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### 1nc tix

#### Obama is pushing Congress to resolve the debt ceiling --- political capital is key.

Pace 9/12

Julie, AP White House correspondent, Syria debate on hold, Obama refocuses on agenda, The Fresno Bee, 9/12/13, http://www.fresnobee.com/2013/09/12/3493538/obama-seeks-to-focus-on-domestic.html

With a military strike against Syria on hold, President Barack Obama tried Thursday to reignite momentum for his second-term domestic agenda. But his progress could hinge on the strength of his standing on Capitol Hill after what even allies acknowledge were missteps in the latest foreign crisis.¶ "It is still important to recognize that we have a lot of things left to do here in this government," Obama told his Cabinet, starting a sustained White House push to refocus the nation on matters at home as key benchmarks on the budget and health care rapidly approach.¶ "The American people are still interested in making sure that our kids are getting the kind of education they deserve, that we are putting people back to work," Obama said.¶ The White House plans to use next week's five-year anniversary of the 2008 financial collapse to warn Republicans that shutting down the government or failing to raise the debt limit could drag down the still-fragile economy. With Hispanic Heritage Month to begin Monday, Obama is also expected to press for a stalled immigration overhaul and urge minorities to sign up for health care exchanges beginning Oct. 1.¶ Among the events planned for next week is a White House ceremony highlighting Americans working on immigrant and citizenship issues. Administration officials will also promote overhaul efforts at naturalization ceremonies across the country. On Sept. 21, Obama will speak at the Congressional Black Caucus Gala, where he'll trumpet what the administration says are benefits of the president's health care law for African-Americans and other minorities.¶ Two major factors are driving Obama's push to get back on track with domestic issues after three weeks of Syria dominating the political debate. Polls show the economy, jobs and health care remain Americans' top concerns. And Obama has a limited window to make progress on those matters in a second term, when lame-duck status can quickly creep up on presidents, particularly if they start losing public support.¶ Obama already is grappling with some of the lowest approval ratings of his presidency. A Pew Research Center/USA Today poll out this week put his approval at 44 percent. That's down from 55 percent at the end of 2012.¶ Potential military intervention in Syria also is deeply unpopular with many Americans, with a Pew survey finding that 63 percent opposing the idea. And the president's publicly shifting positions on how to respond to a deadly chemical weapons attack in Syria also have confused many Americans and congressional lawmakers.¶ "In times of crisis, the more clarity the better," said Sen. Lindsey Graham, R-S.C., a strong supporter of U.S. intervention in Syria. "This has been confusing. For those who are inclined to support the president, it's been pretty hard to nail down what the purpose of a military strike is."¶ For a time, the Obama administration appeared to be barreling toward an imminent strike in retaliation for the Aug. 21 chemical weapons attack. But Obama made a sudden reversal and instead decided to seek congressional approval for military action.¶ Even after administration officials briefed hundreds of lawmakers on classified intelligence, there appeared to be limited backing for a use-of-force resolution on Capitol Hill. Rather than face defeat, Obama asked lawmakers this week to postpone any votes while the U.S. explores the viability of a deal to secure Syria's chemical weapons stockpiles.¶ That pause comes as a relief to Obama and many Democrats eager to return to issues more in line with the public's concerns. The most pressing matters are a Sept. 30 deadline to approve funding to keep the government open — the new fiscal year begins Oct. 1 — and the start of sign-ups for health care exchanges, a crucial element of the health care overhaul.¶ On Wednesday, a revolt by tea party conservatives forced House Republican leaders to delay a vote on a temporary spending bill written to head off a government shutdown. Several dozen staunch conservatives are seeking to couple the spending bill with a provision to derail implementation of the health care law.¶ The White House also may face a fight with Republicans over raising the nation's debt ceiling this fall. While Obama has insisted he won't negotiate over the debt limit, House Speaker John Boehner on Thursday said the GOP will insist on curbing spending.

#### Plan wrecks PC.

Padgett 10

Tim, Latin America Bureau Chief @ Time Magazine last 14 years, 8/23, <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,2013820,00.html>

Proponents of doing just that insist there's more consensus than ever in the U.S. to ditch the Cuba embargo and its travel ban, which, after almost 50 years, have utterly failed to dislodge the Castro regime. Opening Cuba to Americans, they believe, will do more to stimulate democratization there than isolating it has. Even a majority of Cuban Americans now agree. Still, for all the good vibes the bill's backers feel from the White House right now, some note warily that Obama has been loath to spend political capital in Cuba, or the rest of Latin America for that matter. Critics, for example, point to his decision last year to stop applying pressure against coup leaders in Honduras, who'd ousted a leftist President, when conservative Republicans in Congress objected. Embargo supporters, including Cuban-American Senator Robert Menendez of New Jersey, a Democrat, are already blasting Obama's plans to relax Cuba travel. "This is not the time to ease the pressure on the Castro regime," Menendez said this month, insisting it will only give the brothers "a much needed infusion of dollars that will only extend their reign of oppression." As a result, says one congressional aide who asked not to be identified, when it comes time for the White House to give the bill more full-throated support, "there's a fear they may just decide that the fight's not worth it."

#### Collapses the global economy.

Davidson 13

Adam, co-founder of NPR’s “Planet Money,” Our Debt to Society, New York Times, 9/10/13, http://www.nytimes.com/2013/09/15/magazine/our-debt-to-society.html?pagewanted=all

If the debt ceiling isn’t lifted again this fall, some serious financial decisions will have to be made. Perhaps the government can skimp on its foreign aid or furlough all of NASA, but eventually the big-ticket items, like Social Security and Medicare, will have to be cut. At some point, the government won’t be able to pay interest on its bonds and will enter what’s known as sovereign default, the ultimate national financial disaster achieved by countries like Zimbabwe, Ecuador and Argentina (and now Greece). In the case of the United States, though, it won’t be an isolated national crisis. If the American government can’t stand behind the dollar, the world’s benchmark currency, then the global financial system will very likely enter a new era in which there is much less trade and much less economic growth. It would be, by most accounts, the largest self-imposed financial disaster in history.¶ Nearly everyone involved predicts that someone will blink before this disaster occurs. Yet a small number of House Republicans (one political analyst told me it’s no more than 20) appear willing to see what happens if the debt ceiling isn’t raised — at least for a bit. This could be used as leverage to force Democrats to drastically cut government spending and eliminate President Obama’s signature health-care-reform plan. In fact, Representative Tom Price, a Georgia Republican, told me that the whole problem could be avoided if the president agreed to drastically cut spending and lower taxes. Still, it is hard to put this act of game theory into historic context. Plenty of countries — and some cities, like Detroit — have defaulted on their financial obligations, but only because their governments ran out of money to pay their bills. No wealthy country has ever voluntarily decided — in the middle of an economic recovery, no less — to default. And there’s certainly no record of that happening to the country that controls the global reserve currency.¶ Like many, I assumed a self-imposed U.S. debt crisis might unfold like most involuntary ones. If the debt ceiling isn’t raised by X-Day, I figured, the world’s investors would begin to see America as an unstable investment and rush to sell their Treasury bonds. The U.S. government, desperate to hold on to investment, would then raise interest rates far higher, hurtling up rates on credit cards, student loans, mortgages and corporate borrowing — which would effectively put a clamp on all trade and spending. The U.S. economy would collapse far worse than anything we’ve seen in the past several years.¶ Instead, Robert Auwaerter, head of bond investing for Vanguard, the world’s largest mutual-fund company, told me that the collapse might be more insidious. “You know what happens when the market gets upset?” he said. “There’s a flight to quality. Investors buy Treasury bonds. It’s a bit perverse.” In other words, if the U.S. comes within shouting distance of a default (which Auwaerter is confident won’t happen), the world’s investors — absent a safer alternative, given the recent fates of the euro and the yen — might actually buy even more Treasury bonds. Indeed, interest rates would fall and the bond markets would soar.¶ While this possibility might not sound so bad, it’s really far more damaging than the apocalyptic one I imagined. Rather than resulting in a sudden crisis, failure to raise the debt ceiling would lead to a slow bleed. Scott Mather, head of the global portfolio at Pimco, the world’s largest private bond fund, explained that while governments and institutions might go on a U.S.-bond buying frenzy in the wake of a debt-ceiling panic, they would eventually recognize that the U.S. government was not going through an odd, temporary bit of insanity. They would eventually conclude that it had become permanently less reliable. Mather imagines institutional investors and governments turning to a basket of currencies, putting their savings in a mix of U.S., European, Canadian, Australian and Japanese bonds. Over the course of decades, the U.S. would lose its unique role in the global economy.¶ The U.S. benefits enormously from its status as global reserve currency and safe haven. Our interest and mortgage rates are lower; companies are able to borrow money to finance their new products more cheaply. As a result, there is much more economic activity and more wealth in America than there would be otherwise. If that status erodes, the U.S. economy’s peaks will be lower and recessions deeper; future generations will have fewer job opportunities and suffer more when the economy falters. And, Mather points out, no other country would benefit from America’s diminished status. When you make the base risk-free asset more risky, the entire global economy becomes riskier and costlier.

#### Nuclear war

Friedberg and Schoenfeld 8

Aaron, Prof. Politics. And IR @ Princeton’s Woodrow Wilson School and Visiting Scholar @ Witherspoon Institute, and Gabriel, Senior Editor of Commentary and Wall Street Journal, “The Dangers of a Diminished America” <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB122455074012352571.html>

Then there are the dolorous consequences of a potential collapse of the world's financial architecture. For decades now, Americans have enjoyed the advantages of being at the center of that system. The worldwide use of the dollar, and the stability of our economy, among other things, made it easier for us to run huge budget deficits, as we counted on foreigners to pick up the tab by buying dollar-denominated assets as a safe haven. Will this be possible in the future? Meanwhile, traditional foreign-policy challenges are multiplying. The threat from al Qaeda and Islamic terrorist affiliates has not been extinguished. Iran and North Korea are continuing on their bellicose paths, while Pakistan and Afghanistan are progressing smartly down the road to chaos. Russia's new militancy and China's seemingly relentless rise also give cause for concern. If America now tries to pull back from the world stage, it will leave a dangerous power vacuum. The stabilizing effects of our presence in Asia, our continuing commitment to Europe, and our position as defender of last resort for Middle East energy sources and supply lines could all be placed at risk. In such a scenario there are shades of the 1930s, when global trade and finance ground nearly to a halt, the peaceful democracies failed to cooperate, and aggressive powers led by the remorseless fanatics who rose up on the crest of economic disaster exploited their divisions. Today we run the risk that rogue states may choose to become ever more reckless with their nuclear toys, just at our moment of maximum vulnerability. The aftershocks of the financial crisis will almost certainly rock our principal strategic competitors even harder than they will rock us. The dramatic free fall of the Russian stock market has demonstrated the fragility of a state whose economic performance hinges on high oil prices, now driven down by the global slowdown. China is perhaps even more fragile, its economic growth depending heavily on foreign investment and access to foreign markets. Both will now be constricted, inflicting economic pain and perhaps even sparking unrest in a country where political legitimacy rests on progress in the long march to prosperity. None of this is good news if the authoritarian leaders of these countries seek to divert attention from internal travails with external adventures.

### 1nc cp

#### The United States federal government should

#### --- stop allocating resources to OFAC enforcement of the Cuban embargo.

#### --- not place the nuclear arsenal on high alert or retaliate in the event of a nuclear attack.

### 1nc death cult

#### The aff’s simulation of death produces a culture of structural violence that makes destruction desirable --- this is a gateway issue --- if they win death impacts are good, the rest of the 1NC applies --- we won’t cross-apply to prove links.

**Giroux ’12** Henry A Giroux, Frequent author on pedagogy in the public sphere, Truthout, "Youth in Revolt: The Plague of State-Sponsored Violence," March 14, 2012, <http://truth-out.org/index.php?option=com_k2%26view=item%26id=7249:youth-in-revolt-the-plague-of-statesponsored-violence-http://truth-out.org/index.php?option=com_k2%26view=item%26id=7249:youth-in-revolt-the-plague-of-statesponsored-violence>

As the pleasure principle is unconstrained by a moral compass based on a respect for others, it is increasingly shaped by the need for intense excitement and a never-ending flood of heightened sensations. What has led to this immunity and insensitivity to cruelty and prurient images of violence? Part of this process is due to the fact that the American public is bombarded by an unprecedented "huge volume of exposure to ... images of human suffering."(22) As Zygmunt Bauman argues, there are social costs that come with this immersion of a culture of staged violence. One consequence is that "the sheer numbers and monotony of images may have a 'wearing off' impact [and] to stave off the 'viewing fatigue,' they must be increasingly gory, shocking and otherwise 'inventive' to arouse any sentiments at all or indeed draw attention. The level of 'familiar' violence, below which the cruelty of cruel acts escapes attention, is constantly rising."(23) Hyper-violence and spectacular representations of cruelty disrupt and block our ability to respond politically and ethically to the violence as it is actually happening on the ground. In this instance, unfamiliar violence such as extreme images of torture and death become banally familiar, while familiar violence that occurs daily is barely recognized relegated to the realm of the unnoticed and unnoticeable. How else to explain the public indifference to the violence waged by the state against nonviolent youthful protesters, who are rebelling against a society in which they have been excluded from any claim on hope, prosperity and democracy. As an increasing volume of violence is pumped into the culture, yesterday's spine-chilling and nerve-wrenching violence loses its shock value. As the need for more intense images of violence accumulates, the moral indifference and desensitization to violence grows while matters of cruelty and suffering are offered up as fodder for sports, entertainment, news media, and other outlets for seeking pleasure. Marked by a virulent notion of hardness and aggressive masculinity, a culture of violence has become commonplace in a society in which pain, humiliation and abuse are condensed into digestible spectacles endlessly circulated through extreme sports, reality TV, video games, YouTube postings and proliferating forms of the new and old media. But the ideology of hardness and the economy of pleasure it justifies are also present in the material relations of power that have intensified since the Reagan presidency, when a shift in government policies first took place, and set the stage for the emergence of unchecked torture and state violence under the Bush-Cheney regime. Conservative and liberal politicians alike now spend millions waging wars around the globe, funding the largest military state in the world, providing huge tax benefits to the ultra-rich and major corporations and all the while draining public coffers, increasing the scale of human poverty and misery and eliminating all viable public spheres - whether they be the social state, public schools, public transportation, or any other aspect of a formative culture that addresses the needs of the common good. State violence, particularly the use of torture, abductions and targeted assassinations, are now justified as part of a state of exception that has become normalized. A "political culture of hyper punitiveness"(24) has become normalized and accelerates throughout the social order like a highly charged electric current. Democracy no longer leaves open the importance of an experience of the common good. As a mode of "failed sociality," the current version of market fundamentalism has turned the principles of democracy against itself, deforming both the language of freedom and justice that made equality a viable idea and political goal. State violence operating under the guise of personal safety and security, while parading species of democracy, cancels out democracy "as the incommensurable sharing of existence that makes the political possible."(25) Symptoms of ethical, political and economic impoverishment are all around us. Meanwhile, exaggerated violence is accelerated in the larger society and now rules screen culture. The public pedagogy of entertainment includes extreme images of violence, human suffering and torture splashed across giant movie screens, some in 3D, offering viewers every imaginable portrayal of violent acts, each more shocking and brutal than the last. The growing taste for violence can be seen in the increasing modeling of public schools after prisons, the criminalization of behaviors such as homelessness that once were the object of social protections. A symptomatic example of the way in which violence has saturated everyday life can be seen in the growing acceptance of criminalizing the behavior of young people in public schools. Behaviors that were normally handled by teachers, guidance counselors and school administrators are now dealt with by the police and the criminal justice system. The consequences have been disastrous for young people. Not only do schools resemble the culture of prisons, but young children are being arrested and subjected to court appearances for behaviors that can only be termed as trivial. How else to explain the case of the five-year-old girl in Florida who was put in handcuffs and taken to the local jail because she had a temper tantrum; or the case of Alexa Gonzales in New York who was arrested for doodling on her desk. Even worse, a 13-year-old boy in a Maryland school was arrested for refusing to say the pledge of allegiance. There is more at work than stupidity and a flight from responsibility on the part of educators, parents and politicians who maintain these laws; there is also the growing sentiment that young people constitute a threat to adults and that the only way to deal with them is to subject them to mind-crushing punishment. Students being miseducated, criminalized and arrested through a form of penal pedagogy in prison-type schools provide a grim reminder of the degree to which the ethos of containment and punishment now creeps into spheres of everyday life that were largely immune in the past from this type of state violence. The governing through crime ethic also reminds us that we live in an era that breaks young people, corrupts the notion of justice and saturates the minute details of everyday life with the threat, if not reality, of violence. This mediaeval type of punishment inflicts pain on the psyche and the body of young people as part of a public spectacle. Even more disturbing is how the legacy of slavery informs this practice given that "Arrests and police interactions ... disproportionately affect low-income schools with large African-American and Latino populations,"(26) paving the way for them to move almost effortlessly through the school-to-prison pipeline. Surely, the next step will be a reality TV franchise in which millions tune in to watch young kids being handcuffed, arrested, tried in the courts and sent to juvenile detention centers. This is not merely barbarism parading as reform - it is also a blatant indicator of the degree to which sadism and the infatuation with violence have become normalized in a society that seems to take delight in dehumanizing itself. As the social is devalued along with rationality, ethics and any vestige of democracy, spectacles of war, violence and brutality now merge into forms of collective pleasure that constitute an important and new symbiosis among visual pleasure, violence and suffering. The control society is now the ultimate form of entertainment as the pain of others, especially those considered disposable and powerless, has become the subject not of compassion, but of ridicule and amusement in America. High-octane violence and human suffering are now considered another form of entertainment designed to raise the collective pleasure quotient. Reveling in the suffering of others should no longer be reduced to a matter of individual pathology, but now registers a larger economy of pleasure across the broader culture and social landscape. My emphasis here is on the sadistic impulse and how it merges spectacles of violence and brutality with forms of collective pleasure. No society can make a claim to being a democracy as long as it defines itself through shared fears rather than shared responsibilities. Widespread violence now functions as part of an anti-immune system that turns the economy of genuine pleasure into a mode of sadism that creates the foundation for sapping democracy of any political substance and moral vitality. The prevalence of institutionalized violence in American society and other parts of the world suggests the need for a new conversation and politics that addresses what a just and fair world looks like. The predominance of violence in all aspects of social life suggests that young people and others marginalized by class, race and ethnicity have been abandoned as American society's claim on democracy gives way to the forces of militarism, market fundamentalism and state terrorism. The prevalence of violence throughout American society suggests the need for a politics that not only negates the established order, but imagines a new one, one informed by a radical vision in which the future does not imitate the present.(27) In this discourse, critique merges with a sense of realistic hope and individual struggles merge into larger social movements. The challenge that young people are posing to American society is being met with a state-sponsored violence that is about more than police brutality; it is more importantly about the transformation of the United States from a social state to a warfare state, from a state that embraced the social contract to one that no longer has a language for community - a state in which the bonds of fear and commodification have replaced the bonds of civic responsibility and democratic vision. Until we address how the metaphysics of war and violence have taken hold on American society (and in other parts of the world) and the savage social costs it has enacted, the forms of social, political and economic violence that young people are protesting against as well as the violence waged in response to their protests will become impossible to recognize and act on.

### 1nc oil

**Prices rising now --- will remain above $100 --- best and most predictive evidence**

**AllAfrica News 7-30** (“High Oil Prices - Boom to Some, Doom to Others”, 2013, http://m.allafrica.com/stories/201307301218.html/, Deech)

Oil prices have remained **consistently high** and volatile over the past few years. According to estimates, they may remain this way at least until 2014. The Brent crude spot price, which averaged 112 dollars a barrel in 2012, is **projected** to remain **above 100 dollars** a barrel. This is at an average of 108 dollars and 101 dollars per barrel, in 2013 and 2014, respectively. High oil prices may dampen the global economy, which is still struggling to recover from the 2008 financial crisis. High oil prices above 100 dollars can be explained by many factors and they may affect economies in an uneven way, with an unclear outcome for the global economy as a whole. According to estimates by the International Monetary Fund (IMF), a 50pc increase in oil prices, due to a supply shock, would lead to a one to 1.5pc decrease in output, in many regions of the world. Rising oil prices will affect African economies differently depending on whether they are net exporters or net importers of the commodity. For oil-importing economies, high oil prices could translate into high import bills with adverse effects on inflation, production and employment. In contrast, oil-exporting economies could benefit from high oil prices, because an increase in oil revenues improves their balance of payments. In addition, price volatility may harm both importers and exporters of oil. It lowers, for instance, the predictability of marginal costs of production for companies. The uncertainty regarding their cash flows may induce companies to reduce their investments and limit job creation, which can consequently harm economic growth. Oil prices have increased since 2003, from less than 40 dollars to more than 100 dollars per barrel today. Oil prices fell sharply in 2008, before recovering steadily since then. Prices were volatile during 2011 and 2012, mainly because of the Arab Spring and events in Libya, in addition to conflict between Sudan and South Sudan. Many uncertain and conflicting factors on both supply and demand sides have contributed to the persistent high oil prices in recent years. Geopolitical factors are the main causes that drove up oil prices in producing countries. In the past decade, wars in Iraq and political tensions in the Middle East and North Africa have affected the oil market. More recently, disagreements between Western nations and Iran - one of the largest oil producers and exporters in the world - have fuelled risks of sharp disruptions in oil supplies globally. This, in turn, had a significant impact on prices of the commodity. In contrast, major oil producing countries, mainly Saudi Arabia, may not be able to boost production and instead have to cover losses elsewhere, as their capacities are reaching their limit. The decline in aggregate oil inventories and high costs of oil extraction and production are other supply-side factors affecting oil prices. Increasing demand from major emerging economies, such as China and India, has also played an important role in keeping oil prices **persistently high** over the past years. The Asian continent surpassed the US and is now the largest consumer of oil in the world. Despite the slowdown in economic growth in China and India, demand will **remain higher**. This will keep oil prices at high levels. Furthermore, as growth is resuming in the US and as the crisis in the euro area seems to be easing, global demand for oil may increase.

#### The plan ends oil dependence.

**Carroll, 08**—Latin American correspondent for The Guardian (Rory Carroll, “20bn Barrel Oil Discovery Puts Cuba in the Big League”, The Guardian, October 17, 2008, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2008/oct/18/cuban-oil>)//IK

Friends and foes have called Cuba many things - a progressive beacon, a quixotic underdog, an oppressive tyranny - but no one has called it lucky, until now .¶ Mother nature, it emerged this week, appears to have blessed the island with enough oil reserves to vault it into the ranks of energy powers. The government announced there may be more than 20bn barrels of recoverable oil in offshore fields in Cuba's share of the Gulf of Mexico, more than twice the previous estimate.¶ If confirmed, it puts Cuba's reserves on par with those of the US and into the world's top 20. Drilling is expected to start next year by Cuba's state oil company Cubapetroleo, or Cupet.¶ "It would change their whole equation. The government would have more money and no longer be dependent on foreign oil," said Kirby Jones, founder of the Washington-based US-Cuba Trade Association. "It could join the club of oil exporting nations."¶ "We have more data. I'm almost certain that if they ask for all the data we have, (their estimate) is going to grow considerably," said Cupet's exploration manager, Rafael Tenreyro Perez.¶ Havana based its dramatically higher estimate mainly on comparisons with oil output from similar geological structures off the coasts of Mexico and the US. Cuba's undersea geology was "very similar" to Mexico's giant Cantarell oil field in the Bay of Campeche, said Tenreyro.¶ A consortium of companies led by Spain's Repsol had tested wells and were expected to begin drilling the first production well in mid-2009, and possibly several more later in the year, he said.¶ Cuba currently produces about 60,000 barrels of oil daily, covering almost half of its needs, and imports the rest from Venezuela in return for Cuban doctors and sports instructors. Even that barter system puts a strain on an impoverished economy in which Cubans earn an average monthly salary of $20.¶ Subsidised grocery staples, health care and education help make ends meet but an old joke - that the three biggest failings of the revolution are breakfast, lunch and dinner - still does the rounds. Last month hardships were compounded by tropical storms that shredded crops and devastated coastal towns.¶ "This news about the oil reserves could not have come at a better time for the regim**e,"** said Jonathan Benjamin-Alvarado, a Cuba energy specialist at the University of Nebraska.¶ However there is little prospect of Cuba becoming a communist version of Kuwait. Its oil is more than a mile deep under the ocean and difficult and expensive to extract. The four-decade-old US economic embargo prevents several of Cuba's potential oil partners - notably Brazil, Norway and Spain - from using valuable first-generation technology.¶ "You're looking at three to five years minimum before any meaningful returns," said Benjamin-Alvarado.¶ Even so, Cuba is a master at stretching resources. President Raul Castro, who took over from brother Fidel, has promised to deliver improvements to daily life to shore up the legitimacy of the revolution as it approaches its 50th anniversary.¶ Cuba's unexpected arrival into the big oil league could increase pressure on the next administration to loosen the embargo to let US oil companies participate in the bonanza and reduce US dependency on the middle east, said Jones. "Up until now the embargo did not really impact on us in a substantive, strategic way. Oil is different. It's something we need and want."

**ending oil demand ensures a flood**

**Kole 7** (William, Correspondent – AP, “Despite Rising Prices, OPEC Appears to be in No Rush to Raise its Output Targets”, 9-8, http://nwitimes.com/articles/2007/09/08/business/business/doc7e79bb33cb7ec6f28625734f00723bfd.txt)

1. If you remember what happened in the 1970's (look it up if you don't) you will find the biggest fear OPEC has. It is that oil prices will go up and stay high long enough to fuel investment into conservation and alternative energy sources to the point that a critical mass is reached and the need for their oil is **greatly diminished** or **replaced** by other energy sources they don't control. That's exactly what started happening in the 1970's and it took OPEC opening up the tap to make oil cheap again over a decade to reverse the trends. The result was that interest in conservation and alternative energy waned and investments dried up in the face of cheap oil again. We are once again nearing that point and you can expect to see OPEC **flood the market** again if they see us getting serious with conservation and alternative energy sources that compete with, or worse yet, actually **replace** demand for their oil. OPEC walks the fine line between price and demand and wants to keep us hooked up to their oil like a bunch of junkies on drugs while making as much money as possible.

**Any sustained drop below $100 per barrel causes Russian collapse --- that’s the key benchmark**

**Whitmore 13** (Brian, Senior Russia Correspondent – Radio Free Europe, “After The Storm: Trends To Watch In Russia In 2013”, Radio Free Europe, 1-2, The Power Vertical)

It began with a roar and it ended with a whimper. As 2012 wound down in Russia, the soaring expectations for change that accompanied the civic awakening and mass protests at the year’s dawn had clearly faded. But the social, economic, and political forces that spawned them will continue to shape the landscape well into the new year. A fledgling middle class remains hungry for political change, splits still plague the ruling elite over the way forward, and a fractious opposition movement continues to struggle to find its voice. With the Kremlin unable to decisively squelch the mounting dissent and the opposition unable to topple President Vladimir Putin, Russia has entered an uneasy **holding pattern** that has the feel of an interlude between two epochs. "I don't think we are at the end of the Putin era, but we are at the beginning of the end," says longtime Russia-watcher Edward Lucas, international editor of the British weekly "The Economist" and author of the recently published book "Deception." With economic headwinds on the horizon, generational conflict brewing, and new political forces developing, Russian society is changing -- and changing rapidly. But the political system remains ossified. So what can we expect in 2013? Below are several trends and issues to keep an eye on in the coming year. The Oil Curse: Energy Prices And The Creaking Welfare State If 2012 was all about politics, 2013 will also be about **economics**. The Russian economy, the cliche goes, **rests on** two pillars -- oil and gas. And both will come under increasing pressure as the year unfolds. World oil prices, currently hovering between $90 and **$100 per barrel**, are expected to be volatile for the foreseeable future. And any sharp drop could prove **catastrophic** for the Russian economy. Energy experts and economists say Russia's budget will **only** stay balanced if oil prices remain **between $100 and $110** per barrel. Five years ago, the figure needed for a balanced budget was $50 to $55.

#### The impact is 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 k - 5

#### International relations are gendered—the aff’s discourse of security is based on a flawed worldview of identity that makes their impacts inevitable.

**Tickner, 1 IR prof,** —professor at the School of International Relations, USC. B.A. in History, U London. M.A. in IR, Yale. PhD in pol sci, Brandeis U (Ann, Gendering World Politics: Issues and Approaches in the Post-Cold War Era, 44-47 , KD)

44 New issues and new definitions of security have been accompanied by calls for new ways of understanding security. Controversy about the meaning of security has been part of a more fundamental debate over broader epistemological issues that, on the critical side, has included questioning the state-centric foundations and assumptions of realism as well as challenging its positivist-rationalist methodologies. Many scholars on the critical side of these epistemological debates claim that these ontological and epistemological issues are highly interrelated. The beginning of the debate over the meaning of security and its expanding agenda, as well as over how to explain conflict and prescribe for its amelioration, was coincidental with the third debate in IR. Scholars on the critical side began to question realism’s explanations for states’ security behavior based on economistic, rational-choice models or natural-science equilibrium models associated with the balance of power. Many claimed that issues of culture and identity must be included in order to gain a fuller understanding of states’ security interests and policies. Poststructuralist scholars began to question the foundational myths of realist worldviews upon which realist explanations of conflict depend. Claiming that theory cannot be divorced from political practice, critics pointed to realism’s complicity in shaping policymakers’ understandings of and prescriptions for U.S. security behavior in the ColdWar world. Walt’s defense of the social-scientific foundations of security studies (mentioned earlier) and his dismissal of other approaches have drawn sharp criticism from critical-security scholars. The ethnocentricism of his review and his description of a field that appears closely allied with U.S. security interests call into question his claim about the field’s ability to “rise above the political” and raises the issue of whose interest security is serving. Edward Kolodziej has claimed that Walt’s philosophically restrictive notion of the social sciences confines the security scholar to testing propositions largely specified by policymakers; it is they who decide what is real and relevant.33 Kolodziej goes on to say that Walt’s definition of science bars 45 any possibility of an ethical or moral discourse; even the normative concerns of classical realists are deemphasized in order to put the realist perspective on scientific foundations. Challenging Walt’s view of the history of the field as a gradual evolution toward an objective, scientific discipline that ultimately yields a form of knowledge beyond time and history, Keith Krause and Michael Williams have claimed that Walt has created an epistemic hierarchy that allows conventional security studies to set itself up as the authoritative judge of alternative claims;34 this leads to a **dismissal of alternative epistemologies** in terms of their not being “scientific.” Critics claim that issues they consider important for understanding security cannot be raised within a positivist-rationalist epistemology or an ontology based on instrumentally rational actors in a state-centric world. In addition to constraining what can be said about security, a realist-rationalist approach precludes consideration of an ethical or emancipatory politics. For example, Krause and Williams contest realism’s claim that states and anarchy are essential and unproblematic facts of world politics. They suggest that this worldview is grounded in an understanding of human subjects as self contained— as instrumentally rational actors confronting an objective external reality. This methodologically individualist premise renders questions about identity and interest formation as unimportant.35 These and other critics claim that issues of identity and interest demand more interpretive modes of analysis. For this reason, critical scholars see the necessity of shifting from a focus on abstract individualism to a stress on culture and identity and the roles of norms and ideas. Such criticisms are being voiced by scholars variously identified as constructivists, critical theorists, and postmodernists. While not all of them reject realism’s state-centric framework, all challenge its assumptions about states as unitary actors whose identities are unimportant for understanding their security behavior. Although certain of these scholars see an incommensurability between rationalist and interpretive epistemologies, others are attempting to bridge this gap by staying within realism’s state-centric worldview while questioning its rationalist epistemology. Ronald Jepperson, Alexander Wendt, and Peter Katzenstein have argued for what they call “sociological institutionalism”— a view that advocates an identity-based approach, but one that stays within the traditional security agenda, a focus on states, and explanatory social science. Where this approach differs from rationalism is in its investigation of how norms, institutions, and other cultural features of domestic and international environments affect states’ security interests and policies. Conversely, 46 when states enact a particular identity, they have a profound effect on the international system to which they belong.36 Alexander Wendt’s constructivist approach also attempts to bridge the constructivist/rationalist divide. His strategy for building this bridge is to argue against the neorealist claim that self-help is given by anarchic structures. If we live in a self-help world, it is due to process rather than structure; in other words, “anarchy is what states make of it.”37 Constructivist social theory believes that “people act toward objects, including other actors, on the basis of the meanings that the objects have for them.”38 People and states act differently toward those they perceive as friends and those they see as enemies. Therefore, we cannot understand states’ security interests and behavior without considering issues of identity placed within their social context. Claiming that realist ontology and its rationalist epistemology are interdependent, more radical versions of critical-security studies reject these bridging attempts. Their calls for broadening the security agenda are made within the context of both a rejection of rationalism and a search for emancipatory theories that can get beyond realism’s skepticism about progressive change and the possibility of an ethical international politics. Poststructuralists claim that when knowledge about security is constructed in terms of the binary metaphysics of Western culture, such as inside/outside, us/them, and community/anarchy, security can be understood only within the confines of domestic community whose identity is **constructed in antithesis to external threat**.39 This denies the possibility of talking about an international community or an amelioration of the security dilemma since it is only within the space of political community that questions about ethics can be raised. In other words, the binary distinctions of national-security discourse **limit what can be said** and how it can be discussed. Thus, critical-security studies is not only about broadening the agenda— because, as mentioned earlier, this is possible with a realist framework. According to Ken Booth, critical-security is fundamentally different from realism because its agenda derives from a radically different political theory and methodology that question both realism’s constrained view of the political and its commitment to positivism. Critical-security studies rejects conventional security theory’s definition of politics based on the centrality of the state and its sovereignty. Arguing that the state is often part of the problem of insecurity rather than the solution, Booth claims that we should examine security from a bottom-up perspective that begins with individuals; however, critical-security studies should not ignore the state or the military dimensions 47 of world politics: “What is being challenged is not the material manifestations of the world of traditional realism, but its moral and practical status, including its naturalization of historically created theories, its ideology of necessity and limited possibility, and its propagandist common sense about this being the best of all worlds.”40 When we treat individuals as the objects of security, we open up the possibility of talking about a transcendent human community with common global concerns and allow engagement with the broadest global threats.41 The theme of emancipation is one that runs through much of the criticalsecurity studies literature. Emancipatory critical security can be defined as freeing people as individuals and groups from the social, physical, economic, and political constraints that prevent them from carrying out what they would freely choose to do.42 A postrealist, postpositivist emancipatory notion of security offers the promise of maximizing the security and improving the lives of the whole of humankind: it is a security studies of inclusion rather than exclusion.43 Yet imagining security divested of its statist connotations is problematic; the institutions of state power are not withering away. As R. B. J. Walker has claimed, the state is a political category in a way that the world or humanity is not.44 The security of states dominates our understanding of what security can be because other forms of political community have been rendered unthinkable. Yet, as Walker goes on to say, given the dangers of nuclear weapons, we are **no longer able to survive** in a world predicated on an extreme logic of state sovereignty, nor one where war is an option for system change. Therefore, we must revise our understanding of the relationship between universality and particularity upon which a statist concept of security has been constructed. Security must be analyzed in terms of how contemporary insecurities are being created and by a sensitivity to the way in which people are responding to insecurities by reworking their understanding of how their own predicament fits into broader structures of violence and oppression.45 Feminists—with their “bottom-up” approach to security, an ontology of social relations, and an emancipatory agenda—are beginning to undertake such reanalyses.

#### Masculine lenses make extinction inevitable and turn the case—vote negative to reject the affirmatives gendered lens—it’s the only way to open up new frameworks of thought

**Clark 4**—French Professor of Conflict Resolution at George Mason University (Mary E, ‘Rhetoric, Patriarchy & War: Explaining the Dangers of "Leadership" in Mass Culture, Women and Language’ pg. 21, KD)

Today's Western patriarchal world view now dominates globalwide dialogue among the "leaders" of Earth's nearly two hundred nation-states. Its Machiavellian/Realpolitik assumptions about the necessity of' military power to preserve order within and between groups of humans trumps--and **stifles--other** potential **viewpoints**. Founded on the belief that "evil" is innate, it dictates that human conflict must be "controlled": global "law" backed by coercive force. This view, when cross-culturally imposed, becomes a **self-fulfilling prophecy**, thus "**legitimating**" an **escalating use of force**. Western leaders (male and female) use a rhetoric couched in a "hegemonic masculinity" to justify their ready use of military force to coerce "those who are against us" into compliance. This translates globally as "national leaders must never lose facet!" Changing this dominant paradigm requires dismantling the hierarchic hegemony of masculine militarism and its related economic institutions, through global cross-cultural dialogues, thus replacing a hegemonic world view and institutions with new, more adaptive visions, woven out of the most useful remnants of multiple past cultural stories. The paper concludes with a few examples where people around the worm are doing just this--using their own small voices to insert their local "sacred social story" into the global dialogue. This global process--free from a hegemonic militaristic rhetoric--has the potential to initiate a planetary dialogue where "boundaries" are no longer borders to be defended, but sites of social ferment and creative adaptation. When the call came for papers on War, Language, and Gender, referring us to Carol Cohn's seminal paper "Sex and Death in the Rational World of Defense Intellectuals," (1) I at first felt that little more could be added on the subject. But events in Washington in the ensuing weeks stimulated me to a broader "take" on this topic. Defense intellectuals, after all, are embedded in a whole culture, and the interaction is two-way. Not only does their strategic framework with its euphemistic language about war and killing have the outcome of forcing society to think in their terms; their framework and language developed in response to our deeply embedded, Western cultural image of a Machiavellian / neo-Darwinian universe. In other words, militarism and the necessity for organized physical force (2) emerge out of culturewide assumptions about human nature. Throughout historical times these **assumptions** have repeatedly **proved to be self-fulfilling prophecies**. The pervasive perception of enemy-competitors has **generated** violent **conflicts** that flared up and died back, only to flare up again through our **failure** to achieve **deep** **resolution** and, especially, to alter our basic beliefs about human nature and our consequent social institutions. Today our species, politically, comprises some 180190 "nations" of varying cultural homogeneity and moral legitimacy, not to mention size and physical power. Regardless of their indigenous, internal cultural preferences, their cross-national interactions are institutionalized to fit a framework long established by former Western colonial powers among themselves. In other words, the global "reality" constructed by Western patriarchies-a Realpolitik, ultimately grounded in military power-has come to define day-to-day cross-national politics. During the era of the Cold War, this resulted in small, powerless nations seeking alliances with one or other superpower, which offered not only development aid but military protection, and, for locally unpopular, but "cooperating" leaders, small arms to maintain order at home. The "end" of the Cold War brought little change in this pervasive global militarism (though it did strengthen the role of economic hegemony by the remaining superpower (3)). The enormous technological "improvements"-i.e. efficiency in killing power-in weaponry of all types over the past few decades has now resulted in a dangerously over-armed planet that simultaneously faces a desperate **shortage of resources** available for providing the world's people with water, energy, health care, education, and the infrastructure for distributing them. While our environmental and social overheads continue to mount, our species seems immobilized, trapped in an institutionalized militarism-an evolutionary cul-de-sac**! We need** new insights-as Cohn said, a **new language**, a new set of metaphors, a **new mental framework**-for thinking, dialoguing and visioning new patterns of intersocietal interaction.

## case

### russia

#### litany of alt causes in relations

Tucker, 9/12 [Joshua A., Professor of Politics at NYU and a National Security Fellow at the Truman National Security Project, “The Confusing State of U.S.-Russia Relations,” <http://ideas.time.com/2013/09/12/the-confusing-state-of-u-s-russia-relations/>, ALB]

First, the recent direction of Vladimir Putin’s Kremlin in terms of the domestic political sphere is anathema to most of the values that the United States professes to support in its friends and allies: a free press, fair and competitive elections, civil rights for minorities, an independent judiciary, and so on. It seems that hardly more than a few weeks can go by without something happening in Russia that reminds American policymakers of how different the two regimes can be. The recent flight from the country of the distinguished economist Sergei Guriev and the trial, conviction, and release of recent Moscow mayoral candidate and opposition leader Alexander Navalny are but two examples, as are recent laws against “homosexual propaganda.” This is not to say that the United States does not cooperate with foreign regimes that have less than stellar democratic records. At the same time, though, the post-Cold War history of U.S.-Russian relations has been filled repeatedly with the promise of Russia becoming “more democratic” and of potential “resets.” To the extent that this promise isn’t fulfilled, the relationship (rightly or wrongly) suffers.

**No risk of US-Russia War**

#### A) Detargeting

**Ball 5** (Desmond, Professor – Strategic Defense Studies Centre at Australian National University, “The Probabilities of ‘On the Beach’ Assessing Armageddon Scenarios in the 21st Century, May, <http://www.manningclark.org.au/papers/se05_ball.html>)

The **prospects of a nuclear war between the U**nited **S**tates **and Russia must now be deemed** fairly **remote**. **There are now no geostrategic issues that warrant nuclear competition and no inclination in either** Washington or Moscow **to provoke** such issues. US and Russian **strategic forces have been taken off** day-to-day **alert and** their **ICBMs ‘de-targeted’, greatly reducing** the **possibilities of war by accident,** inadvertence **or miscalculation**. On the other hand, while the US-Russia strategic competition is in abeyance, there are several aspects of current US nuclear weapons policy which are profoundly disturbing. In December 2001 President George W. Bush officially announced that the United States was withdrawing from the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty of 1972, one of the mainstays of strategic nuclear arms control during the Cold War, with effect from June 2002, and was proceeding to develop and deploy an extensive range of both theatre missile defence and national missile defence (NMD) systems. The first anti-missile missile in the NMD system, designed initially to defend against limited missile attacks from China and North Korea, was installed at Fort Greely in Alaska in July 2004. The initial system, consisting of sixteen interceptor missiles at Fort Greely and four at Vandenberg Air Force in California, is expected to be operational by the end of 2005. The Bush Administration is also considering withdrawal from the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and resuming nuclear testing. (The last US nuclear test was on 23 September 1992). In particular, some key Administration officials believe that testing is necessary to develop a ‘new generation’ of nuclear weapons, including low-yield, ‘bunkerbusting’, earth-penetrating weapons specifically designed to destroy very hard and deeply buried targets (such as underground command and control centres and leadership bunkers).

#### B) Deterrence

**Turner 2** (Admiral Stansfield, Former Director – Central Intelligence Agency, Fletcher Forum of World Affairs, Winter / Spring, 26 Fletcher F. World Aff. 115, Lexis)

There are, of course, other centrals question to be considered: Would Russian psychology differ from American and would Russian society be willing to accept large numbers of nuclear detonations on their soil in order to perpetrate a nuclear war against the United States? These are difficult questions to answer. The more pertinent concern, however, is that this is an issue of life or death. **No head of state could contemplate plunging the world into nuclear conflict without considering both the mortal threat to** his or **her citizens, and** also **the likelihood of** his or **her own death**, underground shelters notwithstanding. **The presumption that heads of state prefer to live than to die gives us one benchmark. Another is the Cuban missile crisis, in which both** Leonid **Khruschev and** President **Kennedy quite visibly backed away from the prospect of very limited nuclear war.** Finally, **Russia’s economy,** being about the size of Belgium’s, **is so small that its leaders would be well aware that recovery, even from a small nuclear attack, would be a very lengthy process.** In terms of nuclear detonation threats, the United States must consider Russian deterrence as very close to its own.

### ofac

#### No iran war

#### No iran evidence. Prefer this evidence – it’s objective -

Aghsan and Jakobsen 10

Ali Rahigh-Aghsan is Assistant Professor at the Department of Society and Globalisation, Roskilde University and Peter Viggo Jakobsen is Associate Professor at the Department of Political Science, University of Copenhagen. “The Rise of Iran: How Durable, How Dangerous?”. The Middle East Journal, Volume 64, Number 4, Autumn 2010, pp. 559-573. Project Muse.

The rise in Iranian power is unsustainable and less threatening than the hard and soft power arguments suggest. The rise of Iran has largely been caused by factors that Tehran does not control: unsuccessful US policies, high oil prices, and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Tehran has jumped through a window created by others and exploited very favorable external circumstances to position itself as a spoiler in the regional conflicts in the Middle East. The hard and soft power camps are correct in pointing out that Iran can throw a spanner in the works in Afghanistan, Lebanon, Iraq, and Palestine and needs to be given a seat at the table when these issues are being discussed. They are wrong in believing that Iran commands the hard and soft power to determine the outcomes in any of these conflicts singlehandedly. Its declining influence in Iraq is a clear indication of this. Its current ability to shape and determine future outcomes in the Persian Gulf and the Middle East will be reduced by growing political and economic difficulties that will make it increasingly difficult for Tehran to pursue a coherent and proactive foreign and security policy. It will be reduced further by the balancing efforts that Tehran’s active support for Hamas and Hizbullah and its nuclear program have triggered to date; efforts that are bound to increase significantly if Iran does decide to build a nuclear weapon.

#### No escalation – economic incentives to stop conflict

Preble 9— vice president for defense and foreign policy studies at the Cato Institute

Christopher, The Power Problem, p. 111-2

Here again, the stated rationales for our military posture and broader strat-egy with respect to Middle Eastern oil fail a simple cost-benefit test. Whereas the analogy of providing security for commerce makes sense on the local and national level—federal, state, and local governments obviously do have a responsibility for protecting their citizens—these same governments have no respon-sibility to protect merchants and consumers of other countries. That obligation falls to their respective governments, and to the merchants and consumers themselves. Collectively, all of the states in the Persian Gulf have an incentive to guard against regional instability; and if conflict does erupt, they have a vested interest in ensuring that it does not threat the flow of oil. And it doesn’t much matter whether these countries are governed by kings or emirs, petty despots, or enlightened democrats. It is in the interest of all governments, even governments not necessarily committed to principles of Western-style democracy to guard their sources of wealth and power. In this respect, the Persian Gulf states can be expected to continue to sell oil because it is in their economic interest to do so. And if this same source of their economic livelihood—and in some cases regime survival—is threatened, they should be expected to pay the costs to protect it.

#### No Korean war---laundry list---(rational regime, empirics, military inferiority, and it’s all just domestic propaganda)

Fisher ‘13 Max, Foreign Policy Writer @ Washington Post & Former Editor at the Atlantic, “Why North Korea loves to threaten World War III (but probably won’t follow through)” http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/worldviews/wp/2013/03/12/why-north-korea-loves-to-threaten-world-war-iii-but-probably-wont-follow-through/

North Korea is indeed a dangerous rogue state that has, in the recent past, staged small-scale but deadly attacks on South Korea without provocation. In March 2010, a South Korean navy ship was attacked by a ship of unknown origin, killing 46 on board; though North Korea denied responsibility, an investigation concluded it was likely responsible. A few months later, North Korea fired over 100 artillery shells at Yeonpyeong Island, killing two civilians and wounding 19. But is North Korea really an irrational nation on the brink of launching “all-out war,” a mad dog of East Asia? Is Pyongyang ready to sacrifice it all? Probably not. The North Korean regime, for all its cruelty, has also shown itself to be **shrewd, calculating, and single-mindedly obsessed with its own self-preservation**. The regime’s past behavior **suggests pretty strongly** that these **threats are empty**. But they still matter. **For years**, North Korea has threatened the worst and, despite all of its apparent readiness, never gone through with it. So why does it keep going through these macabre performances? We can’t read Kim Jong Eun’s mind, but the most plausible explanation has to do with internal North Korean politics, with trying to set the tone for regional politics, and with forcing other countries (including the United States) to bear the costs of preventing its outbursts from sparking an unwanted war. Starting World War III or a second Korean War would not serve any of Pyongyang’s interests. Whether or not it deploys its small but legitimately scary nuclear arsenal, North Korea could indeed cause substantial mayhem in the South, whose capital is mere miles from the border. But the North Korean military is antiquated and inferior; it wouldn’t last long against a U.S.-led counterattack. No matter how badly such a war would go for South Korea or the United States, it would almost **certainly end with the regime’s total destruction**. Still, provocations and threats do serve Pyongyang’s interests, even if no one takes those threats very seriously. It helps to rally North Koreans, particularly the all-important military, behind the leader who has done so much to impoverish them. It also helps Pyongyang to control the regional politics that should otherwise be so hostile to its interests. Howard French, a former New York Times bureau chief for Northeast Asia whom I had the pleasure of editing at The Atlantic, explained on Kim Jong Il’s death that Kim had made up for North Korea’s weakness with canny belligerence: The shtick of apparent madness flowed from his country’s fundamental weakness as he, like a master poker player, resolved to bluff and bluff big. Kim adopted a game of brinkmanship with the South, threatening repeatedly to turn Seoul into a “sea of flames.” And while this may have sharply raised the threat of war, for the North, it steadily won concessions: fuel oil deliveries, food aid, nuclear reactor construction, hard cash-earning tourist enclaves and investment zones. At the risk of insulting Kim Jong Eun, it helps to think of North Korea’s provocations as somewhat akin to a child throwing a temper tantrum. He might do lots of shouting, make some over-the-top declarations (“I hate my sister,” “I’m never going back to school again”) and even throw a punch or two. Still, you give the child the attention he craves and maybe even a toy, **not because you think the threats are real** or because he deserves it, but because you want the tantrum to stop.

### la rels

#### No risk of nuclear terror – assumes every warrant

**Mueller 10** (John, professor of political science at Ohio State, Calming Our Nuclear Jitters, Issues in Science and Technology, Winter, http://www.issues.org/26.2/mueller.html)

Politicians of all stripes preach to an anxious, appreciative, and very numerous choir when they, like President Obama, proclaim atomic terrorism to be “the most immediate and extreme threat to global security.” It is the problem that, according to Defense Secretary Robert Gates, currently keeps every senior leader awake at night. This is hardly a new anxiety. In 1946, atomic bomb maker J. Robert Oppenheimer ominously warned that if three or four men could smuggle in units for an atomic bomb, they could blow up New York. This was an early expression of a pattern of dramatic risk inflation that has persisted throughout the nuclear age. In fact, although expanding fires and fallout might increase the effective destructive radius, the blast of a Hiroshima-size device would “blow up” about 1% of the city’s area—a tragedy, of course, but not the same as one 100 times greater. In the early 1970s, nuclear physicist Theodore Taylor proclaimed the atomic terrorist problem to be “immediate,” explaining at length “how comparatively easy it would be to steal nuclear material and step by step make it into a bomb.” At the time he thought it was already too late to “prevent the making of a few bombs, here and there, now and then,” or “in another ten or fifteen years, it will be too late.” Three decades after Taylor, we continue to wait for terrorists to carry out their “easy” task. In contrast to these predictions, terrorist groups seem to have exhibited only limited desire and even less progress in going atomic. This may be because, after brief exploration of the possible routes, they, unlike generations of alarmists, have discovered that the tremendous effort required is scarcely likely to be successful. The most plausible route for terrorists, according to most experts, would be to manufacture an atomic device themselves from purloined fissile material (plutonium or, more likely, highly enriched uranium). This task, however, remains a daunting one, requiring that a considerable series of difficult hurdles be conquered and in sequence. Outright armed theft of fissile material is exceedingly unlikely not only because of the resistance of guards, but because chase would be immediate. A more promising approach would be to corrupt insiders to smuggle out the required substances. However, this requires the terrorists to pay off a host of greedy confederates, including brokers and money-transmitters, any one of whom could turn on them or, either out of guile or incompetence, furnish them with stuff that is useless. Insiders might also consider the possibility that once the heist was accomplished, the terrorists would, as analyst Brian Jenkins none too delicately puts it, “have every incentive to cover their trail, beginning with eliminating their confederates.” If terrorists were somehow successful at obtaining a sufficient mass of relevant material, they would then probably have to transport it a long distance over unfamiliar terrain and probably while being pursued by security forces. Crossing international borders would be facilitated by following established smuggling routes, but these are not as chaotic as they appear and are often under the watch of suspicious and careful criminal regulators. If border personnel became suspicious of the commodity being smuggled, some of them might find it in their interest to disrupt passage, perhaps to collect the bounteous reward money that would probably be offered by alarmed governments once the uranium theft had been discovered. Once outside the country with their precious booty, terrorists would need to set up a large and well-equipped machine shop to manufacture a bomb and then to populate it with a very select team of highly skilled scientists, technicians, machinists, and administrators. The group would have to be assembled and retained for the monumental task while no consequential suspicions were generated among friends, family, and police about their curious and sudden absence from normal pursuits back home. Members of the bomb-building team would also have to be utterly devoted to the cause, of course, and they would have to be willing to put their lives and certainly their careers at high risk, because after their bomb was discovered or exploded they would probably become the targets of an intense worldwide dragnet operation. Some observers have insisted that it would be easy for terrorists to assemble a crude bomb if they could get enough fissile material. But Christoph Wirz and Emmanuel Egger, two senior physicists in charge of nuclear issues at Switzerland‘s Spiez Laboratory, bluntly conclude that the task “could hardly be accomplished by a subnational group.” They point out that precise blueprints are required, not just sketches and general ideas, and that even with a good blueprint the terrorist group would most certainly be forced to redesign. They also stress that the work is difficult, dangerous, and extremely exacting, and that the technical requirements in several fields verge on the unfeasible. Stephen Younger, former director of nuclear weapons research at Los Alamos Laboratories, has made a similar argument, pointing out that uranium is “exceptionally difficult to machine” whereas “plutonium is one of the most complex metals ever discovered, a material whose basic properties are sensitive to exactly how it is processed.“ Stressing the “daunting problems associated with material purity, machining, and a host of other issues,” Younger concludes, “to think that a terrorist group, working in isolation with an unreliable supply of electricity and little access to tools and supplies” could fabricate a bomb “is farfetched at best.” Under the best circumstances, the process of making a bomb could take months or even a year or more, which would, of course, have to be carried out in utter secrecy. In addition, people in the area, including criminals, may observe with increasing curiosity and puzzlement the constant coming and going of technicians unlikely to be locals. If the effort to build a bomb was successful, the finished product, weighing a ton or more, would then have to be transported to and smuggled into the relevant target country where it would have to be received by collaborators who are at once totally dedicated and technically proficient at handling, maintaining, detonating, and perhaps assembling the weapon after it arrives. The financial costs of this extensive and extended operation could easily become monumental. There would be expensive equipment to buy, smuggle, and set up and people to pay or pay off. Some operatives might work for free out of utter dedication to the cause, but the vast conspiracy also requires the subversion of a considerable array of criminals and opportunists, each of whom has every incentive to push the price for cooperation as high as possible. Any criminals competent and capable enough to be effective allies are also likely to be both smart enough to see boundless opportunities for extortion and psychologically equipped by their profession to be willing to exploit them. Those who warn about the likelihood of a terrorist bomb contend that a terrorist group could, if with great difficulty, overcome each obstacle and that doing so in each case is “not impossible.” But although it may not be impossible to surmount each individual step, the likelihood that a group could surmount a series of them quickly becomes vanishingly small. Table 1 attempts to catalogue the barriers that must be overcome under the scenario considered most likely to be successful. In contemplating the task before them, would-be atomic terrorists would effectively be required to go though an exercise that looks much like this. If and when they do, they will undoubtedly conclude that their prospects are daunting and accordingly uninspiring or even terminally dispiriting. It is possible to calculate the chances for success. Adopting probability estimates that purposely and heavily bias the case in the terrorists’ favor—for example, assuming the terrorists have a 50% chance of overcoming each of the 20 obstacles—the chances that a concerted effort would be successful comes out to be less than one in a million. If one assumes, somewhat more realistically, that their chances at each barrier are one in three, the cumulative odds that they will be able to pull off the deed drop to one in well over three billion. Other routes would-be terrorists might take to acquire a bomb are even more problematic. They are unlikely to be given or sold a bomb by a generous like-minded nuclear state for delivery abroad because the risk would be high, even for a country led by extremists, that the bomb (and its source) would be discovered even before delivery or that it would be exploded in a manner and on a target the donor would not approve, including on the donor itself. Another concern would be that the terrorist group might be infiltrated by foreign intelligence. The terrorist group might also seek to steal or illicitly purchase a “loose nuke“ somewhere. However, it seems probable that none exist. All governments have an intense interest in controlling any weapons on their territory because of fears that they might become the primary target. Moreover, as technology has developed, finished bombs have been out-fitted with devices that trigger a non-nuclear explosion that destroys the bomb if it is tampered with. And there are other security techniques: Bombs can be kept disassembled with the component parts stored in separate high-security vaults, and a process can be set up in which two people and multiple codes are required not only to use the bomb but to store, maintain, and deploy it. As Younger points out, “only a few people in the world have the knowledge to cause an unauthorized detonation of a nuclear weapon.” There could be dangers in the chaos that would emerge if a nuclear state were to utterly collapse; Pakistan is frequently cited in this context and sometimes North Korea as well. However, even under such conditions, nuclear weapons would probably remain under heavy guard by people who know that a purloined bomb might be used in their own territory. They would still have locks and, in the case of Pakistan, the weapons would be disassembled. The al Qaeda factor The degree to which al Qaeda, the only terrorist group that seems to want to target the United States, has pursued or even has much interest in a nuclear weapon may have been exaggerated. The 9/11 Commission stated that “al Qaeda has tried to acquire or make nuclear weapons for at least ten years,” but the only substantial evidence it supplies comes from an episode that is supposed to have taken place about 1993 in Sudan, when al Qaeda members may have sought to purchase some uranium that turned out to be bogus. Information about this supposed venture apparently comes entirely from Jamal al Fadl, who defected from al Qaeda in 1996 after being caught stealing $110,000 from the organization. Others, including the man who allegedly purchased the uranium, assert that although there were various other scams taking place at the time that may have served as grist for Fadl, the uranium episode never happened. As a key indication of al Qaeda’s desire to obtain atomic weapons, many have focused on a set of conversations in Afghanistan in August 2001 that two Pakistani nuclear scientists reportedly had with Osama bin Laden and three other al Qaeda officials. Pakistani intelligence officers characterize the discussions as “academic” in nature. It seems that the discussion was wide-ranging and rudimentary and that the scientists provided no material or specific plans. Moreover, the scientists probably were incapable of providing truly helpful information because their expertise was not in bomb design but in the processing of fissile material, which is almost certainly beyond the capacities of a nonstate group. Kalid Sheikh Mohammed, the apparent planner of the 9/11 attacks, reportedly says that al Qaeda’s bomb efforts never went beyond searching the Internet. After the fall of the Taliban in 2001, technical experts from the CIA and the Department of Energy examined documents and other information that were uncovered by intelligence agencies and the media in Afghanistan. They uncovered no credible information that al Qaeda had obtained fissile material or acquired a nuclear weapon. Moreover, they found no evidence of any radioactive material suitable for weapons. They did uncover, however, a “nuclear-related” document discussing “openly available concepts about the nuclear fuel cycle and some weapons-related issues.” Just a day or two before al Qaeda was to flee from Afghanistan in 2001, bin Laden supposedly told a Pakistani journalist, “If the United States uses chemical or nuclear weapons against us, we might respond with chemical and nuclear weapons. We possess these weapons as a deterrent.” Given the military pressure that they were then under and taking into account the evidence of the primitive or more probably nonexistent nature of al Qaeda’s nuclear program, the reported assertions, although unsettling, appear at best to be a desperate bluff. Bin Laden has made statements about nuclear weapons a few other times. Some of these pronouncements can be seen to be threatening, but they are rather coy and indirect, indicating perhaps something of an interest, but not acknowledging a capability. And as terrorism specialist Louise Richardson observes, “Statements claiming a right to possess nuclear weapons have been misinterpreted as expressing a determination to use them. This in turn has fed the exaggeration of the threat we face.” Norwegian researcher Anne Stenersen concluded after an exhaustive study of available materials that, although “it is likely that al Qaeda central has considered the option of using non-conventional weapons,” there is “little evidence that such ideas ever developed into actual plans, or that they were given any kind of priority at the expense of more traditional types of terrorist attacks.” She also notes that information on an al Qaeda computer left behind in Afghanistan in 2001 indicates that only $2,000 to $4,000 was earmarked for weapons of mass destruction research and that the money was mainly for very crude work on chemical weapons. Today, the key portions of al Qaeda central may well total only a few hundred people, apparently assisting the Taliban’s distinctly separate, far larger, and very troublesome insurgency in Afghanistan. Beyond this tiny band, there are thousands of sympathizers and would-be jihadists spread around the globe. They mainly connect in Internet chat rooms, engage in radicalizing conversations, and variously dare each other to actually do something. Any “threat,” particularly to the West, appears, then, principally to derive from self-selected people, often isolated from each other, who fantasize about performing dire deeds. From time to time some of these people, or ones closer to al Qaeda central, actually manage to do some harm. And occasionally, they may even be able to pull off something large, such as 9/11. But in most cases, their capacities and schemes, or alleged schemes, seem to be far less dangerous than initial press reports vividly, even hysterically, suggest. Most important for present purposes, however, is that any notion that al Qaeda has the capacity to acquire nuclear weapons, even if it wanted to, looks farfetched in the extreme. It is also noteworthy that, although there have been plenty of terrorist attacks in the world since 2001, all have relied on conventional destructive methods. For the most part, terrorists seem to be heeding the advice found in a memo on an al Qaeda laptop seized in Pakistan in 2004: “Make use of that which is available … rather than waste valuable time becoming despondent over that which is not within your reach.” In fact, history consistently demonstrates that terrorists prefer weapons that they know and understand, not new, exotic ones. Glenn Carle, a 23-year CIA veteran and once its deputy intelligence officer for transnational threats, warns, “We must not take fright at the specter our leaders have exaggerated. In fact, we must see jihadists for the small, lethal, disjointed, and miserable opponents that they are.” al Qaeda, he says, has only a handful of individuals capable of planning, organizing, and leading a terrorist organization, and although the group has threatened attacks with nuclear weapons, “its capabilities are far inferior to its desires.” Policy alternatives The purpose here has not been to argue that policies designed to inconvenience the atomic terrorist are necessarily unneeded or unwise. Rather, in contrast with the many who insist that atomic terrorism under current conditions is rather likely— indeed, exceedingly likely—to come about, I have contended that it is hugely unlikely. However, it is important to consider not only the likelihood that an event will take place, but also its consequences. Therefore, one must be concerned about catastrophic events even if their probability is small, and efforts to reduce that likelihood even further may well be justified. At some point, however, probabilities become so low that, even for catastrophic events, it may make sense to ignore them or at least put them on the back burner; in short, the risk becomes acceptable. For example, the British could at any time attack the United States with their submarine-launched missiles and kill millions of Americans, far more than even the most monumentally gifted and lucky terrorist group. Yet the risk that this potential calamity might take place evokes little concern; essentially it is an acceptable risk. Meanwhile, Russia, with whom the United States has a rather strained relationship, could at any time do vastly more damage with its nuclear weapons, a fully imaginable calamity that is substantially ignored. In constructing what he calls “a case for fear,” Cass Sunstein, a scholar and current Obama administration official, has pointed out that if there is a yearly probability of 1 in 100,000 that terrorists could launch a nuclear or massive biological attack, the risk would cumulate to 1 in 10,000 over 10 years and to 1 in 5,000 over 20. These odds, he suggests, are “not the most comforting.” Comfort, of course, lies in the viscera of those to be comforted, and, as he suggests, many would probably have difficulty settling down with odds like that. But there must be some point at which the concerns even of these people would ease. Just perhaps it is at one of the levels suggested above: one in a million or one in three billion per attempt.

#### Ice age coming --- causes extinction and outweighs warming since we can adapt --- warming solves

Marsh ‘8 (Gerald E. Marsh, Retired Physicist from the Argonne National Laboratory and a former consultant to the Department of Defense on strategic nuclear technology and policy in the Reagan, Bush, and Clinton Administration, “The Coming of a New Ice Age,” February 24, 2008, <http://www.winningreen.com/site/epage/59549_621.htm>)//a-berg

CHICAGO — Contrary to the conventional wisdom of the day, the real danger facing humanity is not global warming, but more likely the coming of a new Ice Age. What we live in now is known as an interglacial, a relatively brief period between long ice ages. Unfortunately for us, most interglacial periods last only about ten thousand years, and that is how long it has been since the last Ice Age ended. How much longer do we have before the ice begins to spread across the Earth’s surface? Less than a hundred years or several hundred? We simply don’t know. Even if all the temperature increase over the last century is attributable to human activities, the rise has been relatively modest one of a little over one degree Fahrenheit — an increase well within natural variations over the last few thousand years. While an enduring temperature rise of the same size over the next century would cause humanity to make some changes, it would undoubtedly be within our ability to adapt. Entering a new ice age, however, would be catastrophic for the continuation of modern civilization. One has only to look at maps showing the extent of the great ice sheets during the last Ice Age to understand what a return to ice age conditions would mean. Much of Europe and North-America were covered by thick ice, thousands of feet thick in many areas and the world as a whole was much colder. The last “little” Ice Age started as early as the 14th century when the Baltic Sea froze over followed by unseasonable cold, storms, and a rise in the level of the Caspian Sea. That was followed by the extinction of the Norse settlements in Greenland and the loss of grain cultivation in Iceland. Harvests were even severely reduced in Scandinavia And this was a mere foreshadowing of the miseries to come. By the mid-17th century, glaciers in the Swiss Alps advanced, wiping out farms and entire villages. In England, the River Thames froze during the winter, and in 1780, New York Harbor froze. Had this continued, history would have been very different. Luckily, the decrease in solar activity that caused the Little Ice Age ended and the result was the continued flowering of modern civilization. There were very few Ice Ages until about 2.75 million years ago when Earth’s climate entered an unusual period of instability. Starting about a million years ago cycles of ice ages lasting about 100,000 years, separated by relatively short interglacial periods, like the one we are now living in became the rule. Before the onset of the Ice Ages, and for most of the Earth’s history, it was far warmer than it is today. Indeed, the Sun has been getting brighter over the whole history of the Earth and large land plants have flourished. Both of these had the effect of dropping carbon dioxide concentrations in the atmosphere to the lowest level in Earth’s long history. Five hundred million years ago, carbon dioxide concentrations were over 13 times current levels; and not until about 20 million years ago did carbon dioxide levels dropped to a little less than twice what they are today. It is possible that moderately increased carbon dioxide concentrations could extend the current interglacial period. But we have not reached the level required yet, nor do we know the optimum level to reach. So, rather than call for arbitrary limits on carbon dioxide emissions, perhaps the best thing the UN’s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and the climatology community in general could do is spend their efforts on determining the optimal range of carbon dioxide needed to extend the current interglacial period indefinitely. NASA has predicted that the solar cycle peaking in 2022 could be one of the weakest in centuries and should cause a very significant cooling of Earth’s climate. Will this be the trigger that initiates a new Ice Age? We ought to carefully consider this possibility before we wipe out our current prosperity by spending trillions of dollars to combat a perceived global warming threat that may well prove to be only a will-o-the-wisp.

#### Warming doesn’t cause extinction

**Carter et. Al 11–** Robert, PhD, Adjuct Research Fellow, James Cook University, Craig Idso, PhD, Chairman at the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, Fred Singer, PhD, President of the Science and Environmental Policy Project, Susan Crockford, evolutionary biologist with a specialty in skeletal taxonomy , paleozoology and vertebrate evolution, Joseph D’Aleo, 30 years of experience in professional meteorology, former college professor of Meteorology at Lyndon State College, Indur Goklany, independent scholar, author, and co-editor of the Electronic Journal of Sustainable Development, Sherwood Idso, President of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, Research Physicist with the US Department of Agriculture, Adjunct Professor in the Departments of Geology, Botany, and Microbiology at Arizona State University, Bachelor of Physics, Master of Science, and Doctor of Philosophy, all from the University of Minnesota, Madhav Khandekar, former research scientist from Environment Canada and is an expert reviewer for the IPCC 2007 Climate Change Panel, Anthony Lupo, Department Chair and Professor of Atmospheric Science at the University of Missouri, Willie Soon, astrophysicist at the Solar and Stellar Physics Division of the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics, Mitch Taylor (Canada) (March 8th, “[Surviving](../../../../Marc/Desktop/Surviving) the Unpreceented Climate Change of the IPCC” <http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2011/mar/8mar2011a5.html>) Jacome

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 climate wars.

**Tertrais, ’11 –**“Dr. Bruno Tertrais is a Senior Research Fellow at the Fondation pour la recherche strate´gique (Foundation for Strategic Research), and a TWQ editorial board member, The Climate Wars Myth,” The Washington Quarterly, 34:3 pp. 17-29 Summer 2011, http://csis.org/files/publication/twq11summertertrais.pdf)//a-berg

Think tanks have enthusiastically embraced this new field of research, and militaries around the world are now actively studying the possible impact of a warming planet on global security. Books with titles such as Climate Wars predict a bleak future.1A well-known French consultant claims that a five degree Celsius increase in average global temperature would generate no less than a ‘‘bloodbath.’’2Former World Bank economist Lord Nicholas Stern?the author of the 2006 ‘‘Stern Report’’ on the possible economic impact of climate change?even declares that failing to deal with climate change decisively would lead to ‘‘an extended world war.’’3 However, there is every reason to be more than circumspect regarding such dire predictions. History shows that ‘‘warm’’ periods are more peaceful than ‘‘cold’’ ones. In the modern era, the evolution of the climate is not an essential factor to explain collective violence. Nothing indicates that ‘‘water wars’’ or floods of ‘‘climate refugees’’ are on the horizon. And to claim that climate change may have an impact on security is to state the obvious?but it does not make it meaningful for defense planning. Since the dawn of civilization, warmer eras have meant fewer wars. The reason is simple: all things being equal, a colder climate meant reduced crops, more famine and instability.4Research by climate historians shows a clear correlation between increased warfare and cold periods.5They are particularly clear in Asia and Europe, as well as in Africa.6Interestingly, the correlation has been diminishing since the beginning of the Industrial Revolution: as societies modernize, they become less dependent on local agricultural output.7 Moreover, if there was any significant link between warfare and warming, the number of conflicts should have been rising in the past two decades. It has not? quite the contrary. Since the end of the Cold War, the total number of wars, after having steadily increased since 1945, has diminished. Statistics published by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), which come from work done at the Uppsala University, clearly show such a decrease. Today, there are half as many wars as two decades ago (17 in 2009 versus 35 in 1989).8This result is mainly due to the rapid decrease in the number of internal conflicts.9As with the number of interstate conflicts, civil wars began to decline from the end of the 1970s onwards. Classic international war has, statistically speaking, disappeared from the modern world. According to the SIPRI/Uppsala University data, in 2009, for the sixth year in a row, there was no ongoing interstate war. (Iraq and Afghanistan do not belong to that category.) Such conflicts represented, in the 2000s, three out of a total of 30 wars, thus 10 percent of the total?in a world where the number of states has tripled since the end of the Second World War. There is even a reverse correlation. The average global temperature diminished between 1940 and 1975: during that period, the total number of conflicts was on the rise. Correlation is not causation. (It may be tempting to argue that the modernization of societies leads to two separate, parallel outcomes: global warming and global peace.) But the existence of these data points should contribute to extreme caution about the hypothetical equation according to which a warmer world would be a war-prone world. In 2007, the Nobel Peace Prize was attributed jointly to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and to former U.S. Vice President Al Gore. Rarely was the attribution of a Nobel Peace Prize so blatantly out of sync with geopolitical realities. A Flawed Concept Of course, some local changes of the climate can have an impact on the stability of societies, and thus increase the propensity to collective violence, generally in a marginal way and mostly in developing countries. Such is the case, for instance, for droughts in countries which are heavily dependent on rain-fed agriculture.10But drawing deterministic conclusions from this observation would be a stretch. There are examples the other way round. At the border of Kenya and Somalia, conflicts are more numerous when the resource (pastures) is abundant.11This fits with a well-known pattern. Resource-rich countries are more likely to be involved in conflict: oil, minerals, or timber attract predators, and revenues from their exploitation fuel civil war. Darfur is the poster child of ‘‘climate conflict.’’ It is appropriate to consider that local variations of climate and the natural environment in western Sudan were part of the conditions that led to collective violence in the region. But they were not a key reason or root cause.12For if that were the case, how would one explain that conflict eruptednearly30yearsafterthecurrentperiod of drought began? Moreover,the conflicts that took place in the Sahel region in the 1970s clearly show that political and human factors are the key to understanding most if not all wars.Inthatregion,thetwoprecedingdecades (the 1950s and 1960s) had seen abundant precipitations; local governments had then deliberately encouraged the development of agriculture in steppes, something which moved cattle-raising toward the north. When rain decreased, cattle-raiserssoughttoreclaimtheirlands,butfacedfarmerswhowerebattlingthe drought. These tensions happened against the background of a traditional rivalry between nomads and settlers, which was frequently instrumentalized by local or nationalgovernments.AndinnorthernMali,theTuaregrebellionwouldprobably not have happened without the radicalization of young Malians who had emigrated to Algeria or Libya because of the drought.13Human and political factors trump climate and environmental ones. In seeking to demonstrate that climate change will lead to more instability, experts sometimes stretch causality chains to the breaking point. A good example is the recent attempt by two researchers of the International Institute for Strategic Studies to show that climate change played a significant role in the Arab Spring of 2011.14According to them, extreme weather events of 2010? record rainfall in Canada, droughts in the former Soviet Union, a cyclone in Australia?led to an increase in food prices, which in turn fueled discontent in the Middle East. But there are three problems with their proposition. First, there is no evidence that the 2010 events deviated so much from traditional weather patterns in these regions that they had to be attributed to climate change. Second, as the authors themselves acknowledge, other factors were at play behind the spike in food prices, such as speculation or the demand for biofuels. Third and most importantly, while food prices may have played a role in the Arab discontent, the authors offer no evidence for their contention that they played a ‘‘necessary’’ role. Most experts of the links between the environment and conflict refrain from adhering to dire predictions about impending climate wars. They show extreme caution about what the historical record shows regarding those links, which are deemed to be at best ‘‘highly speculative.’’15A careful review of the issue concludes that ‘‘the concept of environmentally induced conflict is itself fundamentally flawed.’’16More precisely, as explained by two researchers, ‘‘the suggested causal chains from climate change to social consequences like conflict are long and fraught with uncertainties. One could ask whether it is indeed conceptually fruitful to be talking about climate change and conflict at all.’’17 Talking about ‘‘climate wars’’ is not only unsubstantiated, it may be harmful. When United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon, along with others, claims that climate change is probably one of the key causes of the Darfur conflict, those who perpetrated the massacres should applaud, for it partly absolves them of their own responsibilities. Environmental security expert Geoffrey Dabelko argues ‘‘Characterizing climate change as producing a new type of conflict is both wrong and counterproductive. For instance, simply labeling the genocide in Darfur a ‘climate war’ ignores political and economic motivations for the fighting?and unintentionally could let the criminal regime in Khartoum off the hook.’’18 Beware of Catastrophic Scenarios Some of the most catastrophic scenarios of climate change-induced conflict just do not stand up to scrutiny. To study the possible political consequences of changes in the geography of the Arctic region due to climate change is one thing. To imagine this could lead to armed clashes between Russia and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) is another. First, the diminution of the maximum extent of summer sea ice will not transform the North-Western Passage and the Northern Maritime Route into vital maritime trade arteries: they will be open only a few weeks or a few months a year. Second, the real quantity of hydrocarbon resources in the region is still very much open to debate; and such resources are, for the most part, located within national maritime areas. Third, the attitude of all neighboring states regarding this region, including Russia, reflects a clear preference for settling possible disputes in accordance with accepted international law. Fourth, the scope of these disputes is not increasing?rather the opposite: in April 2010, Norway and Russia settled their decades-long dispute on the delimitation of their respective maritime areas in the Barents Sea. The interruption of the North Atlantic Conveyor Belt (‘‘Gulf Stream’’) due to global warming is a favorite of thrillers and science-fiction writers. The study of its consequences by a consulting firm at the request of the U.S. Department of Defense’s Office of Net Assessment a few years ago was widely noted.19The problem is that the credibility of this scenario is close to nil. Recent scientific research has shown that the Gulf Stream is animated much less by thermohaline circulation (differences in the temperature and salinity of water) than by the winds. Moreover, its role in shaping and regulating the climate of Northern Atlantic regions has been seriously put in doubt.20 Finally, the argument according to which global warming will lead to an increase in the number of natural catastrophes, with grave humanitarian consequences, should be taken with a heavy pinch of (marine) salt. The only available evidence that global warming will lead to more extreme weather events relies on modeling. Data do not really sustain this hypothesis so far. There has not been any increase in global precipitation in recent decades.21Neither have droughts become more frequent or severe.22Hurricane activity is not stronger, and its variation remains within the range of natural variation.23The number of hurricane events has tended to evolve downwards since 1970; in accumulated intensity, 2010 was its lowest in 30 years.24 The Emergency Events Database (EM-DAT) maintained at the Leuwen University in Belgium?one of the most widely used databases for natural disasters?shows a clear rise in the number of weather-related catastrophes over the last 30 years. However, this rise can easily be explained by demographic, economic, sociological, and political factors. EM-DAT only takes into account events that have caused a significant number of victims (which is rising due to population increase and the growing number of humans living on exposed areas), for which a state of emergency has been declared, and a call to international help has been made (the frequency of which is rising for political and media reasons).25 Furthermore, the number of reported catastrophes has also increased?as compared to what it was say, a century ago?due to improved detection and attention. There is every reason to believe that the human, social, and economic consequences of natural catastrophes will be increasingly severe, but this has little to do with climate change. It should also be noted that natural disasters do not necessarily have only negative consequences on national and international security. Quite the contrary: disasters appear to prevent rather than promote civil conflict.26A case in point is the 2004 Asian tsunami, which indirectly contributed to the stabilization of the decades-old secessionist conflict in the Indonesian province of Aceh (a peace agreement was signed in August 2005). No Wars Over Water An avatar of the notion of climate war is that of future wars over water. Such wars have been forewarned since the late 1980s, but the theme has gained popularity since the end of the Cold War.27If some commentators are to be believed, ‘‘the lines of battle are already being drawn for the water wars of the future.’’28It is true that the map of predicted water stress at the 2025—2030 horizon reveals a close match with the map of major geopolitical risks: the Arabian Peninsula and Central Asia are among the regions which are most likely to be affected. Warming will not change anything about the global availability of water resources, but will probably induce changes in the geographical distribution of precipitation. However, this will not necessarily be for the worse: in many regions, the resource for agriculture will increase.29Other regions will see more droughts. However, recent studies have shown that climate change, whatever its origin, has only a small part of responsibility for water crises: population increase is by far the main cause.1

30 Will the melting of Himalayan glaciers lead to a severe water crisis in South Asia, one of the most dangerous parts of the world? On this point, the IPCC included a serious error in its 2007 report, due to a series of confusions. The text claims that these glaciers could be reduced by 80 percent in 2035. The date came from a 2005 report by the World Wildlife Fund (WWF), for which primary sources were press articles and unpublished communications. (The WWF report now includes a correction retracting its claims.)31As to the proportion of glaciers which could disappear by that time, it came from a 1996 UNESCO Report, which mentioned a possible 80 percent reduction of the global total of non-polar ice (not just Himalayan glaciers), but by the year 2350, not 2035.32Resorting to non-peer-reviewed publications is also what led the IPCC to wrongly claim, based on an unsubstantiated assertion included in the Stern Report, that water availability in South Asia was highly dependent on glacier melt.33But recent studies have shown that Himalayan glacier melt accounts for only three to 25 percent of the volume of rivers in South Asia: monsoons and local seasonal snow melt are by far their main sources.34 And water crises do not mean water wars. The issue of access to water resources is undoubtedly a major dimension of numerous regional crises, in particular in the Greater Middle East, as testified by decades-old disputes between Turkey and Syria, or Egypt and Sudan. The value of strategic locations such as the Golan Heights or Kashmir is not a small part of tensions between Syria and Israel, or India and Pakistan. And water sharing can be the cause of local disputes sometimes degenerating into small-scale collective violence in Africa or Asia. However, experts from the University of Oregon, who maintain the most complete database on this topic, state that there has never been a ‘‘war over water’’ (that is, large-scale collective violence for the sake of a water resource) in the past 4,500 years.35The last war over water opposed two Sumerian cities in the middle of the third millennium B.C.E., about sharing the waters of the Tigris and Euphrates. There are good reasons for such a scant record. Any country seeking to control the upstream of a river would need to ensure complete and permanent domination over it, which would be an ambitious goal. In the modern era, resorting to arms over water (like resorting to arms over oil) is just not worth the cost. Especially for those whose geographical location and budget can afford to build desalination plants?which is the case for some of the most water-stressed countries, those located on the Arabian Peninsula. One should therefore not be surprised that access to water has always generated more cooperation than conflict. Since antiquity, thousands of agreements and treaties have been signed for water-sharing. And cooperation between adversaries has stood the test of wartime, as was seen during the 20th century in the Middle East, South Asia, or Southeast Asia. Climate Barbarians at the Gates? What about ‘‘climate refugees’’? Dire evaluations already existed in the middle of the 1990s: British environmentalist Norman Myers claimed at the time that such refugees already numbered 25 million, and that their number might double 15 years later, to reach perhaps 200 million by the middle of the century. This number has been used by many publications since then.36Another widelyquoted prevision?which claims to be an update of Myers’ own?is that of the non-governmental organization Christian Aid, which foresees 250 million climate refugees between 2007 and 2050 (out of a total of one billion environmental refugees).37 Lord Stern himself reportedly stated that a five degree Celsius rise in average global temperature would lead to ‘‘billions’’ having to move.38 But the idea of massive waves of refugees triggered by climate change does not square well with the reality of migration. There is no doubt that environmental change can lead to massive displacements of populations. Such displacements have always existed, including in industrialized countries. Remember the Dust Bowl, which led to the migration of two to three million from the Great Plains to the West in the United States. But such movements are slow (we are more accurately talking about migrants as opposed to refugees), very much dependent on economic opportunities existing elsewhere (the ‘‘pull’’ factor is as important as the ‘‘push’’), and generally of a limited geographical scope (most people want to stay in the same country or region).39They are sometimes due to non-climate related factors: desertification or degradation of the soils is often due to urbanization or intensive agriculture. The same reasoning can be applied to the rise in sea levels. First, the hypothesis of a future constant rise in average sea levels due to global warming is not the likeliest one and is being seriously challenged.40Second, even if one accepts the scenario of a constant rise, is it inconceivable that mankind would be able to adjust and adapt to a rise of a few millimeters per year, as it has done for many decades? Catastrophist analyses evoking massive floods of refugees do not square well with an average rise of two to six millimeters a year (the range of IPCC scenarios). And given such a slow pace, some countries will balance the rise of sea level mass by sedimentation. Take the example of Bangladesh, a poster child of the possible consequences of climate change. The idea that the densely populated coastal regions of that country could be flooded by the rise in sea levels does not take into account the parallel accumulation of sediments brought by the great South Asian rivers, which amount to about one billion metric tons a year.41 Such are the reasons why experts of environmental migrations generally agree that climate change in itself is rarely a root cause of migration.42Major population displacements due to environmental and/or climatic factors will remain exceptional except in the case of a sudden natural disaster.43And most importantly for the sake of this analysis, they are rarely a cause of violent conflict.44 It is not even certain that the very concept of ‘‘climate refugees’’ is relevant.45 Atmospheric or hydrological catastrophes can create massive?and most of the time temporary?population displacements. But such catastrophes have always existed. Why then attempt to create a separate category for their victims, which would distinguish them from those of geological catastrophes (earthquakes, tsunamis, volcanic eruptions) for which human activities bear no responsibility? The concept of climate refugees says more about Western fears of ‘‘barbarians at the gates’’ than it does about the foreseeable reality of the consequences of climate change.46 Is Climate Change Even Relevant to Defense Planning? So much for ‘‘climate wars.’’ But the idea according to which climate change is nevertheless a new, important factor to be taken into account in defense and security planning is itself questionable. Of course, nothing precludes us from including it in the growing list of non-military issues that may have a bearing on global security. But this has to be done in a realistic way. It is not unreasonable to state that climate change may be a ‘‘threat multiplier,’’ for instance.47However, stating this says nothing about the probability of increased violence or instability either at the global level or for a given crisis, or about the likelihood of state failure. Such consequences depend primarily on the reaction of governments and societies?a factor which is impossible to calculate in advance. There are no data to support the vague idea that climate change can have a key role in triggering collective violence?that is, be the proverbial straw that breaks the camel’s back, as argued by an alarmist study (citing once again the example of Darfur).48Climate is ‘‘one of myriad factors in a complex causal web underlying conflict,’’ and the environment is just ‘‘one of manifold and nonessential causal factors’’ which may lead to war.49The main causes of contemporary conflict are societal, not natural (in the broadest sense of the term, i.e., including man-made).50Conflicts are borne out of human choices and mistakes. Could regional previsions of the impact of climate change at least inform policymakers and planners about the areas of the world which are more likely? all things being equal?to suffer from them? The answer is no. Regional effects are extremely difficult to predict with the degree of probability which can be useful for planning.51The IPCC itself underscores that current models do not have the ability to deliver useful previsions at a higher scale than the continental one.52Nobody knows, for instance, whether African monsoons will move northwards (with positive effects on agriculture) or southwards (with negative effects). Here, as noted by a contributor to the IPCC, ‘‘there is complete disagreement between the various models.’’53And when the IPCC attempts to give regional previsions on the evolution of agricultural output, for instance, it is in a way which does not buttress the case for alarmism. Its 2007 report mentions a possible reduction by 50 percent of rain-fed agricultural output in some African countries in 2020. But the sole source it cites to support this claim is a report produced for a Canadian non-governmental organization in which it is mentioned that (unpublished) studies evoke this scenario for three Maghreb countries.54 There are indeed, it seems, some causal links between climate and warfare. But they are of a seasonal nature: ‘‘nations address seasonal climate change in terms of where they fight, rather than through when or whether disputes occur. ... Fighting moves to higher latitudes in the summer, and lower latitudes during the cooler months of the year.’’55 The stakes of climate change are important?and that is why this area should not be the object of intellectual fantasies or fashions. It is appropriate for defense and security planners to monitor the evolution of the scientific and political debate on its possible consequences. But there is no objective reason today to list climate change as a key issue for defense and security planning.

# 2nc

#### No noko.

**Wagstaff** **13** – Keith, The Week, “4 reasons why North Korea won't start a war,” <http://theweek.com/article/index/242528/4-reasons-why-north-korea-wont-start-a-war)//a-berg>

Pyongyang's nuclear capabilities remain in question, but its deftness at violent rhetoric is pretty clear. In The New York Times, Andrei Lankov, author of The Real North Korea: Life and Politics in the Failed Stalinist Utopia, called the country "a tiny dictatorship with a bankrupt economy" that, nonetheless, has leaders that are "remarkably adept at manipulating global public opinion." Continuing its string of threats, the North Korean government warned foreigners on Monday that they might want to leave South Korea due to the threat of nuclear war. Walk through Seoul, however, and it's difficult "to find any South Koreans who are panic-stricken," says Lankov. Why aren't they worried? Because **North Korea is not likely to start a war**. A look at why: 1. **Kim** Jong Un **isn't a madman** North Korea likes to paint its "supreme leader" as something of a super-villain — a powerful, unpredictable man with his finger always on the button. The truth is Pyongyang has always been more pragmatic than it lets on. As Lankov points out, Kim Jong Un isn't Osama Bin Laden, planning a holy war from a cave: North Korea is not a theocracy led by zealots who preach the rewards of the afterlife. In fact, there are no good reasons to think that Kim Jong-un, North Korea's young dictator, would want to commit suicide; he is known for his love of basketball, pizza and other pleasures of being alive. The same logic applies to his advisers, old survivors in the byzantine world of North Korean politics who love expensive cars and good brandy. [New York Times] **It would be pretty hard to hang with Dennis Rodman if your country were hit by missiles**. 2. The whole thing is just an international shakedown Why act like you might start World War III at any minute? Because it gets results. Kim Jong Il played the same game and, as Howard French of The Atlantic notes, "steadily won concessions: fuel oil deliveries, food aid, nuclear reactor construction, hard cash-earning tourist enclaves and investment zones." Max Fisher of The Washington Post likens Kim Jong Un to a kid with a **temper tantrum** who you give "the attention he craves and maybe even a toy, not because you think the threats are real or because he deserves it, but because you want the tantrum to stop." North Korea's economy is in a "dire state," says BBC News, with an estimated per capita income of $1,000 to $2,000 per year. With few natural resources and only one (legal) trade partner, winning some foreign aid in exchange for toning down the rhetoric would be a big win for Pyongyang. 3. **China doesn't** exactly **have North Korea's back** Susan Shirk of ChinaFile calls China the "the economic lifeline of North Korea," essentially propping up the regime with trade and some aid in times of crisis. China has every reason to want peace, mostly because the consequences of war would be disastrous, writes Steven Metz in World Politics Review: Thousands, perhaps millions, of North Korean refugees would seek sanctuary in China. A nuclear exchange could poison the region. The global economy would be thrown into turmoil, hindering China's exports and increasing the cost of imported energy. And, worst of all, the ultimate outcome would be a North Korea less beholden to China and possibly occupied by the United States. [World Politics Review] Despite its strong incentive to keep the current North Korean regime in place, China has been showing signs that its getting tired of its ally. Beijing partnered with the United States to draft tough sanctions against North Korea after it conducted a third nuclear test. On Tuesday, it announced it was shutting down tourism into North Korea, striking a blow to its neighbor's economy. To top it off, Chinese President Xi Jinping publicly acknowledged his frustrations with Pyongyang Sunday when, according to The Washington Post, he told an economic forum, "No one should be allowed to throw a region and even the whole world into chaos for selfish gains." Those are not the words of a country ready to storm into war alongside North Korea. 4. **North Korea would lose** North Korea, with a collection of 1.1 million soldiers, actually has the fourth largest standing army in the world, according to NBCNews.com. The problem is that its "equipment is seriously outdated, going back to its alliance with the former Soviet Union during the Cold War." South Korea, on the other hand, has been armed by the United States, which has also promised to defend South Korea militarily if necessary. North Korea could hold out for a few bloody days or weeks, but ultimately it would lose. "This is a military that if you ran them against the Iraqi military in 1991, North Korea would lose," Jennifer Lind, a professor at Dartmouth College, told USA Today. Kim Jong Un couldn't possibly like those odds.

#### ice age is a question of when and not if --- we are 600 years overdue

**Boyle ‘12** (Rebecca, Popular Science, 01/08, “Human CO2 Emissions Could Avert the Next Ice Age, Study Says,” http://www.popsci.com/science/article/2012-01/human-co2-emissions-could-avert-next-ice-age-study-says)//a-berg

Earth could be entering a new Ice Age within the next millennium, but it might not, the deep freeze averted by warming from increased carbon dioxide emissions. Humans could be thwarting the next glacial inception, a new study says. Even in the comparatively long time scales of Earth history, we’re kind of overdue for another ice age — our current Holocene era has lasted about 11,600 years, roughly 600 years longer than the average interglacial (between-ice-age) periods of the past. If atmospheric CO2 levels were lower, the next ice age might have started sometime within the next 1,000 years, according to researchers from University College London and Cambridge University. Their conclusion is based in part on abrupt temperature changes in the overall temperature contrast between Greenland and Antarctica, according to a Cambridge news release. The North Atlantic would cool rapidly while Antarctica warms, fluctuations that would only happen if expanding ice sheets were calving icebergs huge enough to impact ocean circulation. These temperature see-saws can therefore be used to pinpoint the activation of a new ice age, a “glacial inception.” Chronis Tzedakis from UC London and colleagues examined our present conditions, including temperature averages and solar radiation strength, and found a close analogue to the present, an era called Marine Isotope Stage 19, or about 780,000 years ago. The eras have a similar astronomical configuration and climate, although their CO2 trajectories are pretty different (ours is on the rise). A phenomenon called insolation was a key factor here. Insolation is the seasonal and latitudinal distribution of solar radiation, which changes a tiny bit over tens of thousands of years due to tiny variations in Earth’s orbit around the sun. These little differences are one of the factors that can help trigger a cooling event, cascading toward an ice age. The insolation minimum in the MIS19 era was similar to our own, so it’s a valid analogy, the researchers say. The team applied their glacial inception fingerprinting method to MIS19, looking at ice core samples, plankton remains and debris that would have floated on the encroaching ice, and determined at what point the glacial inception would have started. Then they compared that time frame to the Holocene time frame. “Taking the [current era] to MIS19c analogy to its logical conclusion implies that the current interglacial would be nearing its end,” the researchers write. If, that is, atmospheric CO2 levels were comparable to the MIS19 era. Which they aren't. This shows that while insolation is an important ingredient, apparently it’s not as potent an ice age determinant as CO2. “The current insolation forcing and lack of new ice growth mean that orbital-scale variability will not be moderating the effects of anthropogenically induced global warming,” the authors conclude.

#### Newest evidence proves peatlands will cause an ice age --- only continued emissions solve

Page 12 (Lewis, The Register, “An ICE AGE is coming, only CO2 can save us”, November 9, 2012, http://www.theregister.co.uk/2012/11/09/peat\_ice\_age\_coming\_only\_co2\_can\_save\_us/)//a-berg

A group of Swedish scientists at the University of Gothenburg have published a paper in which they argue that spreading peatlands are inexorably driving planet Earth into its next ice age, and the only thing holding back catastrophe is humanity's hotly debated atmospheric carbon emissions. "We are probably entering a new ice age right now. However, we're not noticing it due to the effects of carbon dioxide," says Professor of Physical Geography Lars Franzén, from the Department of Earth Sciences at Gothenburg uni. Franzén and his colleagues have examined various scenarios for the peatlands of Sweden, which are a continually expanding "dynamic landscape element". According to the scientists: Peatlands grow in height and spread across their surroundings by waterlogging woodlands. They are also one of the biggest terrestrial sinks of atmospheric carbon dioxide. Each year, around 20 grams of carbon are absorbed by every square metre of peatland. The scientists have calculated that the potential is there for Swedish peatlands to triple in extent, enormously increasing their carbon sink effect. By extrapolating to include the rest of the world's high-latitude temperate areas - the parts of the globe where peatland can expand as it does in Sweden - they project the creation of an extremely powerful carbon sink. They theorise that this is the mechanism which tends to force the Earth back into prolonged ice ages after each relatively brief "interglacial" warm period. "Carbon sequestration in peatland may be one of the main reasons why ice age conditions have occurred time after time," says Franzén. With no other factors in play, the time is about right for the present interglacial to end and the next ice age to come on. Indeed, Franzén and his crew think it has barely been staved off by human activity: The researchers believe that the Little Ice Age of the 16th to 18th centuries may have been halted as a result of human activity. Increased felling of woodlands and growing areas of agricultural land, combined with the early stages of industrialisation, resulted in increased emissions of carbon dioxide which probably slowed down, or even reversed, the cooling trend. Other scientists have attributed the Little Ice Age to a quiet period in the Sun's activity: others say it was purely a local effect in Europe, though that theory has lately been disproved by research in Antarctica. In any case, the scientists assess that if it weren't for human activity such as carbon emissions, we could expect a new ice era in short order. They write: Thus, on a global scale, carbon sequestration in peatlands may have had important climate cooling effects towards the ends of previous interglacials ... It cannot be ruled out that similar effects would be seen in a hypothetical Holocene lacking human presence. It's probably worth noting that the great physicist Freeman Dyson long ago suggested that only relatively small amounts of new peatland would be enough to sequestrate colossal amounts of CO2 from the air. Other scientists have noted in recent times that brief warming spells like that observed at the end of the 20th century appear to have occurred towards the end of previous interglacial periods - just before the glaciers returned. If Franzén and his team are right, the big chill is now under way, and is only just being held off by increasing human carbon emissions - perhaps explaining why temperatures have been merely flat for the last 15 years or so, rather than descending. The Swedish scientists' paper is published in the peer-reviewed journal Mires and Peat, and can be read here in pdf.

### 2nc impact wall

#### Comparatively outweighs aff

**Whitehouse 12** – David, science adviser to the Global Warming Policy Foundation, 01/11, “Could rising CO2 levels help prevent the next ice age?” http://www.publicserviceeurope.com/article/1338/could-rising-co2-levels-help-prevent-the-next-ice-age)//a-berg

That the trees no longer completely canopy this land is due to mankind as we cleared the forests. That the ice is no longer here is due to global warming. Without doubt, we live in an interglacial period – a warm time between ice ages. There have been many during the current great glaciation. Some have these periods have been warmer than today, many shorter than our current interglacial's duration. The return of the ice would, short of a giant meteor strike, be the biggest disaster to face humanity. Vast swathes of the northern Hemisphere would be frozen. Northern Europe, Asia, Canada and the United States would have extensive regions rendered uninhabitable. Mankind would have to move south. There would be no choice as no technology could stop the ice or allow our high populations to life amongst it. Some believe the return of the ice will not happen for thousands of years, other that the signs could be visible within decades. But could it be that the greenhouse gasses being pumped into the atmosphere, that many believe are responsible for a recent warming of the planet, might counteract the forces bringing us a new glaciation? Could it be that greenhouse gasses might actually stave off the return of the ice and save the lives of tens of millions, if not civilisation itself? A recent study by scientists at Cambridge University and published in the Journal Nature Geoscience suggests that the carbon dioxide might extend the current interglacial until carbon dioxide levels fall. They believe that the atmospheric concentration of CO2 must be about 240 parts per million before glaciation could start. Currently, it is about 390 ppm. In a 1999 essay, Sir Fred Hoyle said: "The renewal of ice-age conditions would render a large fraction of the world's major food-growing areas inoperable and so would inevitably lead to the extinction of most of the present human population. We must look to a sustained greenhouse effect to maintain the present advantageous world climate. This implies the ability to inject effective greenhouse gases into the atmosphere, the opposite of what environmentalists are erroneously advocating."

#### Every Co2 particle is a life

Watts ’12 (Anthony, American meteorologist, president of IntelliWeather Inc., editor of the blog, Watts Up With That?, and founder of the Surface Stations Project, “Increased CO2 Emissions Will Delay Next Ice Age”, January 8, 2012, <http://wattsupwiththat.com/2012/01/08/increased-co2-emissions-will-delay-next-ice-age/>)//a-berg

Sir Fred Hoyle Vindicated (Via Dr. Benny Peiser of the GWPF) According to new research to be published in Nature Geoscience (embargoed until 1800 GMT/10AM PST, Sunday 8 January 2012), the next ice age could set in any time this millennium were it not for increases in anthropogenic CO2 emissions that are preventing such a global disaster from occurring. The new research confirms the theory developed by the late Sir Fred Hoyle and Professor Chandra Wickramasinghe in the 1990s that without increased levels of CO2 emissions into the atmosphere ‘the drift into new ice-age conditions would be inevitable.’ [...] The problem for the present swollen human species is of a drift back into an ice-age, not away from an ice-age. Manifestly, we need all the greenhouse we can get, even to the extent of the British Isles becoming good for the growing of vines…. The renewal of ice-age conditions would render a large fraction of the world’s major food-growing areas inoperable, and so would inevitably lead to the extinction of most of the present human population. Since bolide impacts cannot be called up to order, we must look to a sustained greenhouse effect to maintain the present advantageous world climate. This implies the ability to inject effective greenhouse gases into the atmosphere, the opposite of what environmentalists are erroneously advocating.

#### Causes nuclear war.

**Stipp 4** (David senior writer for Fortune and a former staff reporter for the Wall Street Journal, where he covered science, medicine, and technology, “The Pentagon's Weather Nightmare The climate could change radically, and fast. That would be the mother of all national security issues,” 2/9/04, CNN, <http://money.cnn.com/magazines/fortune/fortune_archive/2004/02/09/360120/index.htm>)

A TOTAL SHUTDOWN of the ocean conveyor might lead to a big chill like the Younger Dryas, when icebergs appeared as far south as the coast of Portugal. Or the conveyor might only temporarily slow down, potentially causing an era like the "Little Ice Age," a time of hard winters, violent storms, and droughts between 1300 and 1850. That period's weather extremes caused horrific famines, but it was mild compared with the Younger Dryas. For planning purposes, it makes sense to focus on a midrange case of abrupt change. A century of cold, dry, windy weather across the Northern Hemisphere that suddenly came on 8,200 years ago fits the bill--its severity fell between that of the Younger Dryas and the Little Ice Age. The event is thought to have been triggered by a conveyor collapse after a time of rising temperatures not unlike today's global warming. Suppose it recurred, beginning in 2010. Here are some of the things that might happen by 2020: At first the changes are easily mistaken for normal weather variation--allowing skeptics to dismiss them as a "blip" of little importance and leaving policymakers and the public paralyzed with uncertainty. But by 2020 there is little doubt that something drastic is happening. The average temperature has fallen by up to five degrees Fahrenheit in some regions of North America and Asia and up to six degrees in parts of Europe. (By comparison, the average temperature over the North Atlantic during the last ice age was ten to 15 degrees lower than it is today.) Massive droughts have begun in key agricultural regions. The average annual rainfall has dropped by nearly 30% in northern Europe, and its climate has become more like Siberia's. Violent storms are increasingly common as the conveyor becomes wobbly on its way to collapse. A particularly severe storm causes the ocean to break through levees in the Netherlands, making coastal cities such as the Hague unlivable. In California the delta island levees in the Sacramento River area are breached, disrupting the aqueduct system transporting water from north to south. Megadroughts afflict the U.S., especially in the southern states, along with winds that are 15% stronger on average than they are now, causing widespread dust storms and soil loss. The U.S. is better positioned to cope than most nations, however, thanks to its diverse growing climates, wealth, technology, and abundant resources. That has a downside, though: It magnifies the haves-vs.-have-nots gap and fosters bellicose finger-pointing at America. Turning inward, the U.S. effectively seeks to build a fortress around itself to preserve resources. Borders are strengthened to hold back starving immigrants from Mexico, South America, and the Caribbean islands--waves of boat people pose especially grim problems. Tension between the U.S. and Mexico rises as the U.S. reneges on a 1944 treaty that guarantees water flow from the Colorado River into Mexico. America is forced to meet its rising energy demand with options that are costly both economically and politically, including nuclear power and onerous Middle Eastern contracts. Yet it survives without catastrophic losses. Europe, hardest hit by its temperature drop, struggles to deal with immigrants from Scandinavia seeking warmer climes to the south. Southern Europe is beleaguered by refugees from hard-hit countries in Africa and elsewhere. But Western Europe's wealth helps buffer it from catastrophe. Australia's size and resources help it cope, as does its location--the conveyor shutdown mainly affects the Northern Hemisphere. Japan has fewer resources but is able to draw on its social cohesion to cope--its government is able to induce population-wide behavior changes to conserve resources. China's huge population and food demand make it particularly vulnerable. It is hit by increasingly unpredictable monsoon rains, which cause devastating floods in drought-denuded areas. Other parts of Asia and East Africa are similarly stressed. Much of Bangladesh becomes nearly uninhabitable because of a rising sea level, which contaminates inland water supplies. Countries whose diversity already produces conflict, such as India and Indonesia, are hard-pressed to maintain internal order while coping with the unfolding changes. As the decade progresses, pressures to act become irresistible --history shows that whenever humans have faced a choice between starving or raiding, they raid. Imagine Eastern European countries, struggling to feed their populations, invading Russia--which is weakened by a population that is already in decline--for access to its minerals and energy supplies. Or picture Japan eyeing nearby Russian oil and gas reserves to power desalination plants and energy-intensive farming. Envision nuclear-armed Pakistan, India, and China skirmishing at their borders over refugees, access to shared rivers, and arable land. Or Spain and Portugal fighting over fishing rights--fisheries are disrupted around the world as water temperatures change, causing fish to migrate to new habitats. Growing tensions engender novel alliances. Canada joins fortress America in a North American bloc. (Alternatively, Canada may seek to keep its abundant hydropower for itself, straining its ties with the energy-hungry U.S.) North and South Korea align to create a technically savvy, nuclear-armed entity. Europe forms a truly unified bloc to curb its immigration problems and protect against aggressors. Russia, threatened by impoverished neighbors in dire straits, may join the European bloc. Nuclear arms proliferation is inevitable. Oil supplies are stretched thin as climate cooling drives up demand. Many countries seek to shore up their energy supplies with nuclear energy, accelerating nuclear proliferation. Japan, South Korea, and Germany develop nuclear-weapons capabilities, as do Iran, Egypt, and North Korea. Israel, China, India, and Pakistan also are poised to use the bomb. The changes relentlessly hammer the world's "carrying capacity"--the natural resources, social organizations, and economic networks that support the population. Technological progress and market forces, which have long helped boost Earth's carrying capacity, can do little to offset the crisis--it is too widespread and unfolds too fast. As the planet's carrying capacity shrinks, an ancient pattern reemerges: the eruption of desperate, all-out wars over food, water, and energy supplies. As Harvard archeologist Steven LeBlanc has noted, wars over resources were the norm until about three centuries ago. When such conflicts broke out, 25% of a population's adult males usually died. As abrupt climate change hits home, warfare may again come to define human life.

#### Extinction in ten years

**Aym 10** - Individual Investor Magazine staff writer (Terrence, "German Scientist Predicts new Ice Age now approaching", Helium.com, December 22, http://www.helium.com/items/2045473-scientist-predicts-new-ice-age-now-approaching)//KL

As the frenzy over man-made global warming dies the slow death of a thousand cuts, desperate scientists are attempting to interpret what has happened to the sun, what will happen to the Earth as the solar system swings into alignment with the galactic core possibly exposing everything to titanic energies the planet is normally shielded from, and why the Earth may slip into a full-fledged Ice Age in less than ten years. The clock is running out. Then add to their discoveries raw data that suggests the Earth's molten core may have shifted and the readings pouring in that the magnetic field protecting the planet from Unimaginable deadly solar radiation is weakening. Passing the zenith of a nearly two centuries of robust warming, the sun's next phase will see a decline. Climatologists and heliologists agree that within 30 years the sun will go quiet resulting in a dramatic drop of solar heating. The early stages of this activity are already being felt. All of these factors—in one way or another—have or will have a significant impact on the future climate. The impact is not a favorable one. And again, each of these events is cyclical. Arctic ice could spread farther to the south “I think it is even conceivable that the Arctic ice spreads significantly in the years to come,” Globig told reporters for the German weather site weter.t-online. de. "The impact of solar activity on climate has been criminally underestimated for a long time."

### 2NC Co2 Solves

#### Best studies go neg

**Amos ‘12** (Jonathon Amos, Science correspondent, BBC News, “CO2 'drove end to last ice age',” <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/science-environment-17611404>, April 4, 2012)

A new, detailed record of past climate change provides compelling evidence that the last ice age was ended by a rise in temperature driven by an increase in atmospheric carbon dioxide. The finding is based on a very broad range of data, including even the shells of ancient tiny ocean animals. A paper describing the research appears in this week's edition of Nature. The team behind the study says its work further strengthens ideas about global warming. "At the end of the last ice age, CO2 rose from about 180 parts per million (ppm) in the atmosphere to about 260; and today we're at 392," explained lead author Dr Jeremy Shakun. "So, in the last 100 years we've gone up about 100 ppm - about the same as at the end of the last ice age, which I think puts it into perspective because it's not a small amount. Rising CO2 at the end of the ice age had a huge effect on global climate." The study covers the period in Earth history from roughly 20,000 to 10,000 years ago. This was the time when the planet was emerging from its last deep chill, when the great ice sheets known to cover parts of the Northern Hemisphere were in retreat. The key result from the new study is that it shows the carbon dioxide rise during this major transition ran slightly ahead of increases in global temperature. This runs contrary to the record obtained solely from the analysis of Antarctic ice cores which had indicated the opposite - that temperature elevation in the southern polar region actually preceded (or at least ran concurrent to) the climb in CO2. This observation has frequently been used by some people who are sceptical of global warming to challenge its scientific underpinnings; to claim that the warming link between the atmospheric gas and global temperature is grossly overstated. But Dr Shakun and colleagues argue that the Antarctic temperature record is just that - a record of what was happening only on the White Continent. By contrast, their new climate history encompasses data from all around the world to provide a much fuller picture of what was happening on a global scale. This data incorporates additional information contained in ices drilled from Greenland, and in sediments drilled from the ocean floor and from continental lakes. These provide a range of indicators. Air bubbles trapped in ice, for example, will record the past CO2 concentrations in the atmosphere. Past temperatures can also be inferred from ancient planktonic marine organisms buried in the sediments. That is because the amount of magnesium they would include in their calcite skeletons and shells was dependent on the warmth of the water in which they swam. "Our global temperature looks a lot like the pattern of rising CO2 at the end of the ice age, but the interesting part in particular is that unlike with these Antarctic ice core records, the temperature lags a bit behind the CO2," said Dr Shakun, who conducted much of the research at Oregon State University but who is now affiliated to Harvard and Columbia universities. "You put these two points together - the correlation of global temperature and CO2, and the fact that temperature lags behind the CO2 - and it really leaves you thinking that CO2 was the big driver of global warming at the end of the ice age," he told BBC News.

**SCIENCE !**

**Tzedakis et al 12** (Chronis – Professor of Physical Geography at University College London, BA in Geology, James Channell – Professor in the Department of Geological Sciences at the University of Florida, David Hodell – Professor at the Department of Earth Sciences at the Universit of Cambridge, Luke Skinner – Department of Earth Science and the Bjerknes Centre for Climate Research, H.F. KLeiven, UNI Research, “Determining the natural length of the current interglacial,” 1/9/12, Nature Geoscience, <http://www.nature.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/ngeo/journal/v5/n2/pdf/ngeo1358.pdf>)

No glacial inception is projected to occur at the current atmospheric CO2 concentrations of 390 ppmv (ref. 1). Indeed, model experiments suggest that in the current orbital conﬁguration—which is characterized by a weak minimum in summer insolation—glacial inception would require CO2 concentrations below preindustrial levels of 280 ppmv (refs 2–4). However, the precise CO2 threshold 4–6 as well as the timing of the hypothetical next glaciation 7 remain unclear. Past interglacials can be used to draw analogies with the present, provided their duration is known. Here we propose that the minimum age of a glacial inception is constrained by the onset of bipolar-seesaw climate variability, which requires ice-sheets large enough to produce iceberg discharges that disrupt the ocean circulation. We identify the bipolar seesaw in ice-core and North Atlantic marine records by the appearance of a distinct phasing of interhemispheric climate and hydrographic changes and ice-rafted debris. The glacial inception during Marine Isotope sub-Stage 19c, a close analogue for the present interglacial, occurred near the summer insolation minimum, suggesting that the interglacial was not prolonged by subdued radiative forcing 7 . Assuming that ice growth mainly responds to insolation and CO2 forcing, this analogy suggests that the end of the current interglacial would occur within the next 1500 years, if atmospheric CO2 concentrations did not exceed 240 5 ppmv. radi The notion that the Holocene (or Marine Isotope Stage 1, MIS1), already 11.6 thousand years (kyr) old, may be drawing to a close has been based on the observation that the duration of recent interglacials was approximately half a precession cycle (11 kyr; ref. 8). However, uncertainty over an imminent hypothetical glaciation arises from the current subdued amplitude of insolation variations as a result of low orbital eccentricity (Fig. 1). It has thus been proposed that at times of weak eccentricityprecession forcing, obliquity is the dominant astronomical parameter driving ice-volume changes, leading to extended interglacial duration of approximately half an obliquity cycle (21 kyr; ref. 9). In this view, the next glacial inception would occur near the obliquity minimum 10 kyr from now 7 . Climate modelling studies show that a reduction in boreal summer insolation is the primary trigger for glacial inception, with CO2 playing a secondary role 3,5 . Lowering CO2 shifts the inception threshold to higher insolation values 1 , but modelling experiments indicate that preindustrial concentrations of 280 ppmv would not be sufficiently low to lead to new ice growth given the subdued insolation minimum24 . However, the extent to which preindustrial CO2 levels were `natural' has been challenged 10,11 by the suggestion that **anthropogenic interference since the mid Holocene led to increased greenhouse gas (GHG) concentrations, which countered the natural cooling trend and prevented a glacial inception**. The overdue glaciation hypothesis has been tested by climate simulations using lower preindustrial GHG concentrations, with contrasting results, ranging from no ice growth 5 to a linear increase in ice volume 4 to large increases in perennial ice cover 6 .

### AT: Stream Shutdown

#### Warming for Co2 overwhelms- stream shutdown false

CS ’12 (ClimateSight, edited by Kate, scientist, presenter at the 2011 Fall AGU, American GeoPhysical Union, Fall Conference “The Day After Tomorrow: A Scientific Critique,” <http://climatesight.org/2012/04/26/the-day-after-tomorrow-a-scientific-critique/>, April 46, 2012)

Additionally, Jack’s statements regarding the plausibility of an imminent Gulf Stream shutdown due to global warming fly in the face of current scientific understanding. As the world continues to warm, and the Greenland ice sheet continues to melt, the North Atlantic circulation will probably slow down due to the added freshwater. The resulting cooling influence on parts of Europe will probably still be overwhelmed by warming due to greenhouse gases. However, a complete shutdown of the Gulf Stream is extremely unlikely within this century. It’s unclear whether an eventual shutdown is even possible, largely because there is less land ice available to melt than there was during the Younger Dryas. If such an event did occur, it would take centuries and still would not cause an ice age – instead, it would simply cancel out some of the greenhouse warming that had already occurred. Cooling influences simply decrease the global energy balance by a certain amount from its initial value; they do not shift the climate into a predetermined state regardless of where it started.

### AT: Conveyor Belt

#### Most qualified studies go negative

Hoffman ’10 (Doug L. Hoffman, Worked professionally as a mathematician, a computer programmer, an engineer, a computer salesman, a scientist, and a college professor. Dr. Hoffman earned his undergraduate degree, a BS in Applied Mathematics, from the Florida Institute of Technology. There he cut his teeth on computer models of heat flow and urban traffic simulations. After graduating, he performed hydro-acoustic work for the U.S. Navy in the Virgin Islands, where he first met Allen Simmons. Later projects included engineering work on the Carrier Automatic Landing System and cockpit field of view simulations, and environmental models for the Saudi Arabian government, He returned to academia in 1990, earning a Masters degree and a PhD in Computer Science at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. While there he did research in Molecular Dynamics Simulations and, as a member of the BioSCAN team, he helped develop and implement high-speed comparison methods for RNA, DNA, and protein sequences, work funded by the Human Genome Project. After joining the research faculty at UNC, he continued to pursue his thesis work, automated comparison of three dimensional protein molecules, Since 2000, he has been working in industry, serving as senior grid architect for a major information processing company, publishing several papers on modeling the performance of large scale grid computers. With a life long passion for education, he has also continued to teach as an adjunct Professor of Computer Science at Hendrix College and the University of Central Arkansas, “Ocean Conveyor Belt Dismissed”, <http://theresilientearth.com/?q=content/ocean-conveyor-belt-dismissed>, June 29, 2010)

After nearly 50 years of acceptance, the theory that a great ocean “conveyor belt” continuously circulates water around the globe in an orderly fashion has been dismissed by a leading oceanographer. According to a review article in the journal Science, a number of studies conducted over the past few years have challenged this paradigm. Oceanographers have discovered the vital role of ocean eddy currents and the wind in establishing the structure and variability of the ocean’s overturning. In light of these new discoveries, the demise of the conveyor belt model has been become the new majority opinion among the world's oceanographers. According to M. Susan Lozier, of Duke University, “the conveyor-belt model no longer serves the community well.” The idea that the ocean conveyor belt transports cold, dense water from the subpolar North Atlantic along the “lower limb” of the conveyor belt to the rest of the global ocean, where the waters are upwelled and then transported along the “upper limb” back to deepwater formation sites, has been supported by the majority of oceanographers for decades. This circulating flow was assumed to operate along western boundary currents in the deep ocean and provide a continuous supply of relatively warm surface waters to deepwater formation sites. While it was thought to be vulnerable to changes in deepwater production at high latitudes, with significant injections of fresh water capable of disrupting the smooth operation of the system, under normal conditions the conveyor belt was thought to function constantly and consistently. Now it seems that opinions within the oceanographic community have shifted, and the great ocean conveyor belt model has fallen from grace. As detailed in an eye opening article by Dr. Lozier, the conveyor belt has been found wanting and dismissed as the dominant ocean overturning paradigm. Lozier is Professor of Physical Oceanography and Chair of the Earth and Ocean Sciences Division at Duke, and is an expert in large-scale ocean circulation, water mass distribution and variability. The article, “Deconstructing the Conveyor Belt,” begins with a short history of the conveyor belt theory's development. According to Lozier, our modern idea of the ocean’s overturning, and our understanding of its importance to Earth's climate, developed as a result of the work of two prominent oceanographers: Fifty years ago, Henry Stommel theorized that recently ventilated waters of high-latitude origin must be transported equatorward at depth along western-intensified boundary currents. Assuming that water masses formed via deep convection in isolated regions in the northern North Atlantic and near Antarctica essentially fill the abyssal ocean, Stommel surmised that the deep ocean exports these waters via a distributed upwelling to the surface. Furthermore, he suggested that because such upwelling produces a stretching of the water column that induces a loss of angular momentum, the deep interior waters must compensate by flowing poleward toward regions of higher angular momentum. Thus, the equatorward transport of deep water masses was confined to the western boundaries of the basins. Stommel’s theory gave the ocean’s overturning, previously amorphous in its third dimension, a structure: Deep waters are transported equatorward in a steady, continuous deep western-intensified boundary current from their formation sites at high latitudes. The abyssal flow field, as theorized by Stommel in 1958. The second important oceanographer was the eminent Wallace S. “Wally” Broecker, Newberry Professor in the Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences at Columbia University and a scientist at Columbia's Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory. Arguably one of the world’s greatest living geoscientists, for more than half a century, Broecker has investigated the ocean’s role in climate change. He was among the pioneers in using radiocarbon and isotope dating to track historical climate change, and the influence of climate change on polar ice and ocean sediments. It was Broecker who coined the term “ocean conveyor belt.” According to Lozier, work by Broecker and colleagues suggested that the ocean’s overturning was responsible for the rapid climate fluctuations experienced during Earth’s last glacial period. “Though the importance of the ocean’s overturning to Earth’s climate had previously been understood, Broecker’s work essentially cemented the role of the conveyor belt as an agent of climate change,” states her review. “Thus, just as Stommel’s work gave spatial structure to the overturning, Broecker’s provided a temporal context.” So what has changed oceanography's mindset enough to proclaim the conveyor belt—arguably the most important discovery in the history of oceanography—an idea whose time has past? Since its proposal, oceanographers have understood that the conveyor model is an oversimplification of the way ocean overturning actually takes place. But it was believed to be a useful simplification, capable of providing an overall model of the ocean's transportation of heat energy, if not the exact details. But now it seems that some major features of the conveyor belt have been called into question. Here is a list of recent discoveries that have shaken the foundation of the conveyor belt theory. Most of the subpolar-to-subtropical exchange in the North Atlantic occurs along interior pathways. The deep deep western boundary current (DWBC) breaks up into eddies at 11°S. There is little meridional coherence in the overturning transport from one gyre to the next . Wind forcing, rather than buoyancy forcing, can play a dominant role in changing the transport of the overturning. The southward transport of deep waters at 8°S, off the Brazilian coast, was shown to be carried entirely by migrating coherent eddies. Floats launched within the DWBC at 53°N do not follow a continuous boundary current, but instead take multiple paths to the subtropics, including interior pathways far removed from the DWBC. Two recent studies have found unexpected pathways in the upper ocean. A recent study shows that MOC transport in the subtropical North Atlantic is susceptible to variability in the "leakage" of warm and salty water into the South Atlantic. Studies showing little to no coherence across gyre boundaries have prompted interest in monitoring the overturning circulation in the South Atlantic and the subpolar North Atlantic. The connectivity of the overturning and, more importantly, of the meridional heat transport from one basin to the next can no longer be assumed on interannual time scales. When all of these observations are combined, they indicate that the conventional conceptual model of ocean overturning needs revamping. As Dr. Lozier put it: “In sum, the impact of eddies on our concept of a continuous lower limb for the ocean’s overturning has evolved from an understanding that eddies can detrain and entrain fluid along the DWBC to the recognition that the DWBC can, at certain locales and perhaps certain times, be a series of migrating eddies, to the realization that eddy-driven flow provides an alternate pathway for deep waters to spread globally.” In other words, it doesn't work as simply as we thought. Lozier is in a good position to make such a judgment, since it is partly due to her work that scientists are revisiting the conveyor belt model. As noted on this blog in “Conveyor Belt Model Broken,” work by Lozier and Amy Bower of Wood’s Hole, using RAFOS float data, showed that there was something fundamentally wrong with how the ocean's overturning flow was being modeled. By analyzing the divagating float paths, it was discovered that ocean currents did not behave as expected. Reported back in May of 2009, their discovery had the potential to affect both short term and long term climate change. This is because ocean currents not only redistribute surface warmth, the oceans themselves are a vast reservoir for heat and carbon dioxide. I concluded that this finding invalidated the IPCC's GCM climate model predictions, because the models were based on incorrect behavior of the ocean overturning currents. At the time, Dr. Lozier took exception to my supposition, stating in an email, “the climate models care first and foremost about the return of the surface waters and our research has no bearing in the slightest on those waters.” I disagreed, saying that the discovery of significant eddies changed the assumptions on how the deep sea currents flow, which must change the boundary conditions between different masses of water. This cannot help but alter the long term reaction of the ocean to the energy flowing through it. More recently, variations in continuous data measurements from cable-moored instrument arrays identified large and unexpected yearly fluctuations in conveyor flow. As additional discoveries have unfolded, it was also found that there are large reservoirs of CO2 stashed away in the deep ocean, again previously unexpected. As the evidence has piled up, Dr. Lozier has been forced to admit that there are implications for climate change and the way the Earth system is modeled. In her own words: Added impetus for revamping comes from a recent study revealing a considerable reservoir of anthropogenic CO2 in the deep North Atlantic, surmised to result from the production of high-latitude water masses and their subsequent equatorward spread. Clearly, an improved understanding of the pathways of the upper and lower limbs of the ocean’s overturning will aid assessments of the ocean’s role in the uptake, transport, and storage of heat and CO2, crucial components of Earth’s climate system. This reinforces the claim that previous climate models—which are highly dependent on the coupling between ocean and atmosphere and, hence, the ocean circulation models they contain—cannot be considered accurate reconstructions of Earth's climate system. I repeat my earlier assertion: if the conveyor belt model is wrong then none of the IPCC's model results can be taken seriously. This point is underscored by recent work that found small changes in high latitude insolation, driven by Earth's orbital cycles, can trigger significant changes in lower latitude ocean and atmospheric circulation. The circulation of Earth's oceans is now known to be much more complex and nuanced than even a decade ago, which has significant implications for climate modeling.

### no impact

#### Finishing the card

**Tertrais, ’11 –**“Dr. Bruno Tertrais is a Senior Research Fellow at the Fondation pour la recherche strate´gique (Foundation for Strategic Research), and a TWQ editorial board member, The Climate Wars Myth,” The Washington Quarterly, 34:3 pp. 17-29 Summer 2011, http://csis.org/files/publication/twq11summertertrais.pdf)//a-berg

30 Will the melting of Himalayan glaciers lead to a severe water crisis in South Asia, one of the most dangerous parts of the world? On this point, the IPCC included a serious error in its 2007 report, due to a series of confusions. The text claims that these glaciers could be reduced by 80 percent in 2035. The date came from a 2005 report by the World Wildlife Fund (WWF), for which primary sources were press articles and unpublished communications. (The WWF report now includes a correction retracting its claims.)31As to the proportion of glaciers which could disappear by that time, it came from a 1996 UNESCO Report, which mentioned a possible 80 percent reduction of the global total of non-polar ice (not just Himalayan glaciers), but by the year 2350, not 2035.32Resorting to non-peer-reviewed publications is also what led the IPCC to wrongly claim, based on an unsubstantiated assertion included in the Stern Report, that water availability in South Asia was highly dependent on glacier melt.33But recent studies have shown that Himalayan glacier melt accounts for only three to 25 percent of the volume of rivers in South Asia: monsoons and local seasonal snow melt are by far their main sources.34 And water crises do not mean water wars. The issue of access to water resources is undoubtedly a major dimension of numerous regional crises, in particular in the Greater Middle East, as testified by decades-old disputes between Turkey and Syria, or Egypt and Sudan. The value of strategic locations such as the Golan Heights or Kashmir is not a small part of tensions between Syria and Israel, or India and Pakistan. And water sharing can be the cause of local disputes sometimes degenerating into small-scale collective violence in Africa or Asia. However, experts from the University of Oregon, who maintain the most complete database on this topic, state that there has never been a ‘‘war over water’’ (that is, large-scale collective violence for the sake of a water resource) in the past 4,500 years.35The last war over water opposed two Sumerian cities in the middle of the third millennium B.C.E., about sharing the waters of the Tigris and Euphrates. There are good reasons for such a scant record. Any country seeking to control the upstream of a river would need to ensure complete and permanent domination over it, which would be an ambitious goal. In the modern era, resorting to arms over water (like resorting to arms over oil) is just not worth the cost. Especially for those whose geographical location and budget can afford to build desalination plants?which is the case for some of the most water-stressed countries, those located on the Arabian Peninsula. One should therefore not be surprised that access to water has always generated more cooperation than conflict. Since antiquity, thousands of agreements and treaties have been signed for water-sharing. And cooperation between adversaries has stood the test of wartime, as was seen during the 20th century in the Middle East, South Asia, or Southeast Asia. Climate Barbarians at the Gates? What about ‘‘climate refugees’’? Dire evaluations already existed in the middle of the 1990s: British environmentalist Norman Myers claimed at the time that such refugees already numbered 25 million, and that their number might double 15 years later, to reach perhaps 200 million by the middle of the century. This number has been used by many publications since then.36Another widelyquoted prevision?which claims to be an update of Myers’ own?is that of the non-governmental organization Christian Aid, which foresees 250 million climate refugees between 2007 and 2050 (out of a total of one billion environmental refugees).37 Lord Stern himself reportedly stated that a five degree Celsius rise in average global temperature would lead to ‘‘billions’’ having to move.38 But the idea of massive waves of refugees triggered by climate change does not square well with the reality of migration. There is no doubt that environmental change can lead to massive displacements of populations. Such displacements have always existed, including in industrialized countries. Remember the Dust Bowl, which led to the migration of two to three million from the Great Plains to the West in the United States. But such movements are slow (we are more accurately talking about migrants as opposed to refugees), very much dependent on economic opportunities existing elsewhere (the ‘‘pull’’ factor is as important as the ‘‘push’’), and generally of a limited geographical scope (most people want to stay in the same country or region).39They are sometimes due to non-climate related factors: desertification or degradation of the soils is often due to urbanization or intensive agriculture. The same reasoning can be applied to the rise in sea levels. First, the hypothesis of a future constant rise in average sea levels due to global warming is not the likeliest one and is being seriously challenged.40Second, even if one accepts the scenario of a constant rise, is it inconceivable that mankind would be able to adjust and adapt to a rise of a few millimeters per year, as it has done for many decades? Catastrophist analyses evoking massive floods of refugees do not square well with an average rise of two to six millimeters a year (the range of IPCC scenarios). And given such a slow pace, some countries will balance the rise of sea level mass by sedimentation. Take the example of Bangladesh, a poster child of the possible consequences of climate change. The idea that the densely populated coastal regions of that country could be flooded by the rise in sea levels does not take into account the parallel accumulation of sediments brought by the great South Asian rivers, which amount to about one billion metric tons a year.41 Such are the reasons why experts of environmental migrations generally agree that climate change in itself is rarely a root cause of migration.42Major population displacements due to environmental and/or climatic factors will remain exceptional except in the case of a sudden natural disaster.43And most importantly for the sake of this analysis, they are rarely a cause of violent conflict.44 It is not even certain that the very concept of ‘‘climate refugees’’ is relevant.45 Atmospheric or hydrological catastrophes can create massive?and most of the time temporary?population displacements. But such catastrophes have always existed. Why then attempt to create a separate category for their victims, which would distinguish them from those of geological catastrophes (earthquakes, tsunamis, volcanic eruptions) for which human activities bear no responsibility? The concept of climate refugees says more about Western fears of ‘‘barbarians at the gates’’ than it does about the foreseeable reality of the consequences of climate change.46 Is Climate Change Even Relevant to Defense Planning? So much for ‘‘climate wars.’’ But the idea according to which climate change is nevertheless a new, important factor to be taken into account in defense and security planning is itself questionable. Of course, nothing precludes us from including it in the growing list of non-military issues that may have a bearing on global security. But this has to be done in a realistic way. It is not unreasonable to state that climate change may be a ‘‘threat multiplier,’’ for instance.47However, stating this says nothing about the probability of increased violence or instability either at the global level or for a given crisis, or about the likelihood of state failure. Such consequences depend primarily on the reaction of governments and societies?a factor which is impossible to calculate in advance. There are no data to support the vague idea that climate change can have a key role in triggering collective violence?that is, be the proverbial straw that breaks the camel’s back, as argued by an alarmist study (citing once again the example of Darfur).48Climate is ‘‘one of myriad factors in a complex causal web underlying conflict,’’ and the environment is just ‘‘one of manifold and nonessential causal factors’’ which may lead to war.49The main causes of contemporary conflict are societal, not natural (in the broadest sense of the term, i.e., including man-made).50Conflicts are borne out of human choices and mistakes. Could regional previsions of the impact of climate change at least inform policymakers and planners about the areas of the world which are more likely? all things being equal?to suffer from them? The answer is no. Regional effects are extremely difficult to predict with the degree of probability which can be useful for planning.51The IPCC itself underscores that current models do not have the ability to deliver useful previsions at a higher scale than the continental one.52Nobody knows, for instance, whether African monsoons will move northwards (with positive effects on agriculture) or southwards (with negative effects). Here, as noted by a contributor to the IPCC, ‘‘there is complete disagreement between the various models.’’53And when the IPCC attempts to give regional previsions on the evolution of agricultural output, for instance, it is in a way which does not buttress the case for alarmism. Its 2007 report mentions a possible reduction by 50 percent of rain-fed agricultural output in some African countries in 2020. But the sole source it cites to support this claim is a report produced for a Canadian non-governmental organization in which it is mentioned that (unpublished) studies evoke this scenario for three Maghreb countries.54 There are indeed, it seems, some causal links between climate and warfare. But they are of a seasonal nature: ‘‘nations address seasonal climate change in terms of where they fight, rather than through when or whether disputes occur. ... Fighting moves to higher latitudes in the summer, and lower latitudes during the cooler months of the year.’’55 The stakes of climate change are important?and that is why this area should not be the object of intellectual fantasies or fashions. It is appropriate for defense and security planners to monitor the evolution of the scientific and political debate on its possible consequences. But there is no objective reason today to list climate change as a key issue for defense and security planning.
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**Momentum is neg --- will keep rising**

**Daily Finance 7-29** (“Oil Prices Heading Higher! Try This Approach”, 2013, http://www.dailyfinance.com/2013/07/28/oil-prices-heading-higher-try-this-approach/, Deech)

The bad news, which I had to relay to my dad, is that prices aren't likely to **go down** again **anytime soon**. Worse yet, drivers probably should get ready for higher gas prices. Last week's $0.12 jump could only be the beginning because a **confluence of factors** driving supply and demand are likely to **push prices higher**. While that's not what drivers want to hear, I do have a solution to help take away a little bit of the pain at the pump. What's driving prices higher? Before I give you my solution, let's take a deeper look at the problem. The average retail price of gas is made up of four components. By far, the biggest contributor to the price of gas is oil, which is two-thirds the price of gas. The price of oil is driven by both global and regional market conditions. Globally, unrest in Egypt has been a big factor in oil's recent rise. Believe it or not, Egypt is a big deal in the global oil market as it's the largest non-OPEC oil producer in Africa. In fact, U.S. oil and gas producer Apache is actually Egypt's top oil producer, creating over 363,000 barrels of oil equivalent per day. The concern is that this oil production, as well as oil being transported through the important Suez Canal, could potentially be shut off if unrest in the country turns into an all-out civil war. The global oil markets are simply factoring this potential disruption into the price of oil.

**Even if they win prices are decreasing now, they’ll bottom out at $100 --- won’t trigger the link**

**Prime-Tass Business Newswire 13** (Prime-Tass English-language Business Newswire, “Russia's Econ Min: Oil prices to stay above $100\bbl in 2013”, 2-26)

The Economic Development Ministry expects the price of Brent oil to ease but remain **above** U.S. $100 per barrel in 2013, Deputy Minister Andrei Klepach said late on Monday. "Generally, the balance shows a decline. But we are unlikely to see a sharp decrease. Oil prices are likely to **decline slightly**, but to **stay above $100** per barrel," Klepach said. The ministry's 2013 forecast for the price of Urals crude, Russia's main export item, stands at $97 per barrel, but it has not ruled out that the price may rise above $100. In 2012, the average price of the Urals blend amounted rose 1.15% to $110.52 per barrel. Klepach said that the current level of oil prices of around $115 per barrel of Brent mix is above the ministry's expectations, he said.

**Prices are at record highs**

**Hargreaves 7-10** (Steve, Correspondent – CNN, “Oil prices surge above $106, gasoline tops $3.50”, CNN Money, 2013, http://money.cnn.com/2013/07/10/news/economy/oil-prices/index.html, Deech)

U.S. oil prices **jumped** above $106 a barrel Wednesday, their **highest level** in over a year, as stockpiles of crude dwindled and tensions in Egypt kept traders on edge. Gasoline prices in the United States also began to move higher. Oil prices rose nearly $3 a barrel following a report from the American Petroleum Institute showing a 9 million barrel draw down in crude oil stored in tanks around the country. Another report from the U.S. Energy information Administration showed a similar draw. The $3 rise comes on top of gains made over the last couple of weeks after widespread protests and a military takeover in Egypt. U.S. oil prices are up **10%** since the end of June.

**Everything and any link uq or price claims they make are wrong --- we are right**

**Caruso, 7/10**/13 (Dante, trade and board member of the Philadelphia Stock Exchange, writer for Seeking Alpha, “Oil: Surging For The Least Obvious Reason”, Seeking Alpha, July 10, 2013, http://seekingalpha.com/article/1542672-oil-surging-for-the-least-obvious-reason, JKahn)

As oil approached $100 last week, I started to collect data on oil USO,UCO, OIL expecting that the data would convince me that a shorting opportunity was at hand. What I found on the way to my short destination caught me by surprise. The fact that I was looking for an excuse to short oil was unusual, as I have been mostly buyer of dips in oil futures for several years. Oil had mostly been in a tight, $8 range for several months, and that can cause complacency. It also seems reasonable to believe oil is overpriced when mainstream oil articles continuously refer to "surging U.S. production", the "shale miracle", and "coming energy independence" of the U.S. The limitation of that knowledge is that the oil market is priced globally, and knowing what is happening in the U.S. is not necessarily representative of the big picture. With Egypt back as headline news, 2011 served as a logical starting point for analysis- to see what may be driving oil prices. Crude oil bounced during the week of the Egyptian Revolution in January, 2011. The bounce turned out to be a head-fake, though, and oil rolled over to a ten-week low in the next 2 weeks. Oil speculators bought oil on news of the Egyptian Revolution, but prices quickly fell back because the balance of world oil supply was not affected. Traders were bailed out of that losing trade a couple weeks later by riots in Libya, a major oil exporter whose exports were about to plunge. The chart below captures some of the key moments since those events: [Chart Omitted] 3-Year Chart, WTI Crude. Additional timeline comments: (match blue numbers near price bars to comments below) Egyptian Revolution of 2011 began on 1/25/11. Mubarak resignation was announced on 2/11/11. WTI crude bounces for a week above $92 and then rolls over to a ten-week low. 1) 2/15/11: Libya- riot in Benghazi, oil market erupts. 2/10/11: Death toll stands at 233. 3/19/11: First air strikes halt advance of Gaddafi's forces on Benghazi. 2) 5/10/11: CME announces a 25% margin hike on crude oil futures, the 4th margin hike of 2011. 3) 6/23/11: Announcement of a global, coordinated release of 60 million barrels of oil from strategic petroleum reserves. The U.S. Strategic Petroleum Reserve will account for half of the 60 million barrels. 4) 8/21/11: Libyan Rebels enter Tripoli; encounter little resistance. 5) 11/11: Saudi Arabia boosts oil production to 10.047 million bpd, the most in more than 30 years. 6) 4/4/12: Oil analysts reach consensus that another SPR release is needed immediately to derail $5 gasoline, just weeks before oil plunges $25/bbl. 7) 8/17/12: Obama administration announces SPR release is possible. 8) 9/12: Saudi Arabia boosts oil production back up the 30-year high production level of 10 million bpd, and holds that level into November. 9) 11/12: Saudi Arabia begins to throttle oil production back to 9 million bpd in 2 steps. Running through the timeline data, I was surprised to see that Saudi Arabia had to step in and play the role of swing producer, even after Libya's exports resumed (#8). Referring back to the graph- I added supply and demand data (IEA) to complete the picture. The timing of significant changes in oil supply from OECD countries is presented above the blue line. Non-OECD oil supply has fallen slightly over the past two years and is projected to remain unchanged, and is therefore excluded. Additional supply would have to come from OPEC, or drawn from global oil inventories. Only supply changes of greater than 300,000 bpd are shown (above blue line). Changes in global oil demand are registered beneath the blue line. Demand is more volatile than supply, due to variations in seasonality, plus additional factors such as field maintenance. Global demand for oil has increased at an annual pace of approximately one million barrels per day the past two years but the demand surge is not distributed evenly. A surge appears between Q2 and Q3. In 2011, this surge was 1.9 million bpd. In 2012, the jump in demand from Q2 to Q3 was 1.0 million bpd. This demand surge causes a temporary draw on inventories, unless the demand is met with an even greater increase in supply. In Q4 of both 2011 and 2012, oil supply posted a substantial gain. In 2013 demand is expected to surge from Q1 to Q4 by 1.9 million bpd while OECD supply is projected to increase only slightly, from 20.6 million bpd in Q1 to 21.0 million bpd in Q4. This demand imbalance of 1.5 million bpd would have to be met by OPEC and/or drawdown of existing oil inventories. The IEA data set is shown below, with my emphasis on the demand spike into Q3: [Chart omitted] IEA Oil Market Report: World Oil Supply and Demand table with 3 consecutive years of seasonal demand spikes into shown with emphasis. IEA gives the following reason for the seasonality demand jump in 2013: The seasonal ramp-up in global crude throughputs is expected to be steeper than normal this year, with runs increasing by 2.2 million bpd from 2Q13 to 3Q13. That seasonal increase, centered in the non-OECD, is due to new Saudi distillation capacity, increasing Chinese runs after heavy spring maintenance, and recovering throughput at Venezuela's Amuay plant after a 2012 fire. A demand bump of 2.2 million bpd into Q3, if IEA projections are correct, would be the biggest in years. It also will happen in a year where non-OECD oil production is stagnant and OECD production is projected to have the smaller year over year production gain than the past 2 years. Saudi Arabia is the only country believed to have projected to spare capacity to meet this demand surge. Saudi Arabia reduced their oil production in Q4 2012 by approximately the same amount that OECD supply increased during this time period, and did so while Brent Crude prices were stable near $108 and WTI Crude was priced around $88: Data compiled and presented by Stuart Staniford. Note that the rig count (red line) is rising. It is possible that the Saudi Arabia are preparing for an even greater need for their exports. So, as we move into the second half of 2013, the Saudis represent the only sideline supply that can make a meaningful impact on an additional 1.5 million bpd of demand that will be felt. However, there is no guarantee that Saudi Arabia can supply that much oil, as they have not exceeded 10mb/d in decades. Global crude inventories will be falling- particularly if Saudi Arabia is slow or unwilling to ramp production back to 10 million bpd or higher. Meanwhile, in the U.S., the Bakken, Eagle Ford, and other oil shale (tight oil) plays have seen an incredible ramp up in drilling activity, but the oil rig count actually peaked last August: [Chart omitted] With the Oil-directed rig count down in the past year, large increases in U.S. production are not anticipated. This data is incorporated into the IEA projection that anticipates slower supply growth in the second half of 2013. Conclusion: Daily movements in crude oil are nearly always attributed to weather related delays, like fog in the shipping channel, or pipeline problems, field maintenance, or geopolitics. If you're not careful, you could miss the greatest driver of crude oil prices the past few years (particularly in Q3)- like I nearly did. Oil is going up for the most simple, yet overlooked reason: supply & demand. Global demand for oil keeps grinding higher and higher and will soon be 2.5 million bpd higher than when the Libya protests caused a price spike in 2011. With OECD and non-OECD supply not keeping pace with demand, the world is building an even greater dependence on OPEC exports. WTI Crude has already surged $12 since the low in June and is now at the highest level since April 2012. Despite trying to build a case against oil, I came away with the opposite opinion. I now expect WTI oil to trade in the upper end of its 2-year range, between $95 and $115/bbl. I expect to buy oil on any weakness in coming weeks and months, and prefer to buy December 2015 futures, as they are already trading approximately $18 dollars below front-month CL futures. If demand materializes as expected in the second half of 2013, the market will require an output boost from Saudi Arabia, and willingness and availability of that crude will have a significant impact on global pricing. Saudi Arabia has already answered the call in 2011 and 2012 as the global swing producer, and will be tested further this year. Macro market analysis begins with oil. With daily consumption of 18.6 million barrels (U.S.) each dollar per barrel increase represents $6.8 billion that is redirected away from the consumer economy. Oil prices tend to trade in the opposite direction as bond prices, and bond price movements eventually affect stock prices. While it will take months to see the effects of this Q3 jump in demand, global inventories should start to drop soon. If oil prices continue to rise, the second half of 2013 could start to feel like 2007, where the S&P500 SPY topped out and started down, while commodities and commodity stocks stormed higher. In coming months, I expect food and metals to trend in the same direction as oil, as they typically do over longer periods of time: [Chart omitted] Of the commodity sector, silver SLV & PSLV is my current and favorite play for reasons I detailed previously, and the case for silver is even more robust with rising oil prices. We may even hear the word "stagflation" before 2013 is over.

### 2nc link run

#### The framework and motive for oil trade exists now – it’s just a question of the embargo

**WP, 09** (Nick Miroff, staff writer, “Cuba's Undersea Oil Could Help Thaw Trade With U.S.”, 5/16/2009, Washington Post, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/05/15/AR2009051503416.html, JKahn)

Deep in the Gulf of Mexico, an end to the 1962 U.S. trade embargo against Cuba may be lying untapped, buried under layers of rock, seawater and bitter relations. Oil, up to 20 billion barrels of it, sits off Cuba's northwest coast in territorial waters, according to the Cuban government -- enough to turn the island into the Qatar of the Caribbean. At a minimum, estimates by the U.S. Geological Survey place Cuba's potential deep-water reserves at 4.6 billion barrels of oil and 9.8 trillion cubic feet of natural gas, stores that would rank the island among the region's top producers. Drilling operations by foreign companies in Cuban waters are still in the exploratory stage, and significant obstacles -- technological and political -- stand between a U.S.-Cuba rapprochement eased by oil. But as the Obama administration gestures toward improved relations with the Castro government, the national security, energy and economic benefits of Cuban crude may make it a **powerful incentive for change.** Limited commercial ties between U.S. businesses and the island's communist government have been quietly expanding this decade as Cuban purchases of U.S. goods -- mostly food -- have increased from $7 million in 2001 to $718 million in 2008, according to census data. Thawing relations could eventually open up U.S. investment in mining, agriculture, tourism and other sectors of Cuba's tattered economy. But the prospect of major offshore reserves that would be off-limits to U.S. companies and consumers has some Cuba experts arguing that 21st-century energy needs should prevail over 20th-century Cold War politics. "The implications of this have the potential to be a sea change, literally and figuratively, for the Cubans," said Jonathan Benjamin-Alvarado, a political scientist at the University of Nebraska-Omaha who studies Cuba's energy sector. At a House subcommittee hearing last month on U.S.-Cuba policy, former oil executive Jorge Piñón told lawmakers that the United States has a strategic interest in helping Cuba tap its potentially vast hydrocarbon stores and that U.S. companies should receive special permission to do so. "American oil and oil equipment and service companies **have the capital, technology and operational know-how** to explore, produce and refine in a safe and responsible manner Cuba's potential oil and natural gas reserves. Yet **they remain on the sidelines because of our almost five-decade-old unilateral political and economic embargo**," said Piñón, a member of a Brookings Institution advisory group on Cuba policy reform. Cuba has said it welcomes U.S. investment, but American companies remain largely silent on the issue, at least in public, bound by trade sanctions that were established under the Kennedy administration. When Cuban oil officials and U.S. companies attended a joint energy conference at an Ame}rican-owned hotel in Mexico in 2006, the Bush administration forced the facility to expel the Cuban delegation, attempting to thwart any potential for partnership. "Until trade barriers are removed, Chevron is unable to do business in Cuba," said Chevron spokesman Kurt Glaubitz. "Companies like us would have to see a change in U.S. policy before we evaluate whether there's interest." Robert Dodge, a spokesman for the American Petroleum Institute, said his organization is not lobbying for access to Cuba, and Texas congressional representatives with ties to the oil industry said they are focused on opening U.S. territorial waters to drilling. But observers of U.S.-Cuba relations say American companies haven't been sitting on their hands and remain in conversations with Cuban counterparts. At the 2006 Mexico energy conference, U.S. oil companies "**all had plans to move forward as soon as the U.S. government gives them the go-ahead**," said Benjamin-Alvarado, who attended the conference. If that go-ahead is granted, American companies would be entering a drilling contest crowded with foreign competitors. Several global firms, including Repsol (Spain), Petrobras (Brazil) and StatoilHydro (Norway) are exploring in the Gulf of Mexico through agreements with the Castro government, and state companies from Malaysia, India, Vietnam and Venezuela have also signed deals. Sherritt International, a Canadian company, has had oil derricks pumping heavy crude along Cuba's north coast for more than a decade, extracting about 55,000 barrels a day, mostly for Cuba's domestic energy consumption. But most of Cuba's undiscovered reserves are thought to be in two offshore areas. The oil and gas that make up the USGS estimate lie in an area known as the North Cuba Basin, a short distance off the island's northwest coast. The larger deposit is thought to be in a section of the gulf known as the Eastern Gap, to which Mexico and the United States also have a claim. Cuban officials believe there are 10 billion to 15 billion barrels of crude stored there under more than 5,000 feet of seawater and 20,000 feet of rock-- costly to extract but accessible with existing technology. By comparison, U.S. proven reserves total 21 billion barrels. The Eastern Gap area is also coveted by American companies, but in Florida, where anti-Castro and anti-drilling sentiments run high, the Cuban government's energy ambitions have alarmed lawmakers who see the threat of ecological calamity in Cuba's plans to drill in that part of the gulf. "They'd be drilling right in the Gulf Stream," Sen. Bill Nelson (D-Fla.) said in a telephone interview, describing a nightmare scenario in which ocean currents could carry spilled crude into Florida's marine sanctuaries and blacken beaches along the Eastern Seaboard. "There would be a monumental disaster," he said. "There simply should not be drilling out there." Other U.S. lawmakers said oil deals with the Cuban government would throw a lifeline to the island's feeble economy and the 50-year rule of Fidel and Raúl Castro. They also question how reliable a partner Cuba would be. "What if we make those investments and then U.S. assets are nationalized?" Rep. Darrell Issa (R-Calif.) asked after last month's subcommittee hearing. Because it would take three or more years for Cuba to fully develop its energy resources, according to Piñón, U.S. participation in the island's energy sector could benefit a Cuban government not necessarily led by Fidel, 82, or Raúl, 78. Helping Cuba develop its own reserves, he said, would allow the island to gain the political independence and economic footing needed to negotiate a reconciliation with the United States without outside interference. "Since Fidel Castro's 1959 revolution, Cuba's communist government has had to largely rely on foreign providers -- first the Soviet Union, now Venezuela -- to fulfill its energy needs," Piñón said. Cuba's "petroleum dependency" on Hugo Chávez's government "could be used by Venezuela as a tool to influence a Cuban government in maintaining a politically antagonistic and belligerent position toward the United States," he said.

#### The embargo is the most significant factor in preventing an increase in Cuban oil production

**Reuters, 5/29** (Reuters, "Cuban oil hopes sputter as Russian give up for now on well", 5/29/13, www.reuters.com/article/2013/05/29/cuba-oil-idUSL2N0EA00W20130529 //kdh)

A number of factors are working against Cuba's oil hopes, among them the political and logistical difficulties imposed by the long-standing U.S. trade embargo against the island. The embargo makes it difficult to find rigs that do not violate its limitations on the use of U.S. technology in Cuba and, according to experts, adds an estimated 20 percent to costs because everything in the project has to be shipped in from distant, non-U.S. sources.

#### U.S. firms will instigate trade absent the embargo

**LA Times, 11** (Citing the U.S. Geological Survey, “Like oil and water in the gulf”, LA Times, 3/14/2011, Proquest, JKahn)

Cuba and its foreign partners will begin exploring for oil this year in the Gulf of Mexico. Drilling will take place as close as 50 miles from Florida and in sites deeper than BP's Macondo well, the source of last year's disaster. About 5 billion barrels of oil and 10 trillion cubic feet of natural gas lie beneath the gulf in land belonging to Cuba, according to the U.S. Geological Survey. If Cuba finds oil in commercially viable amounts, **this would be transformative**. Revenue from natural resources has the potential to provide long-sought stability for its economy and is likely to significantly alter Cuba's relations with Venezuela, Asia and other leading energy-producing and consuming nations. Discoveries of commercially viable resources would also have an enormous effect on the gulf environment shared by Cuba and the United States. Thanks to the U.S. embargo against Cuba -- a remnant of the Cold War -- the risks to the United States begin the moment the first drill bit pierces the seabed. And we are utterly unprepared. Not only does the embargo prohibit U.S. firms from joining Cuba in any efforts to extract its offshore resources, thus giving the competitive advantage to foreign firms, but it also denies Cuba access to U.S. equipment for drilling and environmental protection -- an especially troubling policy considering the potential for a spill. The embargo also compels Cuba's foreign partners to go through contortions, such as ordering a drilling rig built in China and shipping it nearly 10,000 miles to Cuban waters, to avoid violating U.S. law. Most important, the failed policy of isolating Cuba has the U.S. paralyzed: It stops us from engaging Cuba in meaningful environmental cooperation and prevents us from addressing in advance the threat of potential spills caused by hurricanes or technological failures, which could put our waters, fisheries and beaches at peril. As Cuba gets ready to drill, the Obama administration has limited options. It could do nothing. It could try to stop Cuba from developing its oil and natural gas, an alternative most likely to fail in an energy-hungry world. Or it could use its executive authority to cooperate with Cuba, despite the embargo, to ensure that drilling in the gulf protects our mutual interests. Since the 1990s, Cuba has showed a serious commitment to the environment, building an array of environmental policies, many based on U.S. and Spanish law. But it has no experience responding to major spills. And, like theU.S., Cuba has to balance its economic and environmental interests, and the environmental side will not always prevail. Against this backdrop, cooperation and engagement is the right approach, and there is already precedent for it. During the BP spill, Cuba permitted a vessel from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to look for damage in Cuban waters. The Obama administration declared its willingness to provide limited licenses for U.S. firms to respond to the BP spill, and to others in the future that threaten Cuba. It also provided visas for Cuban scientists to attend an important environmental conference in Florida. But these modest measures are not sufficient. Members of Congress from Florida have introduced bills to impose sanctions on foreign oil companies and U.S. firms that help Cuba drill for oil, and to punish those foreign firms by denying them the right to drill in U.S. waters. These proposals will not stop Cuba from drilling; if enacted, Cuba's partners will disregard them, and they will make cooperation to protect our mutual coastal environment even more difficult. Energy policy and environmental protection are classic examples of how the embargo is an abiding threat to U.S. interests. It should no longer be acceptable to base U.S. foreign policy on the illusion that sanctions will cause Cuba's government to collapse -- or stop Cuba from developing its oil resources. Nor should this policy or the political dynamic that sustains it prevent the U.S. from addressing both the challenges and benefits of Cuba finding meaningful amounts of oil in the Gulf of Mexico. The Obama administration should use its executive authority to guarantee that firms with the best equipment and greatest expertise are licensed in advance to fight the effects of any oil spills. The Treasury Department, which enforces Cuba sanctions, should make clear to the private sector that efforts to protect drilling safety will not be met with adverse regulatory actions. The U.S. government should commit to vigorous information-sharing with Cuba, and open direct negotiations with the Cuban government for environmental agreements modeled on cooperation that exists with our Canadian and Mexican neighbors. Most of all, it should replace a policy predicated on Cuba failing with a diplomatic approach that recognizes Cuba's sovereignty. Only then will our nation be able to respond effectively to what could become a new chapter in Cuba's history, and ours.

#### The embargo is the only thing constraining oil trade

**Padgett, 08** (Tim, TIME Latin America bureau chief, winner of the Maria Moors Cabot Prize from Columbia University for Latin America coverage, Inter-American Press Association award winner, Phi Beta Kappa graduate of Wabash College, M.S.J. from Northwestern University’s Medill Graduate School of Journalism, How Cuba's Oil Find Could Change the US Embargo, TIME, 9/23/2008, http://www.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,1853252,00.html, JKahn)

For decades, the only promise most Cubans saw in the ocean north of their island was the current that carries homemade rafts to Florida. That all changed a few years ago when geologists estimated that between 5 billion bbl. and 10 billion bbl. of oil lie beneath the waters off Cuba's northwest coast. Suddenly it seemed as though the hemisphere's sole communist nation might finally end its desperate dependence on oil-rich allies like the former Soviet Union and Venezuela — and perhaps even escape its impoverished economic time warp altogether. Washington's own Cuba time warp got a jolt as well. The oil discovery has renewed debate over whether **a crude-thirsty U.S. should loosen its 46-year-old trade embargo** against Cuba and let yanqui firms join the drilling, which is taking place fewer than 100 miles off U.S. shores. Despite the Bush Administration's hard line on Cuba, Republicans in Congress have proposed legislation to **exempt Big Oil from the embargo**. That clamor is sure to rise — especially if Barack Obama, who is more open to dialogue with Havana, becomes the next President — now that Cuba's state oil company, Cubapetroleo, or Cupet, has announced a stunning new estimate of more than 20 billion bbl. bubbling off its shores. "This is not a game," Cupet's exploration manager, Rafael Tenreyro, assured reporters in Havana last week. If true, those potential reserves could make Cuba a major petro player in the hemisphere. (The U.S. has reserves of 29 billion bbl.) And it could render the embargo an even more ineffective means of dislodging the aging Castro brothers, Fidel and current President Raúl. "If it really is 20 billion, then it's a game changer," says Jonathan Benjamin-Alvarado, a Cuba oil analyst at the University of Nebraska-Omaha. "It provides a lot **more justification for changing elements of the embargo**, just as we did when we allowed agricultural and medical sales to Cuba" a decade ago. But is the Cuban calculation really on the level? Skeptics ask if the 20-billion-bbl. estimate is just a ploy to rekindle investor interest, at a time when falling oil prices could make the maritime find less attractive to the potential international partners Cuba needs to extract the oil. The effort is all the more urgent, they add, because reduced oil revenues could also make friends like left-wing Venezuelan President Hugo Chávez less able to aid Cuba with cut-rate crude shipments and capital to improve the island's aged refineries. "The Cuba numbers from my point of view are not valid," says Jorge Pinon, an energy fellow at the University of Miami and an expert on Cuba's oil business. "I think they're feeling a lot of pressure right now to accelerate the development of their own oil resources." Benjamin-Alvarado gives Cuba's geologists more benefit of the doubt; but he calls the 20-billion-bbl. estimate "off the charts." "I trust them as oil people, and their seismic readings might be right," he says, "but until we see secondary, outside analysis, this is going to be suspect." The U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), a government agency, made the initial estimate of 5 billion bbl.to 10 billion bbl. for Cuba's northwest offshore sector (known as the Exclusive Economic Zone, or EEZ) in 2004. Tenreyro says Cupet's analysis is based on what he calls a more accurate comparison of similar maritime oil fields like those off Mexico's Gulf Coast. "We're talking about that magnitude," he argued last week. "We have more data" than the USGS. But Cupet, an arm of Cuba's ultra-secret communist government, hasn't offered much more evidence than that. Chris Schenk, who as USGS coordinator in the Caribbean led the 2004 survey, agrees that Cuban geologists "are very good." But he adds, "We would like to see more data." Still, Schenk notes, because of the embargo and Havana's insular information policies, "we can't converse with the Cubans." The Spanish energy company Repsol-YPF has entered into a production-sharing agreement with Cupet and is scheduled to start drilling the first real well in the EEZ next year. Other international firms, including Norway's StatoilHidro and India's Oil & Natural Gas Corp., are part of the Repsol-led consortium. Venezuela's state-run Petroleos de Venezuela is considered a lesser player because it has little deep-water drilling experience. (China is also interested but so far only involved in onshore drilling in Cuba.) Cuba is now in important negotiations with Brazil's Petrobras, which just made its own multibillion-barrel oil find off its coast near Rio de Janeiro and could, analysts say, be the major offshore drilling partner for Cuba if it jumps in.