competition with China. Competing from across the Pacific Ocean for exports to the United States, China certainly does not have Mexico’s unique geographic advantage as a next-door neighbor. According to Lorenza Martínez, Mexico’s Undersecretary of the Economies Ministry, it takes between 20 days and two months to ship goods from China to the United States, whereas Mexican goods can reach their cross-border destinations between two to seven days. This makes a huge difference in cost savings and inventory reduction as just-in-time manufacturing has become more popular with American companies, especially since the 2008 economic recession.16 Distance matters a great deal to the overall competition between China and Mexico for the United States, their most important common market. However, it may not be sufficient to offset China’s greater advantages against Mexico in its volume of exports and its spread and depth of global supply chains. With strong economic ties to multiple Latin American countries and direct competition with Mexico, China has growing interests and stakes in the region today. Does this create the impression of a hegemonic or even colonializing China, like that of the Old World in Latin America? Challenging this perception, Jiang Shixue, an influential Chinese scholar on Latin America, has portrayed the bilateral relationship as South-South cooperation. He cites China National Petroleum Corporation (CNPC), which constructed a school in the city of Talala, Peru as an example of China taking up local corporate social responsibility.17 One could also point to the generally favorable terms of trade for both sides and China’s absence of political intervention in Latin America as additional evidence for a mutually beneficial relationship. Against this larger picture, China-Mexico’s export competition seems to be an outlier.

#### **Best studies**

McDermott, 9 [ Tree Hugger.Com,” Good news: most ecosystems can recover in one lifetime from human induced or natural disturbance”, <http://www.treehugger.com/files/2009/05/most-ecosystems-can-recover-from-disturbance-in-one-lifetime.php>]

There's a reason the phrase "let nature take its course" exists: New research done at the [Yale University School of Forestry & Environmental Science](http://environment.yale.edu/) reinforces the idea that ecosystems are quiet resilient and can rebound from pollution and environmental degradation. Published in the journal [PLoS ONE](http://www.plosone.org/article/info%3Adoi%2F10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0005653), the study shows that most damaged ecosystems worldwide can recover within a single lifetime, if the source of pollution is removed and restoration work done: Forests Take Longest of Ecosystems Studied The analysis found that on average forest ecosystems can recover in 42 years, while in takes only about 10 years for the ocean bottom to recover. If an area has seen multiple, interactive disturbances, it can take on average 56 years for recovery. In general, most ecosystems take longer to recover from human-induced disturbances than from natural events, such as hurricanes. To reach these recovery averages, the researchers looked at data from peer-reviewed studies over the past 100 years on the rate of ecosystem recovery once the source of pollution was removed. Interestingly, the researchers found that it appears that the rate at which an ecosystem recovers may be independent of its degraded condition: Aquatic systems may recover more quickly than, say, a forest, because the species and organisms that live in that ecosystem turn over more rapidly than in the forest.

Consensus of experts agree that there is no impact to warming

Hsu 10

Jeremy, Live Science Staff, July 19, pg. <http://www.livescience.com/culture/can-humans-survive-extinction-doomsday-100719.html>

His views deviate sharply from those of most experts, who don't view climate change as the end for humans. Even the worst-case scenarios discussed by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change don't foresee human extinction. "The scenarios that the mainstream climate community are advancing are not end-of-humanity, catastrophic scenarios," said Roger Pielke Jr., a climate policy analyst at the University of Colorado at Boulder. Humans have the technological tools to begin tackling climate change, if not quite enough yet to solve the problem, Pielke said. He added that doom-mongering did little to encourage people to take action. "My view of politics is that the long-term, high-risk scenarios are really difficult to use to motivate short-term, incremental action," Pielke explained. "The rhetoric of fear and alarm that some people tend toward is counterproductive." Searching for solutions One technological solution to climate change already exists through carbon capture and storage, according to Wallace Broecker, a geochemist and renowned climate scientist at Columbia University's Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory in New York City. But Broecker remained skeptical that governments or industry would commit the resources needed to slow the rise of carbon dioxide (CO2) levels, and predicted that more drastic geoengineering might become necessary to stabilize the planet. "The rise in CO2 isn't going to kill many people, and it's not going to kill humanity," Broecker said. "But it's going to change the entire wild ecology of the planet, melt a lot of ice, acidify the ocean, change the availability of water and change crop yields, so we're essentially doing an experiment whose result remains uncertain."

Even the worst case scenario doesn’t have an impact

Craig Idso, et al., founder and former President of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change and former Director of Environmental Science at Peabody Energy, Volume 14, Number 10: 9 March 2011, “Surviving the Unprecedented Climate Change of the IPCC” , <http://www.co2science.org/articles/V14/N10/EDIT.php> , KENTUCKY

In a paper published in Systematics and Biodiversity, Willis et al. (2010) consider the IPCC (2007) "predicted climatic changes for the next century" -- i.e., their contentions that "global temperatures will increase by 2-4°C and possibly beyond, sea levels will rise (~1 m ± 0.5 m), and atmospheric CO2 will increase by up to 1000 ppm" -- noting that it is "widely suggested that the magnitude and rate of these changes will result in many plants and animals going extinct," citing studies that suggest that "within the next century, over 35% of some biota will have gone extinct (Thomas et al., 2004; Solomon et al., 2007) and there will be extensive die-back of the tropical rainforest due to climate change (e.g. Huntingford et al., 2008)." On the other hand, they indicate that some biologists and climatologists have pointed out that "many of the predicted increases in climate have happened before, in terms of both magnitude and rate of change (e.g. Royer, 2008; Zachos et al., 2008), and yet biotic communities have remained remarkably resilient (Mayle and Power, 2008) and in some cases thrived (Svenning and Condit, 2008)." But they report that those who mention these things are often "placed in the 'climate-change denier' category," although the purpose for pointing out these facts is simply to present "a sound scientific basis for understanding biotic responses to the magnitudes and rates of climate change predicted for the future through using the vast data resource that we can exploit in fossil records." Going on to do just that, Willis et al. focus on "intervals in time in the fossil record when atmospheric CO2 concentrations increased up to 1200 ppm, temperatures in mid- to high-latitudes increased by greater than 4°C within 60 years, and sea levels rose by up to 3 m higher than present," describing studies of past biotic responses that indicate "the scale and impact of the magnitude and rate of such climate changes on biodiversity." And what emerges from those studies, as they describe it, "is evidence for rapid community turnover, migrations, development of novel ecosystems and thresholds from one stable ecosystem state to another." And, most importantly in this regard, they report "there is very little evidence for broad-scale extinctions due to a warming world." In concluding, the Norwegian, Swedish and UK researchers say that "based on such evidence we urge some caution in assuming broad-scale extinctions of species will occur due solely to climate changes of the magnitude and rate predicted for the next century," reiterating that "the fossil record indicates remarkable biotic resilience to wide amplitude fluctuations in climate."

No risk of extinction

Stampf ’7 [Olaf, Staff Writer for Spiegel Online, May 5, “Not the End of the World as we Know it,” http://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/0,1518,481684,00.html]

But even this moderate warming would likely have far fewer apocalyptic consequences than many a prophet of doom would have us believe. For one thing, the more paleontologists and geologists study the history of the earth's climate, the more clearly do they recognize just how much temperatures have fluctuated in both directions in the past. Even major fluctuations appear to be completely natural phenomena. Additionally, some environmentalists doubt that the large-scale extinction of animals and plants some have predicted will in fact come about. "A warmer climate helps promote species diversity," says Munich zoologist Josef Reichholf. Also, more detailed simulations have allowed climate researchers to paint a considerably less dire picture than in the past -- gone is the talk of giant storms, the melting of the Antarctic ice shield and flooding of major cities. Improved regionalized models also show that climate change can bring not only drawbacks, but also significant benefits, especially in northern regions of the world where it has been too cold and uncomfortable for human activity to flourish in the past. However it is still a taboo to express this idea in public. For example, countries like Canada and Russia can look forward to better harvests and a blossoming tourism industry, and the only distress the Scandinavians will face is the guilty conscience that could come with benefiting from global warming.

#### Impossible to cut emissions – no modeling or momentum

**Mead 10** (Walter Russell, senior fellow for U.S. foreign policy at the Council on Foreign Relations, The Death of Global Warming, February 1, <http://blogs.the-american-interest.com/wrm/2010/02/01/the-death-of-global-warming/>)

The global warming movement as we have known it is dead. Its health had been in steady decline during the last year as the once robust hopes for a strong and legally binding treaty to be agreed upon at the Copenhagen Summit faded away. By the time that summit opened, campaigners were reduced to hoping for a ‘politically binding’ agreement to be agreed that would set the stage for the rapid adoption of the legally binding treaty. After the failure of the summit to agree to even that much, the movement went into a rapid decline. The movement died from two causes: bad science and bad politics. After years in which global warming activists had lectured everyone about the overwhelming nature of the scientific evidence, it turned out that the most prestigious agencies in the global warming movement were breaking laws, hiding data, and making inflated, bogus claims resting on, in some cases, no scientific basis at all. This latest story in the London Times is yet another shocker; the IPCC’s claims that the rainforests were going to disappear as a result of global warming are as bogus and fraudulent as its claims that the Himalayan glaciers would melt by 2035. It seems as if a scare story could grab a headline, the IPCC simply didn’t care about whether it was reality-based. With this in mind, ‘climategate’ — the scandal over hacked emails by prominent climate scientists — looks sinister rather than just unsavory. The British government has concluded that University of East Anglia, home of the research institute that provides the global warming with much of its key data, had violated Britain’s Freedom of Information Act when scientists refused to hand over data so that critics could check their calculations and methods. Breaking the law to hide key pieces of data isn’t just ‘science as usual,’ as the global warming movement’s embattled defenders gamely tried to argue. A cover-up like that suggests that you indeed have something to conceal. The urge to make the data better than it was didn’t just come out of nowhere. The global warmists were trapped into the necessity of hyping the threat by their realization that the actual evidence they had — which, let me emphasize, all hype aside, is serious, troubling and establishes in my mind the need for intensive additional research and investigation, as well as some prudential steps that would reduce CO2 emissions by enhancing fuel use efficiency and promoting alternative energy sources — was not sufficient to get the world’s governments to do what they thought needed to be done. Hyping the threat increasingly doesn’t look like an accident: it looks like it was a conscious political strategy. Now it has failed. Not everything that has come out of the IPCC and the East Anglia Climate Unit is false, but enough of their product is sufficiently tainted that these institutions can best serve the cause of fighting climate change by stepping out of the picture. New leadership might help, but everything these two agencies have done will now have to be re-checked by independent and objective sources. The global warming campaigners got into this mess because they had a deeply flawed political strategy. They were never able to develop a pragmatic approach that could reach its goals in the context of the existing international system. The global warming movement proposed a complex set of international agreements involving vast transfers of funds, intrusive regulations in national economies, and substantial changes to the domestic political economies of most countries on the planet. As it happened, the movement never got to the first step — it never got the world’s countries to agree to the necessary set of treaties, transfers and policies that would constitute, at least on paper, a program for achieving its key goals. Even if that first step had been reached, the second and third would almost surely not have been. The United States Congress is unlikely to pass the kind of legislation these agreements would require before the midterm elections, much less ratify a treaty. (It takes 67 senate votes to ratify a treaty and only 60 to overcome a filibuster.) After the midterms, with the Democrats expected to lose seats in both houses, the chance of passage would be even more remote — especially as polls show that global warming ranks at or near the bottom of most voters’ priorities. American public opinion supports ‘doing something’ about global warming, but not very much; support for specific measures and sacrifices will erode rapidly as commentators from Fox News and other conservative outlets endlessly hammer away. Without a commitment from the United States to pay its share of the $100 billion plus per year that poor countries wanted as their price for compliance, and without US participation in other aspects of the proposed global approach, the intricate global deals fall apart. Since the United States was never very likely to accept these agreements and ratify these treaties, and is even less prepared to do so in a recession with the Democrats in retreat, even “success” in Copenhagen would not have brought the global warming movement the kind of victory it sought — although it would have created a very sticky and painful political problem for the United States. But even if somehow, miraculously, the United States and all the other countries involved not only accepted the agreements but ratified them and wrote domestic legislation to incorporate them into law, it is extremely unlikely that all this activity would achieve the desired result. Countries would cheat, either because they chose to do so or because their domestic systems are so weak, so corrupt or so both that they simply wouldn’t be able to comply. Governments in countries like China and India aren’t going to stop pushing for all the economic growth they can get by any means that will work — and even if central governments decided to move on global warming, state and local authorities have agendas of their own. The examples of blatant cheating would inevitably affect compliance in other countries; it would also very likely erode what would in any case be an extremely fragile consensus in rich countries to keep forking over hundreds of billions of dollars to poor countries — many of whom would not be in anything like full compliance with their commitments. For better or worse, the global political system isn’t capable of producing the kind of result the global warming activists want. It’s like asking a jellyfish to climb a flight of stairs; you can poke and prod all you want, you can cajole and you can threaten. But you are asking for something that you just can’t get — and at the end of the day, you won’t get it. The grieving friends and relatives aren’t ready to pull the plug; in a typical, whistling-past-the-graveyard comment, the BBC first acknowledges that even if the current promises are kept, temperatures will rise above the target level of two degrees Celsius — but let’s not despair! The BBC quotes one of its own reporters: “BBC environment reporter Matt McGrath says the accord lacks teeth and does not include any clear targets on cutting emissions. But if most countries at least signal what they intend to do to cut their emissions, it will mark the first time that the UN has a comprehensive written collection of promised actions, he says.”

#### Existing CO2 will cause warming for 1,000 years

**Maugh 9** (Thomas H, Los Angeles Times, Study says some global warming now irreversible, January 27, <http://articles.sfgate.com/2009-01-27/news/17198723_1_carbon-dioxide-warming-s-effect-dioxide-emissions/2>)

Even if by some miracle of environmental activism global carbon dioxide levels reverted to pre-industrial levels, it still would take 1,000 years or longer for the climate changes already triggered to be reversed, scientists said Monday. The gas that is already there and the heat that has been absorbed by the ocean will exert their effects for centuries, according to the analysis, published Monday in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Science. Over the long haul, the warming will melt the polar icecaps more than previously had been estimated, raising ocean levels substantially, the report said. And changes in rainfall patterns will bring droughts comparable to those that caused the 1930s Dust Bowl to the American Southwest, southern Europe, northern Africa and western Australia. "People have imagined that if we stopped emitting carbon dioxide, the climate would go back to normal in 100 years, 200 years," lead author Susan Solomon, a senior scientist at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, said in a telephone news conference. "That's not true." The changes will persist until at least the year 3000, said Solomon, who conducted the study with colleagues in Switzerland and France.

#### **Warming inevitable – even if we stop emissions now**

IPCC 13 – Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Your Author, 9/27/13, (“Working Group I Contribution to the IPCC Fifth Assessment Report Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis Summary for Policymakers, <http://www.climatechange2013.org/images/uploads/WGIAR5-SPM_Approved27Sep2013.pdf>, AW)

CONCLUSION: A lower warming target, or a higher likelihood of remaining below a specific warming target, will require lower cumulative CO2 emissions. Accounting for warming effects of increases in nonCO2 greenhouse gases, reductions in aerosols, or the release of greenhouse gases from permafrost will also lower the cumulative CO2 emissions for a specific warming target (see Figure SPM.10). {12.5} A large fraction of anthropogenic climate change resulting from CO2 emissions is irreversible on a multi-century to millennial time scale, except in the case of a large net removal of CO2 from the atmosphere over a sustained period. Surface temperatures will remain approximately constant at elevated levels for many centuries after a complete cessation of net anthropogenic CO2 emissions. Due to the long time scales of heat transfer from the ocean surface to depth, ocean warming will continue for centuries. Depending on the scenario, about 15 to 40% of emitted CO2 will remain in the atmosphere longer than 1,000 years.
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#### Russian conflict only scenario for extinction—your author

Bostrom ‘02

(Dr. Nick, Professor of Philosophy and Global Studies at YALE, "Existential Risks: Analyzing Human Extinction Scenarios and Related Hazards," 3-8-02, http://www.transhumanist.com/volume9/risks.html)

Risks in this sixth category are a recent phenomenon. This is part of the reason why it is useful to distinguish them from other risks. We have not evolved mechanisms, either biologically or culturally, for managing such risks. Our intuitions and coping strategies have been shaped by our long experience with risks such as dangerous animals, hostile individuals or tribes, poisonous foods, automobile accidents, Chernobyl, Bhopal, volcano eruptions, earthquakes, draughts, World War I, World War II, epidemics of influenza, smallpox, black plague, and AIDS. These types of disasters have occurred many times and our cultural attitudes towards risk have been shaped by trial-and-error in managing such hazards. But tragic as such events are to the people immediately affected, in the big picture of things – from the perspective of humankind as a whole – even the worst of these catastrophes are mere ripples on the surface of the great sea of life. They haven’t significantly affected the total amount of human suffering or happiness or determined the long-term fate of our species. With the exception of a species-destroying comet or asteroid impact (an extremely rare occurrence), there were probably no significant existential risks in human history until the mid-twentieth century, and certainly none that it was within our power to do something about. The first manmade existential risk was the inaugural detonation of an atomic bomb. At the time, there was some concern that the explosion might start a runaway chain-reaction by “igniting” the atmosphere. Although we now know that such an outcome was physically impossible, it qualifies as an existential risk that was present at the time. For there to be a risk, given the knowledge and understanding available, it suffices that there is some subjective probability of an adverse outcome, even if it later turns out that objectively there was no chance of something bad happening. If we don’t know whether something is objectively risky or not, then it is risky in the subjective sense. The subjective sense is of course what we must base our decisions on.[2] At any given time we must use our best current subjective estimate of what the objective risk factors are.[3] A much greater existential risk emerged with the build-up of nuclear arsenals in the US and the USSR. An all-out nuclear war was a possibility with both a substantial probability and with consequences that might have been persistent enough to qualify as global and terminal. There was a real worry among those best acquainted with the information available at the time that a nuclear Armageddon would occur and that it might annihilate our species or permanently destroy human civilization.[4] Russia and the US retain large nuclear arsenals that could be used in a future confrontation, either accidentally or deliberately. There is also a risk that other states may one day build up large nuclear arsenals. Note however that a smaller nuclear exchange, between India and Pakistan for instance, is not an existential risk, since it would not destroy or thwart humankind’s potential permanently. Such a war might however be a local terminal risk for the cities most likely to be targeted. Unfortunately, we shall see that nuclear Armageddon and comet or asteroid strikes are mere preludes to the existential risks that we will encounter in the 21st century. The special nature of the challenges posed by existential risks is illustrated by the following points: · Our approach to existential risks cannot be one of trial-and-error. There is no opportunity to learn from errors. The reactive approach – see what happens, limit damages, and learn from experience – is unworkable. Rather, we must take a proactive approach. This requires foresight to anticipate new types of threats and a willingness to take decisive preventive action and to bear the costs (moral and economic) of such actions. · We cannot necessarily rely on the institutions, moral norms, social attitudes or national security policies that developed from our experience with managing other sorts of risks. Existential risks are a different kind of beast. We might find it hard to take them as seriously as we should simply because we have never yet witnessed such disasters.[5] Our collective fear-response is likely ill calibrated to the magnitude of threat. · Reductions in existential risks are global public goods [13] and may therefore be undersupplied by the market [14]. Existential risks are a menace for everybody and may require acting on the international plane. Respect for national sovereignty is not a legitimate excuse for failing to take countermeasures against a major existential risk. · If we take into account the welfare of future generations, the harm done by existential risks is multiplied by another factor, the size of which depends on whether and how much we discount future benefits [15,16].

#### Plan solves stability - this bolsters the oil industry

**Lugar, 12 –** (Richard Lugar, Senator from Indiana. December 21, 2012. “OIL, MEXICO, AND THE TRANSBOUNDARY AGREEMENT,” http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/)//SDL

Congressional attention to the Mexican energy situation is critical¶ for understanding bilateral issues between our countries and¶ for consideration of U.S. energy security. The United States has a¶ profound interest in economic prosperity and political stability in¶ Mexico, and energy is foundational to both interests. Oil is vital for¶ the Mexican federal budget, underwriting both social programs and¶ law and order, and the oil industry is an important aspect of broader¶ economic activity. Stability and growth, or lack thereof, in Mexico’s¶ oil and gas sector can directly impact issues of bilateral concern.

#### Capital investments allow for oil development

**Lugar, 12 –** (Richard Lugar, Senator from Indiana. December 21, 2012. “OIL, MEXICO, AND THE TRANSBOUNDARY AGREEMENT,” http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/)//SDL

PEMEX likely could develop a deep offshore project by buying¶ technology and expertise through very generous service contracts¶ with many of the same companies with which the IOCs contract.¶ However, under current capital and management constraints,6¶ PEMEX alone is extremely unlikely to have the resources necessary¶ to undertake multiple massive deep offshore developments¶ while also investing in conventional oil production. Moreover, while¶ some technology can be purchased through service contracts,¶ project management expertise to run that type of project is not easily¶ acquired.¶ Therefore, the decision on whether IOCs should be granted access¶ individually or in partnership with PEMEX to develop oil in¶ Mexico depends on how much oil the Mexican Government wants¶ produced and over what span of time. Interlocutors did not indicate¶ that the expectations of either of the largest political parties or the¶ Mexican public are conducive to the long time horizons it would¶ take for PEMEX under current conditions to fully develop Mexico’s¶ oil.

#### Causes reforms which boost production

Lugar, 12 **–** (Richard Lugar, Senator from Indiana. December 21, 2012. “OIL, MEXICO, AND THE TRANSBOUNDARY AGREEMENT,” http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/)//SDL

Any number of management, regulatory, and financial reforms¶ could be beneficial to Mexico’s energy future, but putting oil production¶ on a sustainable growth path will require IOC investment¶ and expertise. Many interlocutors expressed that another incremental¶ reform would not be worth the political effort; as one observer¶ stated, ‘‘If there’s anything we’ve learned on energy reforms¶ in Mexico, it is that if reforms are incremental, they don’t work.’’

#### They have huge reserves – affects the entire market

RICHARD G. LUGAR, 2012 (Senator from Indiana), OIL, MEXICO, AND THE TRANSBOUNDARY AGREEMENT Dec. 21, 2012. Retrieved Apr. 21, 2013 from <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/>, rwg)

Progress, but can it last? A snapshot of Mexico’s oil sector¶ Mexico has a long history of oil production and has prospects for¶ a bright future as an oil power, but such an outcome is not guaranteed.¶ Mexico sits atop significant amounts of oil estimated at 10.4¶ billion barrels of proven reserves, but that number could more than¶ double when unconventional and deep offshore reserves are fully¶ proven. The large unconventional Chicontopec area alone is estimated¶ to hold up to 17.7 billion barrels.

No impact to terrorism – its small

Roberts 02Brad Roberts, member of the research staff at the Institute for Defense Analyses, and Michael Moodie, president of the Chemical and Biological Arms Control Institute, July 2002, “Biological Weapons: Toward a Threat Reduction Strategy, Defense Horizons, http://www.ndu.edu/inss/DefHor/DH15/DH15.htm

The argument about terrorist motivation is also important. Terrorists generally have not killed as many as they have been capable of killing. This restraint seems to derive from an understanding of mass casualty attacks as both unnecessary and counterproductive. They are unnecessary because terrorists, by and large, have succeeded by conventional means. Also, they are counterproductive because they might alienate key constituencies, whether among the public, state sponsors, or the terrorist leadership group. In Brian Jenkins' famous words, terrorists want a lot of people watching, not a lot of people dead. Others have argued that the lack of mass casualty terrorism and effective exploitation of BW has been more a matter of accident and good fortune than capability or intent. Adherents of this view, including former Secretary of Defense William Cohen, argue that "it's not a matter of if but when." The attacks of September 11 would seem to settle the debate about whether terrorists have both the motivation and sophistication to exploit weapons of mass destruction for their full lethal effect. After all, those were terrorist attacks of unprecedented sophistication that seemed clearly aimed at achieving mass casualties--had the World Trade Center towers collapsed as the 1993 bombers had intended, perhaps as many as 150,000 would have died. Moreover, Osama bin Laden's constituency would appear to be not the "Arab street" or some other political entity but his god. And terrorists answerable only to their deity have proven historically to be among the most lethal. But this debate cannot be considered settled. Bin Laden and his followers could have killed many more on September 11 if killing as many as possible had been their primary objective. They now face the core dilemma of asymmetric warfare: how to escalate without creating new interests for the stronger power and thus the incentive to exploit its power potential more fully. Asymmetric adversaries want their stronger enemies fearful, not fully engaged--militarily or otherwise. They seek to win by preventing the stronger partner from exploiting its full potential. To kill millions in America with biological or other weapons would only commit the United States--and much of the rest of the international community--to the annihilation of the perpetrators.

No impact to terrorism – Terrorists’ nuclear weapons fail, and they’ll only use conventional weapons

Muller, November, 2008,( Richard, Prof. Of Physics @ UC-Berkeley, Foreign Policy; The List: Five Physics Lessons for Obama; http://www.foreignpolicy.com/story/cms.php?story\_id=4555&print=1

Conventional Wisdom: A nuclear attack is the biggest terrorist threat we face.

The hard science: Making a nuclear bomb is excruciatingly difficult. North Korean leader Kim Jong Il spent billions making one—starving his people in the process—and even his bomb fizzled. When it was tested in 2006, it released the energy equivalent of about half the jet fuel of each of the planes that crashed into the World Trade Center towers. But even if a nuclear bomb fizzles, can’t it spread deadly radioactivity? And what about a “dirty bomb,” a smaller weapon specifically designed to do just that? This threat is also mostly exaggerated. In reality, a dirty bomb would leave very few immediate casualties. That’s because radioactivity, once spread after an explosion, drops below the threshold for radiation illness. A dirty bomb might not even cause an observable increase in cancer rates. Perhaps that’s why al Qaeda instructed Chicago gang member José Padilla to abandon his goal of making a dirty bomb and told him instead to blow up apartment buildings using natural gas—which would have a greater chance of killing a large number of people. What is most scary is that al Qaeda seems to understand this fact better than many politicians.

Conventional weapons are preferred

Craig Whitlock, Washington Post Foreign Service, 6/5/2007, The Washington Post, “Homemade, Cheap and Dangerous: Terror Cells Favor Simple Ingredients In Building Bombs,” http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/07/04/AR2007070401814\_pf.html

Counterterrorism officials have warned for years that Osama bin Laden and his lieutenants have tried to obtain weapons of mass destruction, such as a nuclear device or chemical or biological weapons. In response, U.S. military and intelligence agencies have invested vast amounts of money to block their acquisition. So far, however, al-Qaeda and its affiliates have relied almost solely on simple, homemade bombs crafted from everyday ingredients -- such as nail-polish remover and fertilizer -- when plotting attacks in Europe and the United States. The makeshift bombs lack the destructive potential of the conventional explosives that rake Iraq on a daily basis. They are also less reliable, as demonstrated by the car bombs that failed to go off in London last week after the culprits tried to ignite them with detonators wired to cellphones. But other attempts have generated plenty of mayhem and damage, including the kitchen-built backpack bombs that killed 52 people in the London public transit system on July 7, 2005. "It makes no difference to your average person if somebody puts a car bomb out there that is crude or one that is sophisticated," said Chris Driver-Williams, a retired British major and military intelligence officer who studies explosive devices used by terrorist groups. "If it detonates, all of a sudden you've got a very serious device and one that has achieved exactly what the terrorists wanted." The advantages of homemade explosives are that they are easy and cheap to manufacture, as well as difficult for law enforcement agencies to detect. According to one expert, the peroxide-based liquid explosives that an al-Qaeda cell allegedly intended to use to blow up nine transatlantic airliners last summer would have cost as little as $15 a bomb.

And, terrorists don’t want to nuclear weapons

Lavoy (Asst. prof nat’l Sec @ Naval Post-Grad School) 1995 [Security Studies, Summer]

Waltz does not dispute the ability of terrorists to gain control of a few nuclear explosives. He does doubt, however, that terrorists ever would use them. This sanguine view derives from three assumptions. Waltz makes about the nature and aims of terrorist organizations. First, because “secrecy is safety” for terrorists, waltz believes that they would not wish suddenly to enlarge their ranks through the multiplication of “suppliers, transporters, technicians, and guardians” required to obtain and maintain nuclear weapons. Second, terrorists are not well suited to carrying out the time-consuming negotiations needed to obtain the compliance of a state placed under a terrorist nuclear threat. Third, terrorists favor tactics of disruption and harassment to threats of wholesale death and destruction; nuclear weapons do not help terroists reach their long-term goals. If terrorists did seek to take many lives, Waltz reasons that poison would be a better weapons.

### No strikes – negotiations now

Slavin, 3/23/12

[Barbara, Senior Fellow at the Atlantic Council, Washington, D.C, “ Iran, Israel and U.S. moves from war rhetoric back to diplomacy,” <http://womennewsnetwork.net/2012/03/23/iran-israel-us-war-rhetoric/>]

After months of sabre-rattling rhetoric by Iran, Israel and the United States, there seems to be a collective, and welcome, time out. Since President Barack Obama’s 4 March speech to the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC), all sides have been stressing non-military means to try to resolve the crisis over Iran’s nuclear program. While asserting that he is determined to prevent Iran from developing nuclear weapons, Obama spent much of his AIPAC address decrying what he called “loose talk” of war. He spoke eloquently of the costs of military conflict for a nation that has fought two wars in the last decade. His message to visiting Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu was clear: I am not going to start another war and you are not going to drag me into one. Netanyahu, for his part, appeared to bow to several realities. A savvy politician, he is recalculating the odds that Obama will be re-elected for another four-year term. The Israeli leader also knows that most of Israel’s defense and intelligence establishment – as well as a majority of the Israeli people – oppose a unilateral strike on Iran that could spark massive retaliation without significantly setting back the Iranian nuclear program. Former Mossad chief Meir Dagan has called such a strike “stupid”. Obama argues that economic sanctions are having a major impact on the Iranian economy and should be given more time to work. Evidence bears this out. U.S. banking sanctions and the threat of a European oil embargo have reduced the value of Iran’s currency by half, increased inflation and unemployment and depressed oil production. The International Energy Agency reported last week that Iran is pumping only 3.3 million barrels a day – down from 3.8 million barrels last year – and Iran’s oil exports may drop by as much as 50 per cent this summer. While denying that sanctions are a factor, Iranian leaders have agreed to come back to negotiations with the so-called P5+1 – the five permanent members of the UN Security Council plus Germany. Talks – the first since January 2011 – are expected to take place after the Iranian New Year holiday. In advance, the Islamic Republic has been conducting a charm offensive. Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei on 8 March reaffirmed a 1995 fatwa that building nuclear weapons would be a “great sin”. He also praised Obama for criticising war talk. “Such remarks are good and indicate a step out of delusions”, Khamenei said. On 15 March, Mohammad Javad Larijani, a U.S.-educated physicist and adviser to Khamenei, told CNN’s Christiane Amanpour that Iran would provide “full transparency” for its nuclear program in return for acceptance of Iran’s right to peaceful nuclear energy under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. Larijani also denied that Iran had any intention of attacking Israel, saying that Iran would defend itself against aggression but would not strike another country first. The Iranians have signaled their interest in dialogue with the United States in other ways. On 5 March, Iran’s Supreme Court ordered a retrial for an Iranian American former U.S. Marine who had been sentenced to death as a CIA spy. On 13 March, the U.S. deported back to Iran an Iranian arms dealer arrested in 2007 in a sting operation in the Republic of Georgia. Taken together, these steps improve the atmosphere for negotiations. However, it remains unclear whether the Obama administration and its partners will put forward proposals that could provide Iran a face-saving way to reduce tensions.

### Political fallout deters

Levy, 3/2/12

[ Daniel Levy directs the Middle East Task Force at the New America Foundation and is an editor of the Middle East Channel. He is a senior policy fellow at the European Council on Foreign Relations., <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/03/02/netanyahu_won_t_attack_iran?page=0,3>]

Netanyahu operates in a highly political environment. Israel is a rambunctious (though certainly imperfect) democracy, in which reelection is a matter of more than passing interest for any prime minister. While Defense Minister Barak may be a serial risk-taker whose days of electoral viability are behind him, those things are certainly not true of Netanyahu. Bibi has served twice so far as Israel's prime minister and is close to becoming the second-longest-serving PM in Israel's history. A tendency characterizing Netanyahu's long term in office, and a counterintuitive one at that, is the degree to which he has been risk-averse, not only in matters of peace, but also in matters of war. No Operation Cast Leads, Lebanon wars, or Syria Deir ez-Zor attack missions under his watch. In fact, he has no record of military adventurism. What's more, Netanyahu hardly appears to be in need of a Hail Mary pass, military or otherwise, to salvage his political fortunes. Polls consistently show that he is a shoo-in for reelection. The right-wing block in Israel currently has a hegemonic grip on Israeli politics, something that seems unlikely to change. Netanyahu secured his own continued leadership of the Likud party in Jan. 31's primary. His primacy on the right faces few challenges from either within the Likud or beyond it. Despite never winning favor with much of the mainstream media, the messy management in his own office, and the challenges of coalition balancing (particularly over issues of religion and state), Netanyahu maintains solid approval ratings with a relatively strong economy and can even now bask in Israel's lowest unemployment numbers in 32 years. Although it is fair to speculate that a successful, daring mission to the heart of Iranian airspace would be domestically popular and a boost to the prime minister, such a mission is anything but risk-free. Not only would the specific military action be fraught with uncertainty and potential hiccups, but the fallout from a strike, even one successful in immediate terms, could have far-reaching repercussions and consequences for Israel in the security and diplomatic arenas and by extension, of course, in the domestic political domain. The Hebrew expression she'yorim shotkim ("silence when shooting") is used to describe the phenomenon whereby domestic criticism of the government is suspended when military action is under way. The problem for Netanyahu is that all signs point to that rule not applying in this case. Former security establishment figures at the highest levels have mounted an unprecedented campaign warning Israel's leader and its public of the follies of launching a solo and premature Israeli military action against Iran. Most outspoken has been recently retired Mossad chief Meir Dagan, who has described a strike on Iran as "the stupidest thing I have ever heard." But he has not been alone. Other former IDF chiefs of staff, as well as Shin Bet and intel leaders, have joined the cautioning chorus. Many are unlikely to shut up if Bibi defies their counsel. And in the public arena, these voices cannot be dismissed as just so many self-serving chickenhawk politicians. The fallout from an attack on Iran is possibly the biggest threat to Bibi serving a third term.

### No public pressure

Levy, 3/2/12

[ Daniel Levy directs the Middle East Task Force at the New America Foundation and is an editor of the Middle East Channel. He is a senior policy fellow at the European Council on Foreign Relations., <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/03/02/netanyahu_won_t_attack_iran?page=0,3>]

Another oft-overlooked aspect is the absence of public pressure in Israel for military intervention or of a supposed Iranian threat featuring as a priority issue for Israelis. The pressure to act is top-down, not bottom-up. And to the extent to which there is trepidation among the public, that is a function of fear at the blowback from Israeli military action, rather than fear of Iranian-initiated conflagration. Also to be factored in is the possibility of 2012 being an election year in Israel (though technically the current parliament could serve until October 2013). If Netanyahu does pursue early elections, as many pundits expect, then the political risk associated with an attack increases, heightened by the likelihood of a strike being depicted as an election ploy. What's more, prices at the pump are an issue for Israeli voters, just as they are in the United States.

Especially noteworthy is the extent to which the elements of Netanyahu's coalition further to his right have not embraced or promoted military action against Iran. In fact, they tend to demonstrate a lack of enthusiasm at the prospect. This applies to both the ultra-Orthodox and the greater Israel settler-nationalists. One reason is that they view the Iran issue as peripheral when compared with, say, the pursuit of settlements and an irreversible presence in all of greater Israel. In fact, a strike on Iran is sometimes depicted as presenting a threat to the settlement enterprise, in as much as there is an expectation that part of the fallout would be enhanced pressure on Israel to tamp down resulting regional anger by displaying more give on the Palestinian front. With so many in the settler movement convinced that the irreversibility of 40-plus years of occupation is within touching distance, the last thing they want now is to rock the boat by creating new and unpredictable challenges to their cause. From the outside, that may seem a stretch, given the American and international timidity with which every new settlement expansion is greeted. Yet concern is voiced in settlement circles when the likes of Haaretz Editor in Chief Aluf Benn makes the case for an Itamar (a hard-core ideological settlement) in exchange for Natanz (an Iranian nuclear facility) -- an idea that has led some errant Israeli peaceniks to flirt with joining the pro-war camp on Iran.

The more settler-centric right is also cognizant of the distraction value served by the Iranian nuclear issue in deflecting attention from its land grabs and entrenchment in the West Bank and East Jerusalem. Chances are, settlements won't be making any headlines in next week's Obama-Netanyahu meeting. Thus, removal of Iran from the agenda is a losing proposition for the settler lobby. Netanyahu himself surely appreciates the extent to which this comes in handy, in that focusing on Iran (although not attacking Iran) allows Israel to line up together with the West in the camp of the "good guys" for once, as opposed to in the doghouse on the Palestinian issue. Want a sense of just how well this distraction serves the greater Israel cause? Take a look at Goldberg's latest interview with Obama for the Atlantic -- 4,561 words and not one of them mentions the Palestinians or settlements.

### International constraints

Levy, 3/2/12
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Finally, in the "maybe Netanyahu won't attack after all" column, Israel's leadership is aware that its nonmembership in various nuclear accords and its assumed weapons-of-mass-destruction capacity will be dragged more harshly into the spotlight following an Israeli strike -- not something that is likely to lead to precipitous Israeli disarmament, but unwanted, unpleasant, and unpredictable, nonetheless.

### Even if Iran struck first, NBD

Kam, PhD IR – Harvard, deputy director – Institute for National Security Studies, ‘11

(Ephraim, “A Green Light on Iran?” Strategic Assessment Vol. 13, No. 4, January)

The question is, which of the threats would military action seek to address? If there is sufficient basis to the assessment that Iran is liable to attack Israel with nuclear weapons, then military action can be weighed as a means to prevent an extreme danger on this level. However, if the basic assumption is that Iran would not launch a nuclear strike against Israel but that Israel would be required to confront threats of the second level, it is doubtful they would justify military action and convince other countries of the necessity of the action. Though important and significant threats, they are not existential, and Israel could cope with them. It is true that in the past Israel conducted many military actions and also went to war in order to remove threats that were not necessarily existential. But the problematic nature of military action against Iran and the exceptional risks it involves, as well as the US administration’s reservations, raise doubts as to whether it would be correct to take such action, if its entire goal would be to confront the second level threats.