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Prices rising and will remain above 100 dollars

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

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.

**Oil prices will stay high now because of Mexico production downturn – plan causes major drop in oil prices by jumpstarting Mexican production**

Alter, 12

[DIANE ALTER](http://moneymorning.com/author/dalter/), Contributing Writer, Money Morning, “[Oil Prices Promise to Head Higher As Mexican Production Dwindles](http://moneymorning.com/2012/08/24/oil-prices-promise-to-head-higher-as-mexican-production-dwindles/),” August 24, 2012, http://moneymorning.com/2012/08/24/oil-prices-promise-to-head-higher-as-mexican-production-dwindles/

According to the U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA), Mexican oil production reached a peak of 3.2 million barrels a day in 2008. And by 2011, it wasn't even producing 3 million barrels a day. Since then oil production has slipped to 2.5 million barrels a day. Worse still, Mexico could actually become a net importer of oil within a decade if it cannot find fresh discoveries to make up for the 25% production drop since 2004 and fails to change its current policies. Higher Oil Prices Worldwide Mexico is currently ranked No. 7 on the list of the world's top oil producers, so less Mexican oil production would also mean higher oil prices worldwide. The loss of Mexico's 1 million barrels a day in exports over an extended period would be a greater blow than the total lost due to sanctions on Iran. While the effects of Mexico's lagging oil production are clear, the causes are more complex. The root of the problem is years of neglect and a government-enforced monopoly. Nationalized in 1938, Mexico's oil industry has prohibited oil behemoths like Exxon Mobil (NYSE: [XOM](http://www.google.com/finance?q=XOM)), BP (NYSE ADR: [BP](http://www.google.com/finance?q=bp)) and others from taking any sizable stake in the country's oil operations. If it allowed more investments from international oil companies, Mexico could revive production, industry analysts say. But that won't be easy. Petroleos Mexicancos, PEMEX, has sole control of the Mexican oil industry and doles out over 32% of its revenue to Mexico's government. But while the Mexican government likes the oil revenue, it has failed to re-invest enough money back into the industry. Mexican lawmakers have long resisted providing PEMEX with the funds needed to find new sources of crude.

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)

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.

Dropping below 100 kills the Russian economy and Putin credibility

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.

Nuclear war

David 99 (Steven R David, professor of international relations at John Hopkins, PhD from Harvard, January/February 1999, “Saving America from the Coming Civil Wars,” Foreign Affairs)

AT NO TIME since the civil war of 1918 -- 20 has Russia been closer to bloody conflict than it is today. The fledgling government confronts a vast array of problems without the power to take effective action. For 70 years, the Soviet Union operated a strong state apparatus, anchored by the KGB and the Communist Party. Now its disintegration has created a power vacuum that has yet to be filled. Unable to rely on popular ideology or coercion to establish control, the government must prove itself to the people and establish its authority on the basis of its performance. But the Yeltsin administration has abjectly failed to do so, and it cannot meet the most basic needs of the Russian people. Russians know they can no longer look to the state for personal security, law enforcement, education, sanitation, health care, or even electrical power. In the place of government authority, criminal groups -- the Russian Mafia -- increasingly hold sway. Expectations raised by the collapse of communism have been bitterly disappointed, and Moscow's inability to govern coherently raises the specter of civil unrest. If internal war does strike Russia, economic deterioration will be a prime cause. From 1989 to the present, the GDP has fallen by 50 percent. In a society where, ten years ago, unemployment scarcely existed, it reached 9.5 percent in 1997 with many economists declaring the true figure to be much higher. Twenty-two percent of Russians live below the official poverty line (earning less than $ 70 a month). Modern Russia can neither collect taxes (it gathers only half the revenue it is due) nor significantly cut spending. Reformers tout privatization as the country's cure-all, but in a land without well-defined property rights or contract law and where subsidies remain a way of life, the prospects for transition to an American-style capitalist economy look remote at best. As the massive devaluation of the ruble and the current political crisis show, Russia's condition is even worse than most analysts feared. If conditions get worse, even the stoic Russian people will soon run out of patience. A future conflict would quickly draw in Russia's military. In the Soviet days civilian rule kept the powerful armed forces in check. But with the Communist Party out of office, what little civilian control remains relies on an exceedingly fragile foundation -- personal friendships between government leaders and military commanders. Meanwhile, the morale of Russian soldiers has fallen to a dangerous low. Drastic cuts in spending mean inadequate pay, housing, and medical care. A new emphasis on domestic missions has created an ideological split between the old and new guard in the military leadership, increasing the risk that disgruntled generals may enter the political fray and feeding the resentment of soldiers who dislike being used as a national police force. Newly enhanced ties between military units and local authorities pose another danger. Soldiers grow ever more dependent on local governments for housing, food, and wages. Draftees serve closer to home, and new laws have increased local control over the armed forces. Were a conflict to emerge between a regional power and Moscow, it is not at all clear which side the military would support. Divining the military's allegiance is crucial, however, since the structure of the Russian Federation makes it virtually certain that regional conflicts will continue to erupt. Russia's 89 republics, krais, and oblasts grow ever more independent in a system that does little to keep them together. As the central government finds itself unable to force its will beyond Moscow (if even that far), power devolves to the periphery. With the economy collapsing, republics feel less and less incentive to pay taxes to Moscow when they receive so little in return. Three-quarters of them already have their own constitutions, nearly all of which make some claim to sovereignty. Strong ethnic bonds promoted by shortsighted Soviet policies may motivate non-Russians to secede from the Federation. Chechnya's successful revolt against Russian control inspired similar movements for autonomy and independence throughout the country. If these rebellions spread and Moscow responds with force, civil war is likely. Should Russia succumb to internal war, the consequences for the United States and Europe will be severe. A major power like Russia -- even though in decline -- does not suffer civil war quietly or alone. An embattled Russian Federation might provoke opportunistic attacks from enemies such as China. Massive flows of refugees would pour into central and western Europe. Armed struggles in Russia could easily spill into its neighbors. Damage from the fighting, particularly attacks on nuclear plants, would poison the environment of much of Europe and Asia. Within Russia, the consequences would be even worse. Just as the sheer brutality of the last Russian civil war laid the basis for the privations of Soviet communism, a second civil war might produce another horrific regime. Most alarming is the real possibility that the violent disintegration of Russia could lead to loss of control over its nuclear arsenal. No nuclear state has ever fallen victim to civil war, but even without a clear precedent the grim consequences can be foreseen. Russia retains some 20,000 nuclear weapons and the raw material for tens of thousands more, in scores of sites scattered throughout the country. So far, the government has managed to prevent the loss of any weapons or much material. If war erupts, however, Moscow's already weak grip on nuclear sites will slacken, making weapons and supplies available to a wide range of anti-American groups and states. Such dispersal of nuclear weapons represents the greatest physical threat America now faces. And it is hard to think of anything that would increase this threat more than the chaos that would follow a Russian civil war.
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A. Interpretation – “economic engagement” means the aff must be an exclusively economic action – it cannot encompass broader forms of engagement

Jakstaite, 10 - Doctoral Candidate Vytautas Magnus University Faculty of Political Sciences and Diplomacy (Lithuania) (Gerda, “Containment and Engagement as Middle-Range Theories” Baltic Journal of Law & Politics Volume 3, Number 2 (2010), DOI: 10.2478/V10076-010-0015-7)

The approach to engagement as economic engagement focuses exclusively on economic instruments of foreign policy with the main national interest being security. Economic engagement is a policy of the conscious development of economic relations with the adversary in order to change the target state‟s behaviour and to improve bilateral relations

That means trade and aid in the form of loans or grants

Resnick, 1 – Assistant Professor of Political Science at Yeshiva University (Evan, Journal of International Affairs, “Defining Engagement” Vol. 54 No. 2, Political Science Complete)

A REFINED DEFINITION OF ENGAGEMENT

In order to establish a more effective framework for dealing with unsavory regimes, I propose that we define engagement as the attempt to influence the political behavior of a target state through the comprehensive establishment and enhancement of contacts with that state across multiple issue-areas (i.e. diplomatic, military, economic, cultural). The following is a brief list of the specific forms that such contacts might include:

DIPLOMATIC CONTACTS

Extension of diplomatic recognition; normalization of diplomatic relations

Promotion of target-state membership in international institutions and regimes

Summit meetings and other visits by the head of state and other senior government officials of sender state to target state and vice-versa

MILITARY CONTACTS

Visits of senior military officials of the sender state to the target state and vice-versa

Arms transfers

Military aid and cooperation

Military exchange and training programs

Confidence and security-building measures

Intelligence sharing

ECONOMIC CONTACTS

Trade agreements and promotion

Foreign economic and humanitarian aid in the form of loans and/or grants

CULTURAL CONTACTS

Cultural treaties

Inauguration of travel and tourism links

Sport, artistic and academic exchanges(n25)

B. Violation – the affirmative signs an agreement with Mexico, which is diplomatic engagement

C. Vote negative

1. Predictable limits – blurring the lines between economic and other forms of engagement makes any positive interaction with another country topical – becomes impossible for the neg to predict or prepare

2. Equitable ground – the economic limit is vital to critiques of economics, trade disads, and non-economic counterplans
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Neoliberalism has had its chance—in the 80’s we spread globalization and free market economics throughout Latin America which caused radical instability due to revolutions as well as deteriorating economic conditions rampant with income inequality and poor living conditions—this invisible violence remains covered up by modern economists who preach it’s beneficial for the greater good—the question we should ask is when will it be good for the people of Latin America?

Pineo, 13 – Senior Research Fellow at the Council on Hemispheric Affairs, and Professor and Chair of the Department of History at Towson University (Ron, Posted on April 11, 2013 - See more at: http://www.coha.org/22227/#sthash.L5CsywQs.dpuf

Poverty in Latin America has been reduced substantially in the last three decades. In the late 1980s, nearly half of Latin America’s population lived in poverty. Today the fraction is about a third. [21] This marks important progress, and it has continued in some area nations. However, it is worth noting that between 2002 and 2008, poverty contracted most in Venezuela, Bolivia, Nicaragua, and Argentina, countries which had largely **abandoned neoliberalism**; in Brazil, which had at least partially rejected neoliberalism; and in only two other states, Honduras and Perú, which still remained, at least partially, committed to free market polices. [22] It was mostly factors **beyond economic policy** that helps to account for recent declines in the rate of Latin American poverty. One factor was increasing remittances from Latin Americans laboring in the developed world, especially in the United States. Total remittances from Latin American workers rose from $12 billion USD in 1995, to $45 billion in 2004, and $68 billion in 2006. [23] However, “by far the main contributor to the reduction in the poverty rate,” as Jaime Ros has noted, was “the fall in the dependency ratio.” [24] The indicator measures the number of non-working age people—children and the elderly—who are supported by the working age population. The higher the dependency number, the greater the economic burden. Source: foreignpolicyblogs.com Latin America’s past demographic history underlies this shift in the dependency ratio. The late 1940s in Latin America witnessed lower overall death rates (the number of people who died a year divided by the total population), especially due to lower infant and childhood mortality rates. Initially, birth rates stayed high even as death rates fell, but after a generation passed Latin America’s birth rates began to drift downward to match the lower death rates. The time gap between the fall in death rates beginning in the late 1940s and the eventual fall in birth rates by the late 1970s resulted in an unprecedented population explosion. Latin America’s population rose from 167 million in 1950 to 285 million by 1970. As this population cohort has aged, Latin America’s dependency ratio fell too, dropping from a very high rate of 87.3 in the years 1965-1970, to 55.0 for 2005-2010, an all-time low for the region. The people born during the population explosion are of working age now, bringing the region a historic but one-time economic advantage, the “demographic bonus” or “demographic dividend.” As a result, Latin America temporarily enjoys a situation of a very large number of workers providing for a greatly reduced number of dependent people. The region’s demographic bonus means that there is, for the moment, less poverty due, in large part, to the increased number of working age people per household. [25] A drop in the dependency ratio carries with it greater female participation in the workforce, for lower fertility means there are fewer children to care for, freeing women to enter the paid workforce. Lower fertility also means better overall lifetime health for women, resulting in more years spent in the paid workforce for adult females. The fertility rate (the number of children born per woman per year) fell in Latin America from 5.6 for the years from 1965 to1970, to 2.4 for the years 2005 to 2010. The resulting demographic bonus has provided a significant, but fleeting, economic asset. By 2025, as the current population ages, Latin America will need to support a very large elderly dependent population. [26] It is fair to conclude that the reduction of poverty in Latin America in recent years was produced mainly by some short-term victories in the commodity lottery (as explained in Part I, the commodity lottery refers to short-term price rises for selected raw material exports), as well as a spike in remittances, and most of all, a one-time reduction in the dependency ratio. Income inequality data for Latin America is less positive. In the 1980s and 1990s, inequality increased significantly in Latin America. For example, from 1984 to 1994, the income of the top 10 percent of the Mexico’s population rose by 21 percent, while the income of the country’s bottom 10 percent fell by 23 percent. Nevertheless, there have been improvements, albeit modest ones, in lowering the Gini coefficient (a measure of economic inequality with 0 being the least inequality—everyone has the same income, and 1.0 being the most inequality—one person has all the income). Source: norlarnet.uio.no From 2002 to 2008, the Gini coefficient improved in seven Latin American states; five of these seven countries—Venezuela, Argentina, Bolivia, Nicaragua, and Paraguay—have traveled the farthest in rejecting neoliberalism. Outside of these nations inequality stayed the same or even increased, including in the largely neoliberal states of Colombia, the Dominican Republic, and Guatemala. In 1970, the richest 1 percent of Latin Americans earned 363 times more than the poorest 1 percent. By 1995, it was 417 times more. Latin America continues to show, by far, the greatest income inequality of any region in the world. Of the 15 most unequal economies in the world today, 10 are in the area. If Latin America’s income were only as unevenly distributed as that of Eastern Europe or South Asia, its recent economic growth, though sometimes anemic, would have reduced the percentage of those living in poverty to 3 percent of the population. [27] The Economist, in its 2010 review of the Latin American economic situation, concluded that the region was “well on the way to building middle-class societies.” [28] The evidence, however, contradicts this assertion. The informal sector—where people arrange irregular employment in itinerant retail sales, as day workers, or other loosely arranged jobs—today accounts for more than half of all workers in Latin America. More than eight of ten new jobs in Latin America are in the informal sector. [29] Informal sector workers enjoy no protective regulation or benefits. They live by their wits, striving to scratch out a living, day by day. Meanwhile, union membership among active workers in Latin America fell from around one-fourth in the 1980s to under one-sixth in the 1990s. Source: laht.com Moreover, significant areas of severe poverty remain in Latin America, expressed along class, racial, gender, and regional divides Poverty underlies poor health, contributing to elevated rates of infant, childhood, and maternal mortality. Of those living in poverty in Latin America, nearly half are children. Due to their undernourishment, a quarter of Latin American children (and as many as half in rural Perú and Guatemala) are stunted in their development. Across Latin America malnutrition is an underlying cause in more than half of the deaths of children under the age of five. In Guatemala maternal mortality among indigenous women is 83 percent higher than the national average. Among the poorest fifth of the Perú’s population, 85 percent of births are not attended by trained personnel, compared to only 4 percent among the wealthiest fifth. Two-thirds of Latin American municipalities do not treat their sewage prior to dumping it into adjacent rivers or the sea. In Panamá, three in ten homes lack access to improved sanitation (sewage disposal), and in Perú, nearly four in ten lack this essential service. Yet with all this effluvium flowing out, still three-quarters of Latin America municipalities do not check public drinking water supplies for impurities. One-quarter of Latin Americans do not have in-home potable water. [30] In Latin America nearly two-thirds of hospital admissions are due to diseases related to the lack of sanitation. Diarrhea accounts for six of every ten deaths of children under the age of five in Latin America. Fresh water can save lives; for each percentage point increase in potable water coverage, the infant mortality rate drops 1 death per 1,000 live births. Yet, Latin America is falling behind in terms of life expectancy. Life expectancy in Latin America was five years longer than East Asia in the mid-1960s, but by the mid-1990s, it was 1.2 years shorter. [31] The weight of this evidence leads to an inescapable conclusion. Cambridge economist Ha-Joon Chang has put it most succinctly, “Over the last three decades, economists…provid[ed]…theoretical justifications for financial deregulation and the unrestrained pursuit of short-term profits…[T]hey advanced theories that justified the policies that have led to slower growth…[and] higher inequality…[**E]conomics has been worse than irrelevant. Economics, as it has been practiced in the last three decades, has been positively harmful for most people**.” [32] The Twilight of Neoliberalism “There is no alternative [to free market policies],” the late British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher once pronounced, but across Latin America, there has been a steady erosion of support for the free market model. At present three-quarters of Latin America governments can be fairly characterized as being governed by center-left or left-oriented leaders. Moreover, there has been a far-reaching reassessment of the relevance of IMF advice, especially after the organization’s punishingly controversial response to the 1997-1998 Asian economic crisis. The Asian economic meltdown brought the reflexive recommendations from the IMF in the form of harsh austerity measures. However, the pro-cyclical policies demanded by the IMF of its client states so plainly worsened the economic situation and needlessly caused considerable human misery

**MARKED**

that the IMF’s reputation was badly damaged. In the wake of IMF’s subsequent mishandling of the 1998 economic crises in Russia and Brazil, large private lenders, especially among the European ones, stopped requiring IMF assurances that borrowing nations follow neoliberal strictures. As Richard Peet has noted, “the…[IMF]’s reputation has never recovered, even in circles that the Fund values. [...] The power of the IMF has been reduced by failed crisis management, [with] countries paying up as quickly as possible and distancing themselves” from the IMF. [33] European lenders concluded that new loans to non-neoliberal Latin American states would perform handsomely, which, in fact, they have. The IMF’s power to impose neoliberal policies on debtor nations has been seriously compromised. Source: herslookingatyousquid.worldpress.com Argentina, following its severe economic crisis in 2001-2002, proved that a nation could successfully challenge the IMF. Argentina defaulted on its $100 billion USD foreign debt and renegotiated its obligations, paying off its loans at a fraction of the original cost. Buenos Aires finished retiring its debt to the IMF in 2005, benefitting greatly from Venezuelan assistance. In offering the money, the late Hugo Chávez promised that, “if additional help is needed to help Argentina finally free itself from the claws of the International Monetary Fund, Argentina can count on us.” [34] Other Latin American nations looked on as Argentina defied the IMF, and continued to watch as Argentina’s economy soared, growing faster than any other nation in the Western Hemisphere after it abandoned IMF-imposed economic policies. Soon a stampede of those flouting IMF mandates followed, with each new defection providing courage to all those nations rejecting neoliberalism. Other international lenders appeared as well. Venezuela loaned money to other countries in the region, including Bolivia, Ecuador, and Nicaragua, but only if they ignored the counsel of the IMF. The Bank of the South, established in 2007, joined Venezuela with Brazil, Argentina, Ecuador, Bolivia, and Paraguay as an alternative source for credit. China, which does not particularly care what the IMF recommends, is also supplying capital. Furthermore, some primary commodity export prices have increased, in part due to the demand for Chinese imports (for example, Argentine soya). This has allowed several Latin American states to build up their financial reserves, making new foreign borrowing less pressing. Today the IMF can coerce only the most feeble economies, mainly now in sub-Sahara Africa. The political landscape has shifted too. By the late 1990s, many of the aging left-wing political parties built around organized labor had been flattened by the assault on unions mounted under neoliberalism. At first voters were willing to give candidates who supported the neoliberal program a chance; nevertheless, as it became increasingly clear that these policies were failing, those who spoke out against neoliberalism were elected in growing numbers. The trouble was that once in office they too often carried out neoliberal programs anyway, as for example with Abdalá Bucaram (1996-1997) or Lucio Gutiérrez (2003-2005) in Ecuador, either because they secretly favored such policies, because the IMF persuaded them to do so, or both. With the traditional left-leaning parties marginalized in several countries and the abandonment of anti-neoliberal promises by elected politicians, ordinary citizens had to develop new political methods to defend themselves. Neoliberal policies so savaged the working class, as well as the urban marginalized and the hard-pressed peasantry, that they had no choice but to organize and fight back. To this end, they created new organizations and, in some cases, used them to seize power. By pressing the neoliberal agenda, the Latin American élites appeared to have overplayed their hand, and they paid for it by losing control of governments that they had controlled for many years, in Venezuela, Ecuador, Bolivia, and beyond. A 2009 Latinobarómetro Survey found that support for democracy (as preferable to all other forms of government) was the strongest in countries that flatly rejected neoliberalism. Of the top five nations in popular support of democracy, four were governed by progressive leaders: Venezuela, Bolivia, Uruguay, and El Salvador. [35] Hope for the Future? Supporters of the free market approach have continued to counsel patience. They argue that stronger economic growth will eventually come, and that all will benefit in the long run. While neoliberal reforms might cause some short-term belt tightening, defenders explain that such adjustments, though sometimes painful, are necessary for the greatest good. We should not give in to “reform fatigue,” but should stay the course. [36] But neoliberal policies have been in place for over 30 years now. How long is the long run? How long must we wait? As John Maynard Keynes famously observed, “In the long run we are all dead.” In 1937 U.S. President Franklin D. Roosevelt observed, “We have always known that heedless self-interest was bad morals. We know now that it is bad economics.” [37] The age of cneoliberalism is ending. It is time for some good economics.

This unethical mindset makes extinction inevitable

Nhanenge 7 [Jytte Masters @ U South Africa, “ECOFEMINSM: TOWARDS INTEGRATING THE CONCERNS OF WOMEN, POOR PEOPLE AND NATURE INTO DEVELOPMENT]

There is today an increasing critique of economic development, whether it takes place in the North or in the South. Although the world on average generates more and more wealth, the riches do not appear to "trickle down" to the poor and improve their material well-being. Instead, poverty and economic inequality is growing. Despite the existence of development aid for more than half a century, the Third World seems not to be "catching up" with the First World. Instead, militarism, dictatorship and human repression is multiplied. Since the mid 1970, the critique of global economic activities has intensified due to the escalating deterioration of the natural environment. Modernization, industrialisation and its economic activities have been directly linked to increased scarcity of natural resources and generation of pollution, which increases global temperatures and degrades soils, lands, water, forests and air. The latter threat is of great significance, because without a healthy environment human beings and animals will not be able to survive. Most people believed that modernization of the world would improve material well-being for all. However, faced with its negative side effects and the real threat of extinction, one must conclude that somewhere along the way "progress" went astray. Instead of material plenty, economic development generated a violent, unhealthy and unequal world. It is a world where a small minority live in material luxury, while millions of people live in misery. These poor people are marginalized by the global economic system. They are forced to survive from degraded environments; they live without personal or social security; they live in abject poverty, with hunger, malnutrition and sickness; and they have no possibility to speak up for themselves and demand a fair share of the world's resources. The majority of these people are women, children, traditional peoples, tribal peoples, people of colour and materially poor people (called women and Others). They are, together with nature, dominated by the global system of economic development imposed by the North. It is this scenario, which is the subject of the dissertation. The overall aim is consequently to discuss the unjustified domination of women, Others and nature and to show how the domination of women and Others is interconnected with the domination of nature. A good place to start a discussion about domination of women, Others and nature is to disclose how they disproportionately must carry the negative effects from global economic development. The below discussion is therefore meant to give an idea of the "flip-side" of modernisation. It gives a gloomy picture of what "progress" and its focus on economic growth has meant for women, poor people and the natural environment. The various complex and inter-connected, negative impacts have been ordered into four crises. The categorization is inspired by Paul Ekins and his 1992 book "A new world order; grassroots movements for global change". In it, Ekins argues that humanity is faced with four interlocked crises of unprecedented magnitude. These crises have the potential to destroy whole ecosystems and to extinct the human race. The first crisis is the spread of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction, together with the high level of military spending. The second crisis is the increasing number of people afflicted with hunger and poverty. The third crisis is the environmental degradation. Pollution, destruction of ecosystems and extinction of species are increasing at such a rate that the biosphere is under threat. The fourth crisis is repression and denial of fundamental human rights by governments, which prevents people from developing their potential. It is highly likely that one may add more crises to these four, or categorize them differently, however, Ekins's division is suitable for the present purpose. (Ekins 1992: 1).

We are not politicians and we cannot trigger reform or policies—this means the only political act is a refusal to engage in structures of domination that exist in the status quo—their form of knowledge production is bankrupt of value and is predetermined by the elite

Walker,88 – BA Wales, MA PhD Queen's University, Prof of Poli Sci Univ of Victoria, Prof of IR @ SPIRE, editor Millennium, Alternatives etc, (RBJ, One World Many Worlds: Struggles for a Just World Peace, 1988)

Critical social movements may be more or less invisible to those trained in the conventional categories of social analysis or mesmerized by the dominant mass media. They may appear to be only marginal and relatively powerless actors. I argue that it is more plausible to understand them as part of a transformative assault on our inherited notions of authority, legitimacy, and power. They can be understood as part of a broad process of social invention that carries the possibility of reconstructing the conditions for a decent life from the bottom up, without waiting for elites to become enlightened or replaced by still more elites. Critical social movements are important not because they have the immediate capacity to induce existing elites to pursue more enlightened policies but because they participate in a more far-reaching reinvention of political life**.** To affirm this view of critical social movements is to assume that six things are possible in a book of this kind: To begin with, it is possible to show how specific social movements participate in broader patterns of struggle on a worldwide basis. It is certainly important to understand the concrete reality of people suffering in specific traps. Movements act out of immediate necessity. People's experiences in particular situations are quite different. To generalize about them is possibly to violate the integrity of the experiences themselves. But the traps people find themselves in are very often linked to wider menaces, such as militarization or international debt. Although particular movements may act in highly specific locations, they in fact respond to processes that are anything but highly specific. So it is also important to show that no matter how isolated they may feel, particular movements are not alone. Second, it is possible to reflect on the similarities between the way movements act in different circumstances in order to understand the possibilities that are now being articulated by critical social movements in general. This theme is pursued in terms of the way movements act within new political spaces, discover new ways of acting politically, extend the horizons of what we think it is possible to be as human beings, and establish connections with each other. Third, it is possible to pursue some of the implications of the ongoing practices of movements for thinking creatively about emerging forms of human solidarity. The traditional statist principle of inclusion and exclusion, of friend and foe, of national community and international anarchy is less and less plausible, despite the rhetoric of those who depend on an enemy "other" to legitimize their own claims to power. Moreover, a solidarity based on the capacity of the workers of the world to unite against capitalism has so far failed to materialize. This does remain a world of both particular political communities and class conflicts. But it is certainly not clear that images of human solidarity rooted in historically and culturally specific experiences of state and class are helpful guides for the future. The practices of critical social movements suggest alternative possibilities. Fourth, it is possible to extend this analysis to the reconceptualization of a number of important ideas that have come to be considered central to thinking about peace, particularly the dominant concepts of security, development, and democracy. To do so is to take the symbolic function of movements very seriously indeed. Movements act in a world that is moving faster than our concepts and language can adequately comprehend. Peace, for example, is conventionally understood as the opposite of war. Critical social movements increasingly see peace as the opposite of injustice. On the one hand, such movements are able to clarify what remains hidden behind the jargon and cliches of official rhetoric and everyday discourse, On the other, they point to new ways of understanding and expressing the changing dynamics of a world in transition. They demonstrate the necessity and potential of enhancing processes of democratization everywhere. Fifth, it is possible to express a solidarity not only with those with whom members of the Committee for a Just World Peace are directly involved as individuals but also with those who struggle for similar things under different circumstances. Sixth, it is possible to speculate in general terms on the concrete practices of critical social movements that might further enhance the prospects for a just world peace. These possibilities may not add up to a resounding manifesto addressed to the waiting masses, nor to a policy agenda addressed to those closest to state power, nor even to a glorious Utopian scheme addressed to the nascent visionary in all of us—some may judge this a sign of weakness. But it is in-creasingly apparent that such images of the relationship between political analysis and political practice are deeply at odds with the understandings of politics that are emerging from critical social movements themselves. These new understandings are important. What seems inevitable turns out to be merely contingent. What seems strong and unapproachable is, in fact, quite brittle. People discover that they are not powerless in the face of daunting problems but are capable of making enormous advances in the immediate situation in which they live, work, love, and play Taken together, these six possibilities amount to different ways of trying to make space for movements. They reflect a willingness to listen, to interpret what is heard, and to recommend—tentatively—on the basis of the interpretation. They suggest ways in which ordinary people can participate in the process of working toward a just world peace in their own everyday lives. They give an emerging sense of coherence to the forces now struggling for expression. They lead to different ways of asking questions about what can and ought to be done. In short, this book participates in an ongoing politics of interpretation. It grows out of a recognition that the categories and languages in which it is now possible to speak about global problems and political practices incorporate historically specific interests. Although there is no shortage of information about the state of the modern world, it is exceptionally difficult to turn this information into liberating human practices. Information is created largely by elites and for elites. Dominant forms of knowledge and information presume some things are important whereas others are less so. Knowledge and power are intimately associated. Emerging social and political forces have always had to challenge pre-vailing categories and interpretations. Such challenges have become especially important in the modern world. Dominant categories are constantly reinforced, not only through overt propaganda and the mass media, but also through pervasive myths about science and progress and sophisticated claims to expertise and legitimacy. It is extremely difficult for emerging social and political forces to put what they are doing into any clear perspective or to see themselves as participating in anything of wider significance. My concern, therefore, is to sketch an interpretation of processes that seem most important from the perspectives of critical social movements. I seek to affirm that whatpeople are doing, often in extreme difficulty and with little clear understanding of how what they are doing resonates with what is going on elsewhere, constitutes a source of considerable hope in the modern world. This is not to say that states, or elites, or political parties, or other more-established political actors are not also doing interesting and hopeful things. But their interpretations of contemporary trajectories are already deeply instilled in us all. There are other voices to be heard. These voices are nurtured in uncertainty and danger. But they aspire to an openness and vision that is blocked by the dominant forces of our time. To engage in struggles for a just world peace in the late twentieth century is to understand that these voices are becoming more and more insistent, more and more aware of how to break through the routines and dogmas that keep us as we are. (8-10)
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Obama pushing Syria strikes now – ensures Congressional approval – but PC is key

Cassata, 9/5

Donna Casata, reporter for the Associated Press; “President Obama lobbying lawmakers on Syria from overseas,” 9/5/2013, http://www.deseretnews.com/article/765637194/Obama-lobbying-lawmakers-on-Syria-from-overseas.html //bghs-ms

WASHINGTON — President Barack Obama pressed skeptical lawmakers to give him the authority to use U.S. military force against Syria during his overseas trip while the administration struggled to rally international support for intervention in an intractable civil war. Ben Rhodes, Obama's deputy national security adviser, told reporters on Thursday that Obama was making calls to members of Congress while he attends an economic summit in St. Petersburg, Russia. The president spoke to a bipartisan group of five lawmakers on Wednesday. "He is going to be doing outreach on the Hill," Rhodes said of the president's lobbying during the two-day summit in Russia. The Obama administration cleared one obstacle on Wednesday when a deeply divided Senate panel approved a resolution authorizing military force, but a significant number of senators remain unconvinced and opposition is growing in the House. Two Republican senators announced on Thursday that they would vote against any military action. Sens. David Vitter of Louisiana and Mike Lee of Utah, members of the Armed Services Committee, expressed their opposition just 24 hours after participating in briefings with Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel and Gen. Martin Dempsey, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Lee said in a statement that the risks of the president's plan outweigh the gains, while Vitter said he was concerned "that getting involved in Syria, after Iraq and Afghanistan, would make mustering our resolve to stop a nuclear Iran impossible." The administration continued its full-scale sales job on Thursday, holding another round of closed-door meetings for lawmakers about its intelligence on Syria. Sen. Dianne Feinstein, D-Calif., chairwoman of the Senate Intelligence Committee, said officials showed a DVD on chemical weapons with "what pinpointed eyes mean, what the convulsions mean" when nerve agents affect people. She said all senators would receive a copy. "It's horrendous," Feinstein said. The administration has focused on influencing lawmakers who will vote, but public opinion polls show little desire for military intervention in Syria. Feinstein acknowledged the lack of popular support. "It weighs on me," she said. "There's no question: What's coming in is overwhelmingly negative." The information has been provided to members of Congress. The public has had no access, a point that Feinstein recognized. "But you see, then they don't know what I know. They haven't heard what I've heard," she said. Days from a Senate vote, an Associated Press survey of senators found 34 supporting or leaning toward military action, 26 opposed or leaning against and 40 undecided. Obama has called for military action after the administration blamed Assad for a chemical weapons attack on Aug. 21 that it says killed more than 1,400 civilians, including at least 400 children. Other casualty estimates are lower, and the Syrian government denies responsibility, contending rebels fighting to topple the government were to blame. Sen. Susan Collins, R-Maine, questioned the necessity of U.S. military action as she entered the classified hearing. "This is not a choice between doing nothing and doing a military strike," she said. Collins appeared undecided but insisted there were other ways to pressure Syrian President Bashar Assad short of an American intervention. She said the Obama administration still hasn't presented a clear strategy and that she had "many questions with the wisdom of the president's request." Sen. Richard Burr, R-N.C., said it was up to the administration to present members with the necessary information. "I think if they do, everybody will agree," he said.

Plan causes a battle— unpopular with Dems for abandoning disclosure requirements.

Rampton Reuters 13

[Roberta, 4/29/13, Reuters, “U.S.-Mexico deal on expanded Gulf oil drilling still in limbo”, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/04/29/usa-mexico-oil-idUSL2N0DG0CV20130429>, accessed 6/30/13, ALT]

The deal, formally known as the Transboundary Hydrocarbons Agreement, provides legal guidelines for deepwater drilling in the 1.5 million acres of the Gulf that straddle the U.S.-Mexico boundary. It is seen as the key to opening a new era of cooperation on oil production between the two countries. Mexico's state-owned oil company Pemex PEMX.UL needs technology and investment to boost its stagnant production, and U.S. companies are eager to help. "The U.S. has a real opportunity now to put energy back on the agenda with Mexico in a way that it really hasn't been able to be on the agenda for the last several years," said Neil Brown, who worked on the issue during the last Congress as lead Republican international energy aide in the Senate. But the final step of implementing the deal has languished. "I'm not aware of strong opposition to it. I think it's been a little more inertia," said Jason Bordoff, a top energy official at the White House until January who now runs Columbia University's Center on Global Energy Policy. In the past several weeks, there have been some signs that the implementing legislation may move forward, but there also could be new complications related to disclosure requirements. DEAL COULD OPEN THE DOOR Oil is critical for the Mexican economy, paying for a third of the government's budget. But production peaked in 2004 at 3.4 million barrels per day and has slipped below 2.6 million bpd. PEMEX says it can revive production with deepwater wells in the Gulf, but needs technical and financial help. The cross-border agreement would be the first step toward joint projects for reservoirs that cross the boundary, providing a way for PEMEX and other oil companies to share production and creating a framework to solve disputes that could arise. "Without the agreement, it creates a barrier to investment," said Erik Melito, a director at the American Petroleum Institute, the oil industry's lobby group. The agreement could help calm Mexico's fears about what is termed the "popote" or drinking-straw effect - fears that U.S. oil companies are going to drain reservoirs that extend into Mexico's side of the border, robbing Mexico of its share, said David Goldwyn, a former State Department official who helped launch negotiations. "This has been an urban myth in Mexico for decades," said Goldwyn, now president of Goldwyn Global Strategies, a consulting firm. Pena Nieto is working toward reforms for PEMEX that would allow for more production and cooperation in projects generally - a delicate issue in a country where PEMEX and oil are symbols of national pride. "If they can see some success here (with the transboundary deal), that's going to change the political conversation in Mexico," Goldwyn said. Failing to implement the deal, though, would be a major setback for U.S.-Mexico energy relations, former U.S. Senator Richard Lugar warned in December, in one of his final reports as the top Republican on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee before he left Congress. In a new twist, the bill includes a measure that would exempt U.S. oil companies drilling in the area from certain disclosure rules that were part of the 2010 Dodd-Frank financial reform law. Those disclosures are strongly backed by the White House and Democratic senators. Aimed at curbing corruption, the rules require oil and mining companies to report payments to any foreign government to the Securities and Exchange Commission. Oil and business lobby groups are fighting the rules in court. Interior and State Department officials did not directly comment on the provision at a hearing last week, saying only that the administration wants to work with the House on details of the bill so that the deal can be in place in time for the next sale of drilling leases for the Gulf, expected to be held in August. Bingaman said the exemption "complicates things significantly" for quick passage of the bill. "They've added in some things that are going to make it difficult to pass in that form," he said, referring to the exemption.

Congressional support of a Syria strike is key to heg

The Economist, 9/7

“Fight this war, not the last one,” 9/7/2013, http://www.economist.com/news/leaders/21584976-when-congress-votes-syria-it-will-be-defining-americas-place-world-fight-war-not //bghs-ms

When Congress votes on Syria, it will be defining America’s place in the world JUST a decade ago, a short season in the ebb and flow of global influence, economics was in thrall to the Washington consensus and geopolitics was a wholly owned subsidiary of the hyperpower run out of the White House. Today, before launching an attack to punish Syria’s Bashar Assad for using chemical weapons, Barack Obama has felt bound to seek the blessing of Congress (see article). Britain has failed to stand alongside its closest ally (see article). The Middle East echoes to talk of America’s diminished leadership. And one of Mr Obama’s aides has briefed that the strike will be “just muscular enough not to get mocked”. America has often let atrocities go unpunished before. In the 1980s it sent no missiles when Saddam Hussein gassed Kurds and Iranians; nor did it do so when Mr Assad’s father, Hafez, massacred as many as 20,000 of his own people. But that was back in the cold war, when Saddam was fighting Iran and before the ban on chemical weapons had been buttressed by a UN convention. Moreover, Mr Obama declared last summer that he would not tolerate Syrian use of chemical weapons. With more than a thousand dead in a nerve-agent attack that, it now turns out, was just the latest of many, the president rightly concluded that Syria was testing America’s capacity to impose its will. This makes the congressional votes and the action to follow one of those episodes that will define America’s—and the West’s—place in the world. It will signal what is left after the hubris of Iraq and unfathomable complexities of Afghanistan. Amid challenges from Russia and Iran and the growing weight of China, both as an economic power and a champion of authoritarian purpose (as opposed to democratic indecision), it is also a measure of the West’s self-belief. The world is watching. Allies and foes alike will shape their behaviour around the expectations that this moment sets in train. It is vital, therefore, that America not only acts, but acts for the right reasons. Baghdad baggage This newspaper has argued that America and its allies should give Mr Assad one chance to renounce his deadly chemicals and, if he demurs, hit him hard. The purpose would not be to bring about regime change, but to re-establish deterrence and because Mr Obama must be seen to stand by his threats. Inaction will encourage Mr Assad to use yet more chemical weapons. Tyrants and proliferators everywhere, including Iran and North Korea, will be emboldened. The hope is that Congress will for once put principle before partisanship and support the president. Joined by France, which all along has been admirably resolute, Mr Obama could then strike the regime in Damascus with an attack severe enough to bury any thought of mockery. That would be good. Yet the way Mr Obama is going about this operation is flawed, both in his choice of a congressional vote and in his rhetoric. The vote in Washington has short-term merits for Mr Obama. Most Americans seem to be against striking Syria (as are most of the British and French). Here is a chance to establish the legitimacy of a strike and dip Republican hands in the blood. But at what cost? There is the possibility of losing the vote, of course—a real presidency-wrecking risk. But even with a victory in Congress, Mr Obama will have weakened the credibility of foreign policy, the very thing that he wants to safeguard. The executive needs to be agile and quick when dealing with the world. The president sometimes needs to take hard and unpopular decisions. Mr Obama insists that his choice to consult the legislature does not curtail that freedom. But this is an operation designed to bolster deterrence. Mr Obama’s request creates expectations that future enforcement will also be subject to the vagaries of congressional sound bites. That tends to weaken deterrence. Mr Obama may retort that he is dealing with the legacy of George W. Bush. This has left Americans (and the British and French) with an abiding scepticism about the use of intelligence and the purpose of intervention. The West has paid for the campaigns in Iraq and Afghanistan with trillions of dollars of taxes and thousands of their soldiers’ lives. Even if they dislike saying it out loud, many Americans doubt that Muslims have much disposition for Western values like democracy and tolerance. Why try to be the world’s policeman if it is not just a thankless task, but a hopeless one? The vision thing These sceptics are fighting the last war. Syria is not Iraq. The evidence that the regime has committed atrocities is clear beyond doubt. Even if Mr Assad defies America after a strike by unleashing yet more sarin, Mr Obama is not about to invade. The arguments for intervening in Syria are narrower and less Utopian than they were in Iraq. First is the calculation of American interests. The international arena is inherently anarchic. Only laws and treaties that are enforced impose any order. By being the world’s policeman, America can shape the rules according to its own interests and tastes. The more America steps back, the more other powers will step in. If it is unwilling to act as enforcer, its own norms will fray. If it is even thought to be reluctant, then they will be tested. China already prods at America; Vladimir Putin’s Russia has begun to confront it—and not only over Syria. Whether Syria was a vital American interest before this attack was debatable, but not after Mr Assad’s direct challenge to Mr Obama’s authority. Second is a reaffirmation of Western values. America’s potency comes not just from its capacity to project force, but also from the enduring appeal of the values invoked by its founders. Those are stronger than Mr Obama seems to think. With China’s economy slowing and its political corruption evident, the Beijing consensus will seem ever less enticing to citizens of the emerging world. Mr Bush tainted America’s values with inept invasion, prisoner abuse and imperial overstretch. Meeting Mr Assad’s atrocities with appropriate force will help to rebuild American moral authority in the world. If Congress must be involved, it should send that message just as loud and clear as it can—and so should Mr Obama’s allies.

Heg solves great power war and decline causes it

**Zhang and Shi, 11** – \*researcher at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington, D.C.\*\* Columbia University, independent consultant for the Eurasia Group and a consultant for the World Bank in Washington, D.C. (Yuhan and Lin, “America’s decline: A harbinger of conflict and rivalry,” 1/22/11 <http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2011/01/22/americas-decline-a-harbinger-of-conflict-and-rivalry/>)

This does not necessarily mean that the US is in systemic decline, but it encompasses a trend that appears to be negative and perhaps alarming. Although the US still possesses incomparable military prowess and its economy remains the world’s largest, the once seemingly indomitable chasm that separated America from anyone else is narrowing. Thus, the global distribution of power is shifting, and the inevitable result will be a world that is less peaceful, liberal and prosperous, burdened by a dearth of effective conflict regulation. Over the past two decades, no other state has had the ability to seriously challenge the US military. Under these circumstances, motivated by both opportunity and fear, many actors have bandwagoned with US hegemony and accepted a subordinate role. Canada, most of Western Europe, India, Japan, South Korea, Australia, Singapore and the Philippines have all joined the US, creating a status quo that has tended to mute great power conflicts. However, as the hegemony that **drew these powers together** withers, so will the pulling power behind the US alliance. The result will be an international order where power is more diffuse, American interests and influence can be more readily challenged, and conflicts or wars may be harder to avoid. As history attests, power decline and redistribution result in military confrontation. For example, in the late 19th century America’s emergence as a regional power saw it launch its first overseas war of conquest towards Spain. By the turn of the 20th century, accompanying the increase in US power and waning of British power, the American Navy had begun to challenge the notion that Britain ‘rules the waves.’ Such a notion would eventually see the US attain the status of sole guardians of the Western Hemisphere’s security to become the order-creating Leviathan shaping the international system with democracy and rule of law. Defining this US-centred system are three key characteristics: enforcement of property rights, constraints on the actions of powerful individuals and groups and some degree of equal opportunities for broad segments of society. As a result of such political stability, free markets, liberal trade and flexible financial mechanisms have appeared. And, with this, many countries have sought opportunities to enter this system, proliferating **stable and cooperative relations**. However, what will happen to these advances as America’s influence declines? Given that America’s authority, although sullied at times, has benefited people across much of Latin America, Central and Eastern Europe, the Balkans, as well as parts of Africa and, quite extensively, Asia, the answer to this question could affect global society in a profoundly detrimental way. Public imagination and academia have anticipated that a post-hegemonic world would return to the problems of the 1930s: regional blocs, trade conflicts and strategic rivalry. Furthermore, multilateral institutions such as the IMF, the World Bank or the WTO might give way to regional organisations. For example, Europe and East Asia would each step forward to fill the vacuum left by Washington’s withering leadership to pursue their own visions of regional political and economic orders. Free markets would become more politicised — and, well, less free — and major powers would compete for supremacy. Additionally, such power plays have historically possessed a zero-sum element. In the late 1960s and 1970s, US economic power declined relative to the rise of the Japanese and Western European economies, with the US dollar also becoming less attractive. And, as American power eroded, so did international regimes (such as the Bretton Woods System in 1973). A world without American hegemony is one where great power wars re-emerge, the liberal international system is supplanted by an authoritarian one, and trade protectionism devolves into restrictive, anti-globalisation barriers. This, at least, is one possibility we can forecast in a future that will inevitably be devoid of unrivalled US primacy.
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Mexico violates human rights

UN, 5/3 – (UN News Centre, “Mexico must strengthen its protection of human rights, reduce use of military – UN expert,” http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=44817&Cr=Mexico&Cr1=#.Uc9VcPm1FqW)

A United Nations independent expert today urged the Mexican Government to strengthen the national structures that protect human rights, in particular the right to life, and reduce the involvement of the military in policing to reduce the use of force in the country. “There seems to be wide agreement among various levels of Government and civil society that the long term solution to the problem of violence in Mexico lies in establishing a strong law enforcement system compliant with international standards surrounding the right to life,” the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions, Christoph Heyns, said at the end of a visit to the country. “The need to achieve this goal as soon as possible should be the guiding star of all policy and other reforms.” Mr. Heyns welcomed the announcement of a number of initiatives aimed at moving the country from relying on the military for internal security. Some of them are already in the process of implementation. “The policies that have been announced should be fully implemented. The involvement of members of civil society in this process is crucial,” Mr. Heyns said. “There is no easy fix, but a slow and steady commitment to strengthening the role of the human rights framework in Mexico is the only long term solution.” He emphasized the importance of decreasing the military’s involvement in policing, ensuring that civil courts and not military ones try members of the military who have been accused of human rights violations, and establishing clear standards on the use of force by law enforcement officials. Mr. Heyns also drew special attention to the issue of ending impunity. “Each and every loss of life should be investigated with the same rigor. And each and every perpetrator should be apprehended and tried. Pursuing this objective will serve not only to decrease impunity, but to restore the value that society attaches to life,” he said.

Shun them—a priori

Beversluis, 89 (Eric H. April 1989. “On Shunning Undesirable Regimes: Ethics and Economic Sanctions.” Public Affairs Quarterly, April, vol. 3, no. 2)

A fundamental task of morality is resolving conflicting interests. If we both want the same piece of land, ethics provides a basis for resolving the conflict by identifying "mine" and "thine." If in anger 1 want to smash your face, ethics indicates that your face's being unsmashed is a legitimate interest of yours which takes precedence over my own interest in expressing my rage. Thus ethics identifies the rights of individuals when their interests conflict. But how can a case for shunning be made on this view of morality? Whose interests (rights) does shunning protect? The shunner may well have to sacrifice his interest, e.g., by foregoing a beneficial trade relationship, but whose rights are thereby protected? In shunning there seem to be no "rights" that are protected. For shunning, as we have seen, does not assume that the resulting cost will change the disapproved behavior. If economic sanctions against South Africa will not bring apartheid to an end, and thus will not help the blacks get their rights, on what grounds might it be a duty to impose such sanctions'? We find the answer when we note that there is another "level" of moral duties. When Galtung speaks of "reinforcing... morality," he has identified a duty that goes beyond specific acts of respecting people's rights. The argument goes like this: There is more involved in respecting the rights of others than not violating them by one's actions. For if there is such a thing as a moral order, which unites people in a moral community, then surely one has a duty (at least prima facie) not only to avoid violating the rights of others with one's actions but also to support that moral order. Consider that the moral order itself contributes significantly to people's rights being respected. It does so by encouraging and reinforcing moral behavior and by discouraging and sanctioning immoral behavior. In this moral community people mutually reinforce each other's moral behavior and thus raise the overall level of morality. Were this moral order to disintegrate, were people to stop reinforcing each other's moral behavior, there would be much more violation of people's rights. Thus to the extent that behavior affects the moral order, it indirectly affects people's rights. And this is where shunning fits in. Certain types of behavior constitute a direct attack on the moral order. When the violation of human rights is flagrant, willful, and persistent, the offender is, as it were, thumbing her nose at the moral order, publicly rejecting it as binding her behavior. Clearly such behavior, if tolerated by society, will weaken and perhaps eventually undermine altogether the moral order. Let us look briefly at those three conditions which turn immoral behavior into an attack on the moral order. An immoral action is flagrant if it is "extremely or deliberately conspicuous; notorious, shocking." Etymologically the word means "burning" or "blazing." The definition of shunning implies therefore that those offenses require shunning which are shameless or indiscreet, which the person makes no effort to hide and no good-faith effort to excuse. Such actions "blaze forth" as an attack on the moral order. But to merit shunning the action must also be, willful and persistent. We do not consider the actions of the "backslider," the weak-willed, the one-time offender to be challenges to the moral order. It is the repeat offender, the unrepentent sinner, the cold-blooded violator of morality whose behavior demands that others publicly reaffirm the moral order. When someone flagrantly, willfully, and repeatedly violates the moral order, those who believe in the moral order, the members of the moral community, must respond in a way that reaffirms the legitimacy of that moral order. How does shunning do this? First, by refusing publicly to have to do with such a person one announces support for the moral order and backs up the announcement with action. This action reinforces the commitment to the moral order both of the shunner and of the other members of the community. (Secretary of State Shultz in effect made this argument in his caB for international sanctions on Libya in the early days of 1986.). . Further, shunning may have a moral effect on the shunned person, even if the direct impact is not adequate to change the immoral behavior. If the shunned person thinks of herself as part of the moral community, shunning may well make clear to her that she is, in fact, removing herself from that community by the behavior in question. Thus shunning may achieve by moral suasion what cannot be achieved by "force." Finally, shunning may be a form of punishment, of moral sanction, whose appropriateness depends not on whether it will change the person's behavior, but on whether he deserves the punishment for violating the moral order. Punishment than can be viewed as a way of maintaining the moral order, of "purifying the community" after it has been made "unclean," as ancient communities might have put it.

Consequences are irrelevant

Kemerling, No Date– PhD from the University of Iowa specializing in Modern Philosophy, Human Nature, Ethics (Garth, “Kant: The Moral Order”, <http://www.philosophypages.com/hy/5i.htm>)

We begin with the concept of that which can be conceived to be good without qualification, a good will. Other good features of human nature and the benefits of a good life, Kant pointed out, have value only under appropriate conditions, since they may be used either for good or for evil. But a good will is intrinsically good; its value is wholly self-contained and utterly independent of its external relations. Since our practical reason is better suited to the development and guidance of a good will than to the achievement of happiness, it follows that the value of a good will does not depend even on the results it manages to produce as the consequences of human action. Kant's moral theory is, therefore, deontological: actions are morally right in virtue of their motives, which must derive more from duty than from inclination. The clearest examples of morally right action are precisely those in which an individual agent's determination to act in accordance with duty overcomes her evident self-interest and obvious desire to do otherwise. But in such a case, Kant argues, the moral value of the action can only reside in a formal principle or "maxim," the general commitment to act in this way because it is one's duty. So he concludes that "Duty is the necessity to act out of reverence for the law."

## Relations

Status quo economic ties are high and resilient—that is sufficient to solve the advantage

Wilson 11 – MA in International Affairs @ American U, Associate at the Mexico Institute of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, where he develops the Institute’s research and programming on regional economic integration and U.S.-Mexico border affairs

(Christopher, “Working Together,” Mexico Institute @ Woodrow Institute, Scholar)//BB

The economic ties between the United States and Mexico are reinforced by a large web of social networks. Thirty-two million U.S. residents, or one in ten, are of Mexican origin, including roughly 12 million people born in Mexico.10 Perhaps a million Americans live in Mexico, almost a fifth of all Americans who live abroad.11 Close to 15,000 Mexicans are pursuing college degrees in the United States, and 13 million Mexicans visit the U.S. in 2010.12 As the top tourist destination for U.S. travelers, an even larger 19 million U.S. residents visit Mexico each year.13 Just as social networks often facilitate the creation of commercial relationships within the United States, the depth and intensity of bilateral social integration spurs the development of economic links between the U.S. and Mexico. Import and export relationships, production sharing arrangements, and investment opportunities are all made easier by the relatively high level of understanding derived from the geographic and cultural proximity of United States and Mexico.

Warming’s inevitable even if we cut emissions to zero—multiple studies confirm

Gillett et al 10—director @ the Canadian Centre for Climate Modelling and Analysis

Nathan, “Ongoing climate change following a complete cessation of carbon dioxide emissions”. *Nature Geoscience*

Several recent studies have demonstrated that CO2-induced 17 global mean temperature change is irreversible on human 18 timescales1\_5. We find that not only is this climate change 19 irreversible, but that for some climate variables, such as Antarctic 20 temperature and North African rainfall, CO2-induced climate 21 changes are simulated to continue to worsen for many centuries 22 even after a complete cessation of emissions. Although it is 23 also well known that a large committed thermosteric sea level 24 rise is expected even after a cessation of emissions in 2100, 25 our finding of a strong delayed high-latitude Southern Ocean 26 warming at intermediate depths suggests that this effect may be 27 compounded by ice shelf collapse, grounding line retreat, and ensuing accelerated ice discharge in marine-based sectors of the 28 Antarctic ice sheet, precipitating a sea level rise of several metres. 29 Quantitative results presented here are subject to uncertainties 30 associated with the climate sensitivity, the rate of ocean heat 31 uptake and the rate of carbon uptake in CanESM1, but our 32 findings of Northern Hemisphere cooling, Southern Hemisphere 33 warming, a southward shift of the intertropical convergence zone, 34 and delayed and ongoing ocean warming at intermediate depths 35 following a cessation of emissions are likely to be robust. Geo- 36 engineering by stratospheric aerosol injection has been proposed 37 as a response measure in the event of a rapid melting of the 38 West Antarctic ice sheet24. Our results indicate that if such a 39 melting were driven by ocean warming at intermediate depths, as 40 is thought likely, a geoengineering response would be ineffective 41 for several centuries owing to the long delay associated with 42 subsurface ocean warming.

China makes the impact inevitable and they don’t model

Downs 8

Eric, Fellow @ Brookings, China Energy Fellow, Foreign Policy, John L. Thornton China Center U.S.-China Economic & Security Review Commission, China’s Energy Policies and Their Environmental Impacts, http://www.brookings.edu/testimony/2008/0813\_china\_downs.aspx

China suffers from a disconnect between the increasingly prominent position of energy issues on its domestic and foreign policy agendas and the capacity of the country’s institutions to manage the energy sector. Some Chinese commentators have even argued that the biggest threat to China’s energy security is posed by the very institutions responsible for enhancing it. Consequently, restructuring China’s energy policymaking apparatus has been a subject of intense debate in recent years as the country has grappled with an unexpected surge in energy demand, growing dependence on energy imports, rising global energy prices and periodic domestic energy supply shortages. Authority over China’s energy sector at the national level is fractured among more than a dozen government agencies, the most important of which is the National Development and Reform Commission (NDRC). Within the NDRC itself, responsibility for energy is similarly scattered among multiple departments. Prior to the restructuring in March 2008, the key component was the Energy Bureau, which had a broad mandate but lacked the authority, tools and manpower to fulfill it. In 2005, the government added another cook to the kitchen with the establishment of the National Energy Leading Group, an advisory body headed by Premier Wen Jiabao. While the leading group’s creation reflected recognition of the need to strengthen energy sector management, it did not eradicate China’s energy governance woes. China’s fragmented energy policymaking structure has impeded energy governance because there is no single institution, such as a Ministry of Energy, with the authority to coordinate the interests of the various stakeholders. For example, the implementation of energy laws is hampered by the fact that those laws often do not specify the government agencies responsible for implementation because of disputes over who should be in charge. Similarly, the fuel tax that the NPC approved in 1999 has not been implemented because of the failure of the relevant stakeholders to reach an agreement. The policy paralysis within the energy bureaucracy stands in sharp contrast to the activism of China’s state-owned energy companies. These firms are powerful and relatively autonomous actors. Their influence is derived from their full and vice ministerial ranks, the membership of some top executives in the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, industry expertise, internationally listed subsidiaries and profitability (at least until recently). More often than not, it is China’s energy firms who initiate major energy projects and policies that are later embraced by the government, such as the West-East Pipeline and the acquisition of foreign energy assets. The companies also have some capacity to advance corporate interests at the expense of national ones. For example, oil and power generating companies have periodically reduced their output to pressure the government to raise the state-set prices of refined products and electricity, which have not kept pace with increases in the market-determined prices of crude oil and coal. Similarly, China’s national oil companies have ignored guidance from the central government about where they should invest overseas. II. China’s “new” energy policymaking structure The recent changes to China’s energy policymaking apparatus are the latest in a series of institutional reforms aimed at improving energy governance. In March 2008, the NPC approved two additions to China’s energy bureaucracy – the State Energy Commission (SEC) and the National Energy Administration (NEA). The SEC, a high-level discussion and coordination body whose specific functions, organization and staffing have not yet been determined, will replace the National Energy Leading Group. The daily affairs of the SEC will be handled by the NEA, a vice-ministerial component of the NDRC, which is the successor to the NDRC’s Energy Bureau. In addition to the Energy Bureau, the NEA is also comprised of other energy offices from the NDRC, the Office of the National Leading Group, and the nuclear power administration of the Commission of Science, Technology and Industry for National Defense. The NEA has a broad mandate, which includes managing the country’s energy industries, drafting energy plans and policies, negotiating with international energy agencies and approving foreign energy investments. The NEA, like its predecessor, will struggle to fulfill its mandate because it lacks the authority, autonomy, manpower and tools to deal with the country’s energy challenges. Although the NEA’s capabilities in each of these areas are greater than those possessed by the NDRC Energy Bureau, they still fall short of what the NEA needs to do its job. Authority: The NEA has more political clout than its predecessor, but not enough to mitigate the bureaucratic infighting that undermines energy decision-making. The NEA is a vice-ministerial body, which is a step above that of the Energy Bureau, which was a bureau-level organization. However, the NEA still does not have the authority it needs to coordinate the interests of ministries, commissions and state-owned energy companies. One of the frustrations of officials in the NDRC Energy Bureau was that the energy companies often undercut their authority by circumventing the Bureau to hold face-to-face discussions with China’s senior leadership. The authority of the NEA is somewhat enhanced by the appointment of Zhang Guobao, a Vice-Chairman of the NDRC with full ministerial rank, as head of the NEA. While it was widely expected that Zhang would retire, his new position is a reflection of his substantial energy expertise. Zhang, who has worked at the NDRC since 1983, is a smart and skillful bureaucrat with encyclopedic knowledge of China’s energy sector. He has overseen the development of some of the country’s major infrastructure projects, including the West-East Pipeline, the transmission of electricity from west to east, the Qinghai-Tibet Railway and the expansion of Beijing Capital International Airport. Autonomy: The NEA is a creature of the NDRC. Some Chinese media reports speculated that the fact that the NEA’s offices will be separate from those of the NDRC and that the NEA will have its own Party Group – which will give the NEA greater autonomy in managing its affairs, including personnel decisions – are signs of the NEA’s independence. However, the fact that Zhang Guobao – an NDRC “lifer” – is head of the NEA and its Party Group indicates that the NEA’s room to maneuver will be constrained by the NDRC. Moreover, the NEA’s independence is limited by the fact that key tools it needs to effectively manage the energy sector are in the hands of the NDRC. Tools: Arguably the greatest constraint on the NEA’s ability to fulfill its mandate is the fact that is does not possess the authority to set energy prices, which remain the purview of the NDRC’s Pricing Department. The issue of who would end up with the power to determine energy prices was, in the words of Zhang Guobao, a subject of “constant dispute” during the bureaucratic reorganization. Although the NEA can make suggestions about energy price adjustments and should be consulted by the NDRC on any proposed changes, the shots are still being called by the NDRC (and ultimately the State Council, whose approval is needed for any major energy price changes). The fact that the NDRC retained control over energy prices is hardly surprising. The power to set prices is one of the NDRC’s main instruments of macroeconomic control, which it understandably is reluctant to relinquish, especially to a subordinate component which might be tempted to adjust energy prices in ways that run counter to broader NDRC objectives, such as combating inflation. The NEA’s lack of authority over energy prices makes its task of mitigating the current electricity shortages, which are partly rooted in price controls, especially challenging. Electricity prices are set by the state, while coal prices are determined by the market. The failure of electricity price increases to keep pace with soaring coal prices has contributed to the national power shortage because some electricity producers can't afford coal while others are unwilling to operate at a loss. With no pricing power, the NEA has little choice but to resort to administrative measures to achieve an objective that would be more effectively realized by raising and ultimately liberalizing electricity prices. Personnel: The central government is still managing the energy sector with a skeleton crew. Contrary to rumors that the NEA’s staff would be as large as 200, it ended up with just 112 people. This staff quota is certainly larger than that of the NDRC Energy Bureau, which had only 50 people, but it does not represent a major increase in the number of people directly involved in managing the energy sector at the national level. Moreover, some Chinese media reports have speculated that the NEA may face the problem of “too many generals and not enough soldiers” because at least half of the 112 slots at the NEA are for positions at the deputy department head level and above. The Party organ that determines the functions, internal structure and staff quotas for government institutions probably resisted calls for more personnel out of concern that if it approved a large staff for the NEA, then other government bodies would also press for more manpower at a time when the State Council is trying to streamline the bureaucracy. In sum, China’s new energy administration is unlikely to substantially improve energy governance. The organizational changes are tantamount to rearranging deck chairs on the Titanic. Although the energy bureaucracy looks a bit different, its limited capacities remain largely unchanged. Consequently, we can expect to see a continuation of business as usual: conflicts of interest will impede decision-making; the energy companies will remain important drivers of projects and policies; state-set energy prices will continue to contribute to periodic domestic energy supply shortfalls; and the NEA, with no authority to adjust energy prices, probably will resort to “second best” administrative measures to try to eradicate those shortages. The modest tinkering to China’s energy policymaking apparatus unveiled during the March 2008 NPC meeting reflects the conflicts of interest that stymie energy decision-making. Despite widespread recognition among Chinese officials and energy experts of the need to get the country’s energy institutions “right” and the growing chorus of voices calling for the establishment of a Ministry of Energy (MOE), there are powerful ministerial and corporate interests that favor the status quo. The opposition to the creation of a MOE, a hot topic of debate in Chinese energy circles in recent years, was led by the NDRC and the state-owned energy companies. The mere specter of a MOE strikes fear in the heart of the NDRC because it would deprive the NDRC of a substantial portion of its portfolio and important tools of macroeconomic control. The NDRC’s aversion is shared by the energy firms who are reluctant to have another political master and afraid that a MOE would limit their direct access to China’s leadership. Such opposition helps explain why the government was unable to forge a consensus in favor of more robust changes to China’s energy policymaking apparatus. Implications for the United States First, US policymakers should recognize that China’s fractured energy policymaking apparatus may constrain the Chinese government from doing all that US policymakers would like it to do – and indeed what Chinese leaders themselves might want to do – to enhance international energy security and combat climate change. If China falls short of our expectations it may not reflect a conscious decision by Beijing to shirk its global responsibilities but rather the limited capacity of its national energy institutions to bend other actors, notably firms and local governments, to its will.

Adaptation solves the extinction impact

**NIPCC** **11**- Archived 8 March, Surviving the Unprecedented Climate Change of the IPCC, http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2011/mar/8mar2011a5.html

(Citing: Willis, K.J., Bennett, K.D., Bhagwat, S.A. and Birks, H.J.B. 2010. 4°C and beyond: what did this mean for biodiversity in the past? Systematics and Biodiversity 8: 3-9.)

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

Relations solve drug networks

Storrs 6 (K. Larry Storrs, Specialist in Latin American Affairs, Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division of CRS, 1/18/2006 “Mexico’s Importance and Multiple Relationships with the United States”, http://assets.opencrs.com/rpts/RL33244\_20060118.pdf)

Sharing a 2,000-mile border and extensive interconnections through the Gulf of¶ Mexico, the United States and Mexico are so intricately linked together in an¶ enormous multiplicity of ways that President George W. Bush and other U.S.¶ officials have stated that no country is more important to the United States than¶ Mexico. At the same time, Mexican President Vicente Fox (2000-2006), the first¶ president to be elected from an opposition party in 71 years, has sought to strengthen¶ the relationship with the United States through what some have called a “grand¶ bargain.” Under this proposed bargain, the United States would regularize the status¶ of undocumented Mexican workers in the United States and economically assist the¶ less developed partner in the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA),¶ while Mexico would be more cooperative in efforts to control the illegal traffic of¶ drugs, people, and goods into the United States.¶ The southern neighbor is linked with the United States through trade and¶ investment, migration and tourism, environment and health concerns, and family and¶ cultural relationships. It is the second most important trading partner of the United¶ States, and this trade is critical to many U.S. industries and border communities. It¶ is a major source of undocumented migrants and illicit drugs and a possible avenue¶ for the entry of terrorists into the United States. As a result, cooperation with Mexico¶ is essential to deal effectively with migration, drug trafficking, and border, terrorism,¶ health, environment, and energy issues.

Drug cartels are key to the Mexican economy – generates valuable liquidity in the banking system

Lange, 10 – Washington Correspondent for Reuters, citing US officials in Mexico; additional reporting by Lizbeth Diaz in Tijuana (Jason, “From spas to banks, Mexico economy rides on drugs,” Reuters, 22 January 2010, http://www.reuters.com/article/2010/01/22/us-drugs-mexico-economy-idUSTRE60L0X120100122)//BI

Mexican cartels, which control most of the cocaine and methamphetamine smuggled into the United States, bring an estimated $25 billion to $40 billion into Mexico from their global operations every year. To put that in perspective: Mexico probably made more money in 2009 moving drugs than it did exporting oil, its single biggest legitimate foreign currency earner. From the white Caribbean beaches of Cancun to violent towns on the U.S. border and the beauty parlors of Mexico City's wealthy suburbs, drug cash is everywhere in Mexico. It has even propped up the country's banking system, helping it ride out the financial crisis and aiding the country's economy. Smuggled into Mexico mostly from the United States in $100 bills, narco money finds its way onto the books of restaurants, construction firms and bars as drug lords try to legitimize their cash and prevent police from tracing it. "Mexico is saturated with this money," said George Friedman, who heads geopolitical analysis firm Stratfor. In western Mexico, drug money started pouring into Zapopan and nearby Guadalajara in the 1980s as the Sinaloa cartel bought hospitals and real estate, said Martin Barron, a researcher at the institute that trains Mexico's organized crime prosecutors. Now residents in the region known in Mexico for its piety say drug smugglers barely make an effort to disguise themselves. A strip of fancy boutiques in Zapopan was financed with drug money, says Jaime Ramirez, a local newspaper columnist who has been reporting on the drug world for two decades. As well as the Grupo Collins factory in Zapopan, a nearby car wash is also on the U.S. Treasury's black list. A local cemetery draws relatives of traffickers who were among the 17,000 people killed in the drug war in Mexico since 2006. "A lot of narcos are buried there. You should see it on Fathers' Day," Ramirez said, as a black pick-up truck with tinted windows pulled in. Zapopan residents just shrug their shoulders when a wealthy neighbor displays traits seen as typical of a drug trafficker -- wearing cowboy gear, playing loud "norteno" music from the country's north or holding lavish parties attended by guests who arrive in pick-up trucks or SUVs. "Living alongside them is normal," Ramirez said. "Everybody knows when a neighbor is on the shady side." One of those neighbors was Sandra Avila, a glamorous trafficker known as the "Queen of the Pacific," who lived in Zapopan before being arrested in Mexico City in 2007. On a typical day in Zapopan recently, men unloaded boxes from vans in the Grupo Collins compound, near the company's private chapel and soccer field. From behind the factory's high walls, there was little to suggest it could have ties to a cartel. "It has always been really calm," said Genaro Rangel, who sells tacos every morning to factory workers from a stall across the street. The plant was advertising a job opening on the company web site for a machine room technician. Washington's accusation, filed under a U.S. sanctions program, makes it illegal for Americans to do business with Grupo Collins and freezes any assets it might have in U.S. accounts. In a 2006 report, Mexican authorities named Grupo Collins' owner Telesforo Tirado as an operator of the Colima cartel. The U.S. Treasury and Mexico's Attorney General's office both declined to provide further details on the case and Grupo Collins executives also refused to comment. But Tirado has previously denied the charges in the Mexican media. CASHING IN ON THE DRUG TRADE What's going on in Zapopan is happening all over Mexico. A well-known Mexico City restaurant specializing in the spicy cuisine of the Yucatan peninsula was added to the U.S. list of front companies in December. Months earlier, one of Mexico's top food critics had recommended it. Drug money has also fueled part of a real estate boom around tourist resorts such as Cancun, said a senior U.S. law enforcement official in Mexico City. "We've had cases where traffickers purchased large tracts of land in areas where any investor would buy," he said, asking not to be named because of concerns about his safety. An architect in the city of Tijuana did well out of designing buildings that cartels would build and rent out to legitimate local businesses. "The pay was enough for me to build a house for myself, as well as to buy a lot a tools," he said. He was once hired to design a tunnel that led to the street from a secret door in a drug gang member's closet. Craving acceptance, the drug gangs even throw their money at acquaintances to get them on the social scene. A drug trafficker pays his friend Roberto, who declined to give his last name, to keep him connected in Tijuana and introduce him to women. "I take him to parties," Roberto said. In the wealthy shopping areas of Interlomas, near Mexico City, the Perfect Silhouette spa offers breast implants. Staffed by young women in loose-fitting white suits, the spa also sells weight-loss creams and offers massages. The U.S. Treasury recently said it was part of the financial network of the Beltran Leyva cartel, whose leader was gunned down by elite Mexican marines in December. The salon's manager, Teresa Delgado, appeared baffled by the U.S. accusations. "We haven't seen anything strange here," she said. A woman Delgado identified as the owner did not return a phone call requesting an interview. Businesses enlisted to launder drug money typically get a cut worth 3 percent to 8 percent of the funds passing through their books, the U.S. law enforcement official said. "SMURFING" AROUND THE LAWS Much of the cartels' profits eventually ends up in Mexico's banking system, the U.S. official said. During the global financial crisis last year, those assets provided valuable liquidity, says economist Guillermo Ibarra of the Autonomous University of Sinaloa. "They had a cushion from drug trafficking money that to a certain extent helped the banks," Ibarra said. Indeed, drug money in banks is a global phenomenon, not just in Mexico. A United Nations report on the global drug trade in 2009 said that "at a time of major bank failures, money doesn't smell, bankers seem to believe." Drug gangs in Mexico have their associates make thousands of tiny deposits in their bank accounts to avoid raising suspicion from banking authorities, a practice known as "smurfing," said the U.S. official. Mexico's banking association and the finance ministry's anti-money laundering unit declined to comment for this story. While Mexico is confiscating more drugs and assets than ever under President Felipe Calderon, forfeitures of money are still minuscule compared to even low-ball estimates of the amount of drug money that flows into Mexico. Under Calderon, authorities have confiscated about $400 million, almost none of which was seized from banks, said Ricardo Najera, a spokesman for the Attorney General's Office. Mexican bank secrecy laws make it particularly difficult to go after drug money in financial institutions, Najera said. "We can't just go in there and say 'OK, let's have a look,'" he said. "We have to trace the illicit origin of that money before we can get at those bank accounts." The U.S. Treasury has blocked only about $16 million in suspected Mexican drug assets since June 2000, a Treasury official in Washington said. The official, who asked not to be named, said the sanctions program aims to hit drug lords by breaking "their commercial and financial backbones." But freezing assets is not "the principal objective nor the key measure of success." MAFIA CAPITALISM Data on Mexican banking provides a novel way for calculating the size of the drug economy. Ibarra crunched numbers on monetary aggregates across different Mexican states and concluded that more money sits in Sinaloan banks than its legitimate economy should be generating. "It's as if two people had the same job and the same level of seniority, but one of them has twice as much savings," he said, talking about comparisons between Sinaloa and other states. Ibarra estimates cartels have laundered more than $680 million in the banks of Sinaloa -- which is a financial services backwater -- and that drug money is driving nearly 20 percent of the state's economy. Edgardo Buscaglia, an academic at Columbia University, recently scoured judicial case files and financial intelligence reports, some of which were provided by Mexican authorities. His research found organized crime's involvement in Mexican businesses had expanded sharply in the five years through 2008, with gangs now involved in most sectors of the economy.

## PEMEX

PEMEX instability inevitable for several reasons – these cumulative risks to the industry crush the advantage

Martin and Longmire 11 – Jeremy Martin is Director of the Energy Program at the Institute of the Americas, Sylvia Longmire is a Mexico Security Expert & President, Longmire Consulting (Jeremy Martin and Sylvia Longmire, Journal of Energy Security, “The Perilous Intersection of Mexico’s Drug War & Pemex”, March 22, 2011, http://www.borderlandbeat.com/2011/03/perilous-intersection-of-mexicos-drug.html) // CB

Pemex exposed and impacted As discussed previously, oil theft from Pemex pipelines, money laundering by way of service stations, and, worst of all, provocative kidnappings of the company’s executives and those of service companies working with the state firm, are all on the rise. Unofficial figures place thefts from the Pemex network at roughly $2 billion annually. And security experts point to this as an important source of revenue for drug cartels—especially as the Mexican government continues to crack down on them. Thefts from the Pemex network are not new, but the increase and the strain it is placing on the already-taxed company is important. And the illegal tapping has grown significantly in the areas where the drug war is the most pervasive. The spike in fuel thefts and illegal trading, as well as kidnappings, has led some to question whether Pemex is fully in charge of all its facilities across the nation. For some experts following the situation, the answer is a resounding no. Indeed, many analysts indicate that the physical security and monitoring of pipelines belonging to Pemex are severely lacking. According to Mexican daily El Universal, oil looting has occurred in almost every state in Mexico, while the Wall Street Journal, citing Pemex statistics, indicated that between January and November 2010, Pemex discovered 614 illegal siphons—368 in liquid fuels pipelines, 196 in oil pipelines, and 50 in liquefied petroleum gas ducts. Pemex has begun installing systems to detect declines in pressure in some oil product pipelines but the project is expected to take years to complete. Kidnappings send shudders Kidnappings of Pemex executives and subcontractors, including workers from international firms, have taken place across the country but most notably in Tabasco, Tamaulipas and Nuevo Leon, sending shudders throughout the company and Mexico. The kidnappings have terrorized a community where, according to a Los Angeles Times story, jobs on the oil rigs and at the gas wells are handed down, father to son, for generations. “How is it,” asked a relative of a kidnapped worker, “that Pemex, supposedly the backbone of the nation, can be made to bow down like this?” One analysis, published by Grupo Reforma highlighted the oil town of Reforma, Chiapas, where at least 30 Pemex employees—ranging from executives to laborers—have been kidnapped over the past year. Mexico Weekly has also reported on other forms of violence that have flared in prime Pemex production zones, such as the Burgos Basin, site of Mexico's biggest natural gas field in Tamaulipas. Last spring, gunmen seized the Gigante Uno gas plant and kidnapped five Pemex workers. Increasingly unsafe conditions are severely hindering Pemex’s ability to produce natural gas in the Burgos Basin. The Burgos Basin stretches across the northern border state of Tamaulipas, where the Gigante Uno plant is located, and spills into the states of Nuevo León and Coahuila. All three states are experiencing extremely high levels of drug-related violence, especially along these states’ border with Texas. The stretch from Nuevo Laredo to Matamoros is in the midst of a bloody conflict between the Gulf cartel and Los Zetas, former paramilitaries and enforcers for the Gulf cartel who are now one of the more vicious DTOs in their own right. Los Zetas are viewed as largely responsible for the kidnapping of Pemex employees in that region. “Once Pemex … comes under regular attack from the cartels, rather than just random, disorganized thugs, then you have far more serious national security problems – much worse in the government's eyes than a bunch of homicides in the slums of Ciudad Juárez," said Malcolm Beith, author of The Last Narco, a book about the hunt for Joaquin “El Chapo” Guzmán Loera. Regrettably, Burgos is becoming synonymous with the perilous intersection of Mexico’s raging drug war with Pemex’s efforts to produce the critical energy supplies the nation and region demand. The Murphy Energy case One case of fuel theft from Pemex that’s winding its way through the justice system provides a unique insight into that part of the problem the company is confronting. According to MarketWatch, federal documents released in August 2010 revealed a Texas chemical plant, owned by German chemical company BASF Corp., bought $2 million worth of petroleum products that had been stolen from Pemex and smuggled across the US border. The documents also showed the stolen condensate passed through several companies' hands before arriving on a barge at the BASF facility in Port Arthur, Texas. The actual transport of stolen oil from Mexican pipelines into US corporate hands is complicated at best. Donald Schroeder, former president of Trammo Corp., testified that in January 2009, two companies, Murphy Energy Corp. and Continental Fuels, contacted him. Both wanted to sell him stolen condensate. Apparently he agreed to buy it, and the transfers began. “Unnamed import companies” would sell the condensate to intermediary companies like Continental (which has since shuttered its headquarters in Houston). Those import companies would smuggle the condensate across the border and store it in Continental facilities. No details were available on how those trucks managed to successfully cross the US Mexico border. These piecemeal transfers would continue until there was enough oil in the storage facility to fill a barge and ship to BASF. Jim McAlister, an Assistant US Attorney, said he has no reason to believe that BASF has any involvement in the alleged wrongdoing. The President and founder of Murphy Energy Corp., Matt Murphy, said the company did not know that the condensate was stolen. Josh Crescenzi, the vice president of Continental Fuels, has not been indicted in the case, nor has anyone else from Continental. This particular case has been a success, resulting in the handover of $2.4 million by US customs authorities to the Mexican government. But the extent of corruption in Mexico—within Pemex, in particular—and the ease with which oil can be stolen from pipelines makes the mitigation of oil looting an almost insurmountable challenge. Adding to the problem is the fact that Mexican cartels are involved. According to Reuters, the Mexican government believes the cartels use stolen jet fuel in their aircraft to cover up any evidence of illicit flights. In August 2009, Mexico’s federal police commissioner Rodrigo Esparza said Los Zetas used false import documents to smuggle at least $46 million worth of oil in tankers to unnamed US refineries. President Felipe Calderón has said that DTOs in northern Mexico are responsible for most oil theft. On some levels Pemex is not just a victim of oil-thieving DTOs; sometimes, it’s directly involved. In February 2010, Mexican military units seized more than four tons of marijuana at Pemex installations in Reynosa, Tamaulipas. The discovery was made after Pemex security alerted officials that armed men were removing Pemex employees from a fuel supply station. In response, a Mexican Naval helicopter was dispatched to the scene but retreated after receiving heavy weapons fire from the ground. When military units arrived on the ground, they found the marijuana loaded on trucks abandoned at the site. These alarming facts have led to perhaps the most ominous question of all: Is the company being infiltrated by the perpetrators of the nation’s drug business? In light of the increasing number of incidents President Calderón has acknowledged, there may well be internal operatives at Pemex aiding and abetting the DTOs. For its part, Pemex is soliciting the help of the Mexican people to try to put a stop to oil looting. Last August, the Mexican government posted a Pemex press release, in which exhorts that oil looting is not just an unpatriotic crime against the company and the government, but against the Mexican people. It also offers the number of a hotline where individuals can anonymously report pipeline breaches. Why the perilous intersection matters The relevance of what is happening in Mexico matters on a variety of levels, but in particular, there are three broad reasons that bear discussion. First, and as best portrayed in Figure 2, Pemex has seen its oil production drop precipitously since 2004. The firm has been struggling for the better part of the last decade to deal with a burdensome tax straitjacket, poor planning at its largest field, a lack of new discoveries of oil and production, and an inability to implement serious reform.

**MARKED**

 Moreover, by the nature of being dragged into—and becoming part of—Mexico’s massive drug war, Pemex is clearly suffering from the additional strain and havoc wrought by the myriad elements of the conflict on its business. From huge financial losses to the increasing inability to control its network and prevent theft to the more serious kidnapping threats, the evidence is only becoming clearer. The second reason concerns Mexico’s fiscal dependency on oil and Pemex. As assorted struggles impact the company's and the nation’s fiscal well-being, broader and longer term economic growth and employment discussions become ever more complicated for policy makers. These issues are particularly critical as the nation appears far from passage of the necessary and far-reaching national tax and fiscal reforms that could ameliorate some of the burden on Pemex and the nation’s oil dependency. Third, all of the above leads to the real potential for further erosion of Mexico’s critical role as a secure and constant energy supplier for the United States and the Western Hemisphere. As oil prices steadily rise in early 2011, it is quite rational to revisit the significant energy security aspects of Mexico’s persistent energy woes, which are now clearly exacerbated by the overflow of drug war violence and corruption. On the heels of yet another State of the Union address in the United States that included elegant rhetoric about the country’s energy imbalance and energy security risks, a comprehensive, all of the above approach and solution remains far from reach. Conclusion Clearly oil, and energy more broadly, is not a sector of the economy where Mexico needs any further impediments. Pemex’s huge hurdles derive largely from its inability to replace declining oil production and navigate a burdensome nationalistic legacy. What is now added to the combustible mix is an increasing drain on the company’s finances and, worse, a sense of trepidation among executives in the field. Threats against its executives and loss of its resources are surely not a useful element as the company makes efforts to reform itself.

Current reforms don’t solve private investment

Steffy 8/19 (Loren Steffy – energy contributor at Forbes, 8/19/13, “Are Mexico's Oil Reforms Enough To Lure Foreign Investors?”, http://www.forbes.com/sites/lorensteffy/2013/08/19/are-mexicos-oil-reforms-enough-to-lure-foreign-investors/) //MD

¶ Undoing 75 years of law and national pride doesn’t happen quickly. Mexico made a significant step last week in loosening its restrictions on foreign investment in its oilfields, but determining the impact of those proposed reforms could take years to sort out.¶ While the changes proposed by Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto would allow the government to offer some sort of profit-sharing to foreign oil companies, it stops short of enabling foreign companies to book reserves from Mexico. The proposal is designed to entice foreign investment while not offending Mexico’s sense of national pride surrounding its oil resources.¶ U.S. majors and large independents, though, are looking for more reserves than they are profits these days, so it’s not clear if the change will go far enough to woo them south of the border. The majors, in particular, are already struggling with their large size and poorly performing assets.

Turn – Increasing resource production causes Dutch Disease – drives up prices for domestic goods and services, wrecking the economy

Holland, Energy Trends Insider, 12

[Andrew, 6-7-12, Energy Trends Insider, “Will Dutch Disease Follow-on the American Energy Boom?,” <http://www.energytrendsinsider.com/2012/06/07/will-dutch-disease-follow-on-the-american-energy-boom/>, accessed 7-12-13, MSG]

An ongoing discussion among some of us analysts at Consumer Energy Report has been about whether having natural resources like oil or coal is actually beneficial to a country (see Are Countries With Vast Oil Resources Blessed or Cursed?, Oil Dependence — Tom Friedman’s False Narrative, and Oil — Easy to Produce, But Not Easy to Buy). The argument which I’ve made is that a boom in natural resources production can cover up some short-sighted economic policies; in effect, the earnings from producing oil mean that countries do not have to invest in their education or produce their own manufactured goods. The other side of the argument is that it can only be a good thing for new resources to be found. Leaving aside the question of whether natural resource wealth undermines institutions or causes corruption (and there is good evidence of a resource curse among developing countries) there is one thing that increased production of oil does, once it gets to be a big enough sector of the economy: it pushes up the value of that country’s currency. All else equal (as economists always have to say), new production of natural resources strengthens the domestic currency. That’s because those resources are either exported or are used to replace imports. Dutch Disease Phenomenon Now – I should mention that I like a strong dollar, personally: it means I can afford to travel abroad more, and buy more when I get there. It also means that French wine (for example) becomes cheaper relative to Californian wine. I like French wine, and would welcome being able to buy more. However, that shows the problem with having a strong currency — it undermines domestic manufacturing and production (of Californian wine, in this example) by driving up prices of American-made goods and services. This phenomenon is called “Dutch Disease.” Coined by The Economist in 1977 to describe how finding natural gas in the North Sea in 1959 affected the Netherlands’ economy over the ensuing decades. The symptoms of the ‘disease’ are when commodity exports push up the value of a nation’s currency, making other parts of the economy less competitive. This leads to a current-account deficit, which makes the economy even more dependent upon the commodity. The disease is especially pernicious for commodities like oil, coal, and natural gas because these industries are very capital-intensive, and actually do not generate that many jobs. There are two major industrialized countries that have undergone commodities booms over the past decade: Canada and Australia. They are both showing signs of suffering from Dutch Disease, with the Canadian dollar increasing in value vs. the American dollar (Canada’s #1 trading partner by far) by over 50% in the last ten years, and the Australian dollar increased in value compared to world currency rates by almost 70% in the past decade.

## Spills

**Tons of alt causes to ocean biod**

**Kunich 6** – Professor of Law, Appalachian School of Law (John, Killing Our Oceans, p 122-3, AG)

It is crucial, albeit perhaps counterintuitive, that we pay close attention to land-based activities even as we focus on marine hotspots. There are enormous threats to marine biodiversity that originate, not in the oceans, but on dry land in the coastal zones of the world. Part of the reason these threats are prevalent is that an estimated 67 percent of the entire global human population lives either on the coast or within 37 miles of the coast, and that percentage is increasing.14 These huge and growing populations often cause overutilization of fishing and other resources

**MARKED**

 in coastal areas, habitat destruction and degradation, pollution (both organic and inorganic), eutrophication and related issues such as pathogenic bacteria and algal toxins, introduction of invasive species, watershed alteration, marine littering, and other harms to the nearby marine regions.15 Given that so many key marine centers of biodiversity reside in the near-coast coral reefs and continental shelf areas, it is of tremendous importance that our legal approach embrace appropriate controls over these land-based threats. Any plan that shortsightedly and narrowly focuses too much on ocean-based activities will, paradoxically, miss the boat.

# 2NC

## Oil

### Nuke Mod

Putin's leadership solves nuclear modernization

Bugriy 13 (Maksym, Correspondent – Ukrainian Week, “Russia is Arming Itself, but Against Whom?”, Ukrainian Week, 3-31, http://ukrainianweek.com/World/76030)

The intensification of military reforms was an **ideological cornerstone** of Putin’s 2012 presidential campaign. In a programmatic article, he wrote about a new global trend: increasingly frequent attempts to resolve economic issues and obtain access to resources through force. Thus, his claim is that Russia should not “lead anyone into temptation by being weak”. As he was preparing his return to the presidency, Putin announced “**unprecedented programmes** to develop the Armed Forces and modernize the defence industrial complex”, declaring that some 23 trillion roubles (US $750 bn) would be allocated to this end in the next decade. Tellingly, the key programmatic theses in the article begin with stressing the need to reform strategic analysis for national defence. The goal is to have foresight, an ability to estimate threats 30-50 years in advance. As far as a security strategy is concerned, the Kremlin has embraced the classical theory of nuclear containment as its main mechanism. At the same time, Russia will be following a contemporary worldwide trend of producing high-precision long-range conventional weapons that can also later be used for strategic containment purposes. READ ALSO: Do the Russians Want War? Moscow’s **emphasis** on nuclear containment forces it to follow the classical geopolitical conceptions of “air force” and “naval force”. Hence, strategic bombers, joined by drones and fifth-generation fighter aircraft, will form the core of its Air Force. The Navy will be modernized with an emphasis on long-range submarines and securing an “oceanic fleet” with a strategic presence in regions of interest. In March 2012, Vice-Admiral Viktor Churikov, Russia’s Air Force Commander, confirmed the decision to have a permanent operational unit of five to six ships from Russia’s Black Sea fleet stationed in the Mediterranean and said that similar units may be formed to navigate the Pacific and Indian Oceans. According to other sources, Russia was in negotiations with Vietnam this winter about opening military bases there. Putin is critical of modernization in the form of “spot purchases” of Western equipment (such as the acquisition of French Mistral aircraft carriers) and supports the modernization of Russia’s own military industrial sector. **High-priority** weaponry and combat equipment for Russia’s Armed Forces include **modern nuclear arms** (many of the existing missiles have been in service for over 20 years and must be upgraded) and air and space defence systems, complete with new anti-aircraft armaments; high-tech communications, reconnaissance and control systems; unmanned drones; personal combat protection systems; high-precision weapons and the means to counteract them. Russia’s Armed Forces are to focus on nuclear containment and conventional high-precision weapons, developing oceanic naval forces, the Air Force and space defence. The goal is to create a common national system of air and space defence. Together with nuclear containment forces, it will counter the antiaircraft systems of, above all, the USA and NATO. Geographically, Russia will be “a guarantor of stability” in Eurasia: an collective security system for the “Eurasian space” based on the Collective Security Treaty Organization is in the works, and the North (primarily the resource-rich Arctic) and the Asian-Pacific region will be high-priority regions for the Kremlin.

That prevents accidental nuclear use

Mosher 3 (David, Senior Policy Analyst in Nuclear Weapons Policy – RAND, “Excessive Force”, RAND Corporation, Fall, http://www.rand.org/pubs/periodicals/rand-review/issues/fall2003/force.html)

Russian strategic nuclear forces remain the only current threat to the national **existence** of the United States. Although the risk of deliberate attack from Russia has sharply fallen since the end of the Cold War, the risk of an **accidental** or **unauthorized** use of Russian nuclear forces has arguably **risen**. For example, Russia’s early-warning system has severely **deteriorated**, as has the country’s ability to keep its mobile (and thus survivable) nuclear forces deployed. There are additional concerns about the state of Russia’s command-and-control system and the rise of separatist violence. None of the nuclear arms control treaties after the Cold War have dealt with the issue of accidental or unauthorized use of nuclear weapons. Instead, these treaties have concentrated on reducing the total number of nuclear warheads each side wields. While these reductions are extremely important for improving the overall U.S.-Russian relationship, they do little to ease the risks of an accidental or unauthorized nuclear launch. This is because those risks stem from the nuclear postures and underlying nuclear doctrines of each nation, which remain firmly rooted in the hostile relationship forged during the Cold War.

Russian accidental launch causes extinction

Mintz 1 (Morton, Former Chair – Fund for Investigative Journalism and Reporter – Washington Post, “Two Minutes to Launch”, The American Prospect, http://www.prospect.org/cs/articles?article=two\_minutes\_to\_launch)

Hair-trigger alert means this: The missiles carrying those warheads are armed and fueled at all times. Two thousand or so of these warheads are on the intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) targeted by Russia at the United States; 1,800 are on the ICBMs targeted by the United States at Russia; and approximately 1,000 are on the submarine-based missiles targeted by the two nations at each other. These missiles would launch on receipt of three computer-delivered messages. Launch crews--on duty every second of every day--are under orders to send the messages on receipt of a single computer-delivered command. In no more than two minutes, if all went according to plan, Russia or the United States could launch missiles at predetermined targets: Washington or New York; Moscow or St. Petersburg. The early-warning systems on which the launch crews rely would detect the other side's missiles within tens of seconds, causing the intended--or accidental--enemy to mount retaliatory strikes. "**Within a half-hour, there could be a nuclear war that would extinguish all of us**," explains Bruce Blair. "It would be, basically, a nuclear war by checklist, by rote."

### A2: Shale

Won’t flood because of shale --- they’re investing in it

Jaffe 13 (Amy Myers, Executive Director for Energy and Sustainability – University of California-Davis, Former Fellow in Energy Studies and Director – James Baker III Institute for Public Policy, “OPEC Reacts to US Shale Oil Boom with New Strategy”, The Energy Collective, 4-15, http://theenergycollective.com/amjaffe/209501/opec-starts-react-us-shale-boom-new-strategy)

The first signs are emerging that key Persian Gulf members of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) are adjusting their strategies to cope with the growing threat that North American shale oil is making to their long-term dominance in global energy markets. The OPEC moves lag behind other international players such as Statoil and Sinochem, who are staking out a major stake in the U.S. shale industry but provide the first insights on how major oil producers might respond over time to the possibility of a future supply glut: Integration through foreign investment. The U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA) tallies that 20 percent of the $133.7 billion in investment in U.S. shale plays between 2008 and 2012 included joint ventures by foreign companies. In 2013, China’s Sinochem entered into a $1.7 billion venture with Pioneer Resources for a stake in the Wolfcamp shale. Liquefied natural gas (LNG) powerhouse Qatar Petroleum (QP) might be next, according to Middle East Economic Survey. QP is considering investment in Canadian or U.S. shale upstream assets as a price hedge for its planned investment along with ExxonMobil to convert the Golden Pass LNG import terminal near Port Arthur, Texas, to an export facility. The QP strategy mirrors Statoil, which aimed to sustain a high growth path through diversification to foreign investment as it hit up against production constraints inside Norway. Qatar is facing possible long-term decline in its future crude oil production as well as an extended moratorium on further development of the massive North Field natural gas field. Saudi Arabia can also tap its ongoing downstream investment and integration to **protect** its exports from shale oil competition. The expansion of Saudi Aramco’s joint venture Motiva refinery in Port Arthur, Texas, gives the Saudis leverage to try to maintain their geopolitically prominent, one million barrels a day plus crude exports to the United States even in the face of rising supplies from U.S. shale oil and Canadian oil sands. Saudi Arabia can ill-afford to get knocked out of the U.S. crude oil market at this delicate time when U.S. support could be more critical to the kingdom’s future. Saudi Arabia is also pursuing shale resources at home, which Baker Hughes estimates to be as large as 645 trillion cubic feet. Saudi Aramco has committed $9 billion to pilot projects such as the Quesaiba shale and the Nafud Basin north of Riyadh.

Shale oil not cost competitive --- won’t cause a flood

Arab News 13 (“Shale oil ‘unlikely to hurt Saudi exports’”, 3-25, http://www.arabnews.com/news/445785)

The entry of shale oil into world markets is **not likely** to pose any major challenge to conventional oil exporters such as Saudi Arabia in the Gulf in the near future, according to fossil fuel researchers and analysts. Analysts argue that factors such as the cost of the production, environment threats and alternative markets will ensure there is continued demand for conventional oil even if the US market is saturated with shale oil. Asharq Al-Awsat discussed the issue with three prominent experts in the oil market and economy. Turki Al-Hoqail, an economic analyst based in Washington DC, said the shale oil revolution in the US has the potential to change the map of global oil trade in the long term because it would ensure that the US achieves self sufficiency in its oil demand and reduce imports. Kamel Al-Haremi, a Kuwaiti oil-analyst, said the US depends for 85 percent of its oil needs on local output and neighboring producers Canada and Mexico. Only 15 percent of oil is imported from regions such as the Middle East. He feared that this low percentage will also disappear when the US achieves self sufficiency in the field of shale oil by between 2017 and 2020 and will emerge as a dominant force in the oil market. On the other hand, Saudi Shoura Council Member Fahd bin Jama, a well-known oil analyst, said he believed that the US shale oil will be not a cheap affair. “The flooding of the oil market with the shale oil will not be logical because the cost of a barrel will be around $ 60 and its flooding will eat away profit margins of companies in the field and, which will, in turn, **strengthen** the survival of the conventional sources of oil at least for the next 30 years,” he said. Al-Hoqail also supported this view. He says that the shale oil, with a production cost of $ 65-$ 75, will **never be a threat** to Gulf oil exporters including Saudi Arabia. Production costs vary between $ 7 to $ 15 in the region, he says.

Shale won’t materialize

Reuters 12 (“U.S. shale oil won't flood global market-EOG CEO”, 11-28, http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/11/28/eog-oil-idUSL1E8MS69S20121128)

Nov 28 (Reuters) - Crude oil extracted from the United States shale formations is **not likely** to flood the global market because only the Eagle Ford and Bakken formations are driving significant growth, EOG Resources Inc's chief executive Mark Papa said on Wednesday. From 2011 to 2015, EOG expects U.S. oil production will grow only 2 million barrels per day to 7.7 million barrels, driven mostly by higher output from the Eagle Ford in South Texas and the Bakken in North Dakota, Papa told the Jefferies Global Energy Conference in Houston. The Eagle and Bakken accounted for more than 80 percent of U.S. crude oil extracted from shale and other rock from 2005 to 2012, while other basins like the Woodford and the Mississippian have produced **little crude**, Papa said, citing data from energy consulting firm IHS. "Think of how many companies are saying the future of their oil growth is those kind of plays," the executive said on a webcast. "On a national basis, they are **insignificant**. It's a **lot of PR**, is what it is." Oil production from the promising Utica shale in Ohio will be **negligible** over the long-term, he said.

Hot damn! - cutbacks now

FoxNews, 13 (Kelly David Burke, “Obama administration cuts back oil shale development”, Published June 22, 2013, http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2013/06/22/obama-administration-cuts-back-oil-shale-development/)

Controversy is heating up over an administration plan to drastically reduce the amount of federal lands available for oil shale development in the American West. The Bush administration had set aside 1.3 million acres for oil shale and tar sands development in Colorado, Utah and Wyoming. The new Bureau of Land Management plan cuts that amount by two-thirds, down to 700,000 acres, a decision that has prompted industry outrage. "What they basically did was make it so that nobody is going to want to spend money going after oil shale on federal government lands," said Dan Kish, Senior Vice President of Institute for Energy Research.

### Link

Renewed drilling in the Gulf empirically lowers oil prices substantially

Hargreaves, 12

Steve Hargreaves is a staff writer for CNNMoney.com, where he focuses on the energy industry.

Previously, Hargreaves lived and worked in Bangkok and Istanbul, freelance writing and teaching English, and has been published in the Village Voice and the Australian Financial Review. He has also worked as a municipal beat reporter at a daily newspaper in Brunswick, Me., and as a freelancer for Portland's alternative weekly covering city politics. Hargreaves holds a B.A. in environmental studies from St. Lawrence University. “The oil industry's plan to lower gas prices,” 3/23/12 http://money.cnn.com/2012/03/23/news/economy/oil-industry-gas-prices/index.htm

Eighteen years is a long time to wait. But the industry says that if Obama merely announced such a plan, oil prices would drop overnight in anticipation of this new production. "Markets are driven by expectations," Jack Gerard, president of the American Petroleum Institute, said on a recent conference call. Saudi Arabia can't save us from high oil prices Gerard noted that oil prices fell $16 in the two days in 2008 after George W. Bush lifted a moratorium on drilling off the coasts, a moratorium that was effectively reinstated after BP's (BP) Gulf of Mexico disaster.

The plan causes a flood

Schelmetic 11 (Tracey E., Contributor – TMC, “Saudi Prince Frets that High Oil Prices will Spur Drive to Alternative Energy”, TMC, 6-1, http://green.tmcnet.com/channels/renewable-energy/articles/181084-saudi-prince-frets-that-high-oil-prices-will.htm, Deech)

What do you do when you're a theocratic ruler of an oil-rich nation and you see the insidious creep of **alternative energy** technologies coming to end your party? You worry, apparently. Saudi Arabian prince Alwaleed bin Talal recently told CNN that his country wants to see oil prices **come down** to between **$70** and $80 a barrel. The reason? The Saudi rulers are **apprehensive** that high oil prices are spurring Western countries to seek replacement energy sources. The prince is concerned that if oil prices remain at high current levels, countries that use a lot of petroleum products – like the U.S. and Western European nations – will be encouraged to invest in alternative energy sources such as **solar**, **wind power**, **geothermal heat**, **hydropower** and **other technologies** – all of which would be **detrimental** to the oil-rich nation.

### A2: Dutch Disease

High oil prices solve Dutch disease --- creates resiliency

Grinkevich 12 (Vlad, Economic Commentator – RIA Novosti, “High Oil Prices Open “Window of Opportunity” for Russian Economy”, RIA Novosti, 1-27, http://en.rian.ru/analysis/20120127/170994608.html)

Speaking at a news conference at RIA Novosti on Thursday, Odd Per Brekk, senior resident representative of the IMF office in Russia, said that high oil prices have opened a “**window of opportunity**” for Russia to take measures to **strengthen** and **protect** its economy. To take full advantage of this opportunity, the Russian government must undertake a complete economic transformation – keeping inflation at 3%-5%, cutting budget expenses, improving the financial sector, creating an attractive investment climate and eventually reducing the dependence of its economy on the export of raw materials. In other words, Moscow must pursue comprehensive economic modernization, funded by its oil and gas revenues.

**High GDP ensures increased productivity and lowered inflation**

**Bentley 08** – Moscow News business editor (Ed “Russia’s Roaring Economy not out of the Forest” Moscow News 06/06/2006 http://www.themoscownews.com/business/20080606/55331949.html)

GDP and growth Last year, GDP increased by 8.1 percent, marking an eighth straight year of economic growth. GDP has increased by an average of 7.8 percent a year since 2000, making Russia significantly richer than when Putin assumed office. The IMF predicts that economic growth will remain over 5 percent a year until 2013. However, Russia's GDP per capita of $9,075 is still significantly below that of other G8 nations. Both the U.S. and the U.K. have a GDP per capita of approximately $45,000 and this is set to rise to $55,723 in the U.S. by 2013, according to IMF data. The IMF estimates that GDP per capita in Russia will be $25,090 in 2013. Presently, Russians are less wealthy than their G8 counterparts. Prospects Until 2020 Due to energy prices the Russian economy is in a position with significant potential. Eight years of impressive growth are likely to continue into the future and Russia will begin to catch up with other countries according to IMF predictions. However, for the long term success and stability of the economy, two significant challenges must be overcome. Lowering inflation would create a stable economy which would encourage investment and fuel future growth. Furthermore, diversification is needed to ensure long term growth and protect against shocks in the energy market. As Chizhov suggested, developing high tech industries would allow for substantial growths in GDP and productivity, extending beyond 2020

**No Russian Dutch disease**

**RT 11** (“The Russian economy and its oil,” 5/24, http://rt.com/business/news/russia-economy-oil-rpice)//mat

RT: What is the best way the government can diversify the economy and at the same time take advantage of the energy resources that it has? SD: “Well that’s a slightly different question. The answer to that is very simple. If you are endowed with significant natural resources, one way how you diversify your economy, if this is still the core of your economy, the core of your wealth, the way you diversify and the way you make the economy more diversified is by creating more value added. So I think the clear sort of strategic goal that the Russian government should pursue is increasing the degree of refining of, for example, for oil. So instead of selling simple vacuum gas oil, maybe fuel oil, which is subsequently being refined into high value added products in the west, you build these refining complexes here. Instead of burning associated gas, for example, you create petrochemical refining complexes which process it into various liquefied gas, and various associated petrochemical products, and you export that. So, I don’t think it is fair to say that, ok if you have a natural resource driven economy, you are in a bad situation. I mean Australia has a natural resource driven economy, and so does Canada, and so does Norway, but there are always ways, if you think about things to create value to make it more diversified, and the more you add value, the more added value is in the product you sell the less vulnerable you are to commodity price swings. Because commodity price swings affect, fir4st and foremost, the raw natural resources, and to a much lesser degree they affect the final product. So we all know how much the oil price changes every day, but the price per tonne of rubber or plastic or certain petrochemical specialized products doesn’t change that often. It’s subject to much more longer term contracts. And if you go from producing gas to also producing electricity, that doesn’t change daily, it’s not as volatile. So there are different ways, I think, how you can diversify the economy, and simply make Russia, instead of raw material exporter, into a high quality, high value added energy exporter. In different types of energy, and different types of resources, as your final product. And that I think is the only kind of reasonable diversification strategy.” RT Do you think Russia has Dutch disease and how does energy reliance work in Russia with the import competing sector? SD: “There are elements of Dutch disease, so I think not all the symptoms are here because the oil industry is not, Dutch disease happens when one industry, in this case oil and gas industry, really begins to crowd out investment and jobs and becomes the centre of everything, so the rest of the economy kind of dies. In the Russian case, it’s a little bit different because a lot of the money that flows into the country, via the oil and gas sector, subsequently flows further into the economy. So the impact from the oil and gas sector for example, on the currency is not what it used to be. So, yeah, if the oil prices are high it gets stronger, but it’s not dramatically stronger, and I think the economy is becoming, in relative terms, it is getting better if oil prices are high, instead of getting worse. Dutch disease really happens if there is one sector that is doing well and it drains resources from all the other sectors. In Russia’s case when oil prices are high, all sectors are enjoying it because it trickles down to the entire economy. So I think there are certain elements of it, but I don’t think Russia has Dutch disease, and whatever people say, fortunately if oil prices are high it is good for Russia, and it is good for Russia as a whole, not just for Russian oil companies.” RT: How open is the Russian energy sector to foreign investment? SD: “It’s both open and closed.I think it is fairly open to larger strategic deals.We have seen BP-Rosneft deal, which although it has been declined, for the time being, on technical grounds, and it didn’t happen, the fact that both sides wanted to do it, that the Russian government was willing to receive that investment, and BP was willing to make it, I think it is a big testament to how open the industry is for business.Total bought a big stake in Novatek, there are certain PSAs which continue to operate.If they went through difficult times, but both Sakhalin 1 and Sakhalin 2 are producing energy and making money off it.So on the one hand it is open, on the other hand it clearly has become much more concentrated among the top players, so if you look beyond that, there are various laws on participation in the Russian oil and gas sector, and, in general, if you are an up and coming western company that wants to come in and develop the Russian reserves, I think you would have a problem unless you are a global major that can bring something to the table with technology with capital etc, then I think it is fairly open.So, I think it is more open than many many other emerging markets in the world.I would say that for big companies it is fairly open, for small and mid sized companies it is fairly difficult, simply because the industry has become a lot more concentrated in recent years.” RT: Do you think energy prices will remain about where they are for the short to medium term, and what does this mean for the Russian economy? SD: “Well we went through the period two years ago when the oil went from $90/bbl to $150/bbl down to $30/bbl, and for every price level there was an absolutely credible explanation why this is the right price level.So I really have no idea what the oil price will be in the future.The various research suggest that the price of about $60-$80/bbl makes production of oil economical for most of the producers – so if it drops below $60 a lot of people would have to stop production because they would begin to lose money – and at a price of about $80/bbl everyone is making a reasonable margin for them to continue doing it – so I think we should probably see the oil price gradually weakening a little bit to where it was before the latest rally.And speaking about Russia $75-$80/bbl would give the government more or less a balanced budget and more or less kind of stable existence for one or two years, but I think the way the social expenditures, and the way the budget expenditures have been growing – that pace of growth would not be sustainable with the $80 barrel of oil.So, $75-$80 is OK to balance the budget one or two years – maybe borrow money a little bit externally – going forward, I haven’t done this calculation, but there have been some analysts who have done the math, and it seems that every year Russia would need an oil price of about $5-$10 dollars per year higher to meet the rising budget expenditures.”

## Spills

**Oceans resilient**

**Kennedy 2** (Victor, Coastal and Marine Ecosystems and Global Climate Change, http://www.pewclimate.org/projects/marine.cfm)

There is evidence that marine organisms and ecosystems are resilient to environmental change. Steele (1991) hypothesized that the biological components of marine systems are tightly coupled to physical factors, allowing them to respond quickly to rapid environmental change and thus rendering them ecologically adaptable. Some species also have wide genetic variability throughout their range, which may allow for adaptation to climate change.

#### No impact to biodiversity

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

Note – Colin Tudge - Research Fellow at the Centre for Philosophy at the London School of Economics. Frmr Zoological Society of London: Scientific Fellow and tons of other positions. PhD. Read zoology at Cambridge.

Simon Levin = Moffet Professor of Biology, Princeton. 2007 American Institute of Biological Sciences Distinguished Scientist Award 2008 Istituto Veneto di Scienze Lettere ed Arti 2009 Honorary Doctorate of Science, Michigan State University 2010 Eminent Ecologist Award, Ecological Society of America 2010 Margalef Prize in Ecology, etc… PhD

Although one may agree with ecologists such as Ehrlich and Raven that the earth stands on **the brink of** an episode of **massive extinction, it may not follow** from this grim fact **that human** being**s will suffer** as a result. On the contrary, skeptics such as science writer Colin Tudge have challenged biologists to explain **why we need more than a tenth of the 10 to 100 million species that grace the earth**. Noting that "cultivated systems often out-produce wild systems by 100-fold or more," Tudge declared that "the argument that humans need the variety of other species is, when you think about it, a theological one." n343 Tudge observed that "the elimination of all but a tiny minority **of our fellow creatures does not affect the material well-being of humans** one iota."n344 This skeptic challenged ecologists to list more than 10,000 species (other than unthreatened microbes) that are essential to ecosystem productivity or functioning. n345 "**The human species could survive just as well** if 99.9% of our fellow creatures went extinct, provided only that we retained the appropriate 0.1% that we need." n346   [\*906]   The monumental Global Biodiversity Assessment ("the Assessment") identified two positions with respect to redundancy of species. "At one extreme is the idea that each species is unique and important, such that its removal or loss will have demonstrable consequences to the functioning of the community or ecosystem." n347 The authors of the Assessment, a panel of eminent ecologists, endorsed this position, saying it is "unlikely that there is much, if any, ecological redundancy in communities over time scales of decades to centuries, the time period over which environmental policy should operate." n348 These eminent ecologists rejected the opposing view, "the notion that species overlap in function to a sufficient degree that removal or loss of a species will be compensated by others, with negligible overall consequences to the community or ecosystem." n349  Other biologists believe, however, that species are so fabulously redundant in the ecological functions they perform that the life-support systems and processes of the planet and ecological processes in general will function perfectly well with fewer of them, certainly fewer than the millions and millions we can expect to remain **even if** **every threatened organism becomes extinct**.

MARKED

 n350 Even the kind of sparse and miserable world depicted in the movie Blade Runner could provide a "sustainable" context for the human economy as long as people forgot their aesthetic and moral commitment to the glory and beauty of the natural world. n351 The Assessment makes this point. "Although any ecosystem contains hundreds to thousands of species interacting among themselves and their physical environment, the emerging consensus is that the system is driven by a small number of . . . biotic variables on whose interactions the balance of species are, in a sense, carried along." n352   [\*907]   To make up your mind on the question of the functional redundancy of species, consider an endangered species of bird, plant, or insect and ask how the ecosystem would fare in its absence. The fact that the creature is endangered suggests an answer: it is already in limbo as far as ecosystem processes are concerned. What crucial ecological services does the black-capped vireo, for example, serve? Are any of the species threatened with extinction necessary to the provision of any ecosystem service on which humans depend? If so, which ones are they?  Ecosystems and the species that compose them have changed, dramatically, continually, and totally in virtually every part of the United States. There is little ecological similarity, for example, between New England today and the land where the Pilgrims died. n353 In view of the constant reconfiguration of the biota, **one may wonder why Americans have not suffered more as a result of ecological catastrophes**. The cast of species in nearly every environment changes constantly-local extinction is commonplace in nature-but the crops still grow. Somehow, it seems, property values keep going up on Martha's Vineyard in spite of the tragic disappearance of the heath hen.  One might argue that the sheer number and variety of creatures available to any ecosystem buffers that system against stress. Accordingly, we should be concerned if the "library" of creatures ready, willing, and able to colonize ecosystems gets too small. (Advances in genetic engineering may well permit us to write a large number of additions to that "library.") In the United States as in many other parts of the world, however, the number of species has been increasing dramatically, not decreasing, as a result of human activity. This is because the hordes of exotic species coming into ecosystems in the United States far exceed the number of species that are becoming extinct. Indeed, introductions may outnumber extinctions by more than ten to one, so that the United States is becoming more and more species-rich all the time largely as a result of human action. n354 [\*908] Peter Vitousek and colleagues estimate that over 1000 non-native plants grow in California alone; in Hawaii there are 861; in Florida, 1210. n355 In Florida more than 1000 non-native insects, 23 species of mammals, and about 11 exotic birds have established themselves. n356 Anyone who waters a lawn or hoes a garden knows how many weeds desire to grow there, how many birds and bugs visit the yard, and how many fungi, creepy-crawlies, and other odd life forms show forth when it rains. All belong to nature, from wherever they might hail, but not many homeowners would claim that there are too few of them. Now, not all exotic species provide ecosystem services; indeed, some may be disruptive or have no instrumental value. n357 This also may be true, of course, of native species as well, especially because all exotics are native somewhere. Certain exotic species, however, such as Kentucky blue grass, establish an area's sense of identity and place; others, such as the green crabs showing up around Martha's Vineyard, are nuisances. n358 Consider an analogy [\*909] with human migration. Everyone knows that after a generation or two, immigrants to this country are hard to distinguish from everyone else. The vast majority of Americans did not evolve here, as it were, from hominids; most of us "came over" at one time or another. This is true of many of our fellow species as well, and they may fit in here just as well as we do. It is possible to distinguish exotic species from native ones for a period of time, just as we can distinguish immigrants from native-born Americans, but as the centuries roll by, species, like people, fit into the landscape or the society, changing and often enriching it. Shall we have a rule that a species had to come over on the Mayflower, as so many did, to count as "truly" American? Plainly not. When, then, is the cutoff date? Insofar as we are concerned with the absolute numbers of "rivets" holding ecosystems together, extinction seems not to pose a general problem because a far greater number of kinds of mammals, insects, fish, plants, and other creatures thrive on land and in water in America today than in prelapsarian times. n359 The Ecological Society of America has urged managers to maintain biological diversity as a critical component in strengthening ecosystems against disturbance. n360 Yet as Simon Levin observed, "much of the detail about species composition will be irrelevant in terms of influences on ecosystem properties." n361 [\*910] He added: "For net primary productivity, as is likely to be the case for any system property, **biodiversity matters only up to a point**; above a certain level, increasing biodiversity is likely to make **little difference**." n362 What about the use of plants and animals in agriculture? There is no scarcity foreseeable. "Of an estimated 80,000 types of plants [we] know to be edible," a U.S. Department of the Interior document says, "only about 150 are extensively cultivated." n363 About twenty species, not one of which is endangered, provide ninety percent of the food the world takes from plants. n364 Any new food has to take "shelf space" or "market share" from one that is now produced. Corporations also find it difficult to create demand for a new product; for example, people are not inclined to eat paw-paws, even though they are delicious. It is hard enough to get people to eat their broccoli and lima beans. It is harder still to develop consumer demand for new foods. This may be the reason the Kraft Corporation does not prospect in remote places for rare and unusual plants and animals to add to the world's diet. Of the roughly 235,000 flowering plants and 325,000 nonflowering plants (including mosses, lichens, and seaweeds) available, farmers ignore virtually all of them in favor of a very few that are profitable. n365 To be sure, any of the more than 600,000 species of plants could have an application in agriculture, but would they be preferable to the species that are now dominant? Has anyone found any consumer demand for any of these half-million or more plants to replace rice or wheat in the human diet? There are reasons that farmers cultivate rice, wheat, and corn rather than, say, Furbish's lousewort. There are many kinds of louseworts, so named because these weeds were thought to cause lice in sheep. How many does agriculture really require? [\*911] The species on which agriculture relies are domesticated, not naturally occurring; they are developed by artificial not natural selection; they might not be able to survive in the wild. n366 This argument is not intended to deny the religious, aesthetic, cultural, and moral reasons that command us to respect and protect the natural world. These spiritual and ethical values should evoke action, of course, but we should also recognize that they are spiritual and ethical values. We should recognize that ecosystems and all that dwell therein compel our moral respect, our aesthetic appreciation, and our spiritual veneration; we should clearly seek to achieve the goals of the ESA. There is no reason to assume, however, that these goals have anything to do with human well-being or welfare as economists understand that term. These are ethical goals, in other words, not economic ones. Protecting the marsh may be the right thing to do for moral, cultural, and spiritual reasons. We should do it-but someone will have to pay the costs. In the narrow sense of promoting human welfare, protecting nature often represents a net "cost," not a net "benefit." It is largely for moral, not economic, reasons-ethical, not prudential, reasons- that we care about all our fellow creatures. They are valuable as objects of love not as objects of use. What is good for   [\*912]  the marsh may be good in itself even if it is not, in the economic sense, good for mankind. The most valuable things are quite useless.
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#### Striking Syria is key to preserve global stability and prevent escalation of hotspots

Miller, 9/4

Chris Miller, nine-year veteran of the US army, serving in nuclear, biological and chemical defense, reporter for The Guardian; “nine-year veteran of the US army, serving in nuclear, biological and chemical defense,” 9/4/2013, http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2013/sep/04/chemical-weapons-red-line-world //bghs-ms

Echoing President Barack Obama's remarks of a year ago, US Secretary of State John Kerry has called the use of chemical weapons a "red line for the world", asserting that evidence shows beyond a reasonable doubt the Assad regime used Sarin nerve gas against its own people. Failing to act now would push that red line back and send a message that the use of chemical weapons will be frowned upon, but that nothing will result other than stern international admonitions. This would reverse the tide that has been rolling back the use of chemical warfare for the last 25 years. Chemical weapons are a world red line, and action is necessary to protect hard-won international progress against chemical weapons proliferation. The long war against chemical weapons use The first world war was the first occasion on which chemical weapons were used on a large scale in war. The results of these attacks, mostly on British and German soldiers, were so horrendous that a prohibition of their use was included in the 1925 Geneva Protocol – subsequently ratified by 138 nations. This was the first formal recognition that the use of chemical weapons is a red line for the world community. The US and USSR took another step against chemical weapons by agreeing to cease production and set up an inspection regime in the1989 Wyoming Agreement. Then, in 1993, the world again pushed forward the red line to halt the production, stockpiling, and use of chemical weapons in the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC). The rest of the world has kept these agreements, and the reduction of chemical weapons has progressed steadily ever since. The Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW), the enforcement agency of the CWC, has reported that 72% of the world's declared stockpiles have been eliminated, as of 2011. The rest are scheduled to decommissioned within the next few years. These are mostly located in Libya and Iraq, but crucially, they are secured and will be eliminated with co-operation from other CWC signatory states. The US has eliminated 90% of its chemical weapons and Russia over 60%. There are reports of chemical weapons use by Russia, Vietnam, and Cambodia in the late 1970s and early 1980s. Saddam Hussein notoriously used chemical weapons against Kurds around Halabja, and during the Iran-Iraq war in 1988. Halabja memorial (AP) However, there have now been no proven lethal chemical attacks in 25 years. Worldwide, the use of chemical weapons in war has virtually ceased since the 1993 adoption of the CWC. Only Syria has continually chosen to ignore the world's red line on chemical weapons; it is one of only seven nations in the world that refuses to ratify the CWC. (It is joined only by Angola, North Korea, Egypt, and South Sudan; Israel and Burma/Myanmar have signed the CWC, but not ratified it.) At a time when the rest of the world was eliminating chemical weapons, Syria was actively stockpiling precursor chemicals and building what has become one of the largest chemical weapons arsenals in the world. In July 2012, an official Assad regime spokesman, Jihad Makdissi, declared it was Syrian government policy that chemical weapons would not be used against Syrians, but reserved the right to use them against any external forces. So, Assad could not even keep his own declared red line on chemical weapons use. Unleashing nerve gas on noncombatants in Damascus was a big step over the line. What about other conflict-zone 'red lines'? Throughout the last century, the world has borne witness to violence throughout the world, including violent political crackdowns, ethnic cleansing, religious conflict, assassinations and border wars. In virtually every one, international law, norms and values – "red lines", if you will – have been stretched or broken. Victims and refugees caught in these conflicts have repeatedly called for intervention by outside powers. Most of these calls have been made on the United States and other western powers. Sometimes, we have answered; most often, we have not. So what makes this "red line" different and why should we act this time? The world order has been in turmoil since the fall of the Soviet Union in 1990 upended the geopolitical bipolarity of the previous 50 years. Former Soviet satellites in eastern Europe and the Caucasus continue to struggle for their own identity and to remain independent. The Arab Spring uprisings are tearing apart the old political order in the Middle East, while the rise of China is making its Asian neighbours nervous and attracting American attention. South American nations continue their journey out of poverty and away from repressive regimes. Meanwhile, the US is coming to the end of over a decade at war, in Afghanistan and Iraq. Finally, we have already witnessed over 100,000 deaths in Syria. Not all of the benefits the world was promised when the US and its allies prevailed in the cold war anti-Communist struggle have materialised. In some parts of the world, things seem to be regressing, rather than improving. That is why it is important to preserve and jealously guard what progress has been made in working toward a more peaceful world – even if that means turning to military action against rogue states in order to do so. The steady worldwide reduction of chemical weapons is a prime example of that progress – one that we cannot allow to be eroded so easily. A failure to act after the Assad regime has crossed that red line would be akin to the world retreating and setting a new, weaker standard without a fight. No state other than Syria has dared to cross the line of chemical weapons use in a quarter-century. If we do not act today, we have set a new world precedent that says the use of chemical weapons is frowned upon, but there will be no serious consequences. We should not retreat so easily without serious consideration of what we would be sacrificing for the future. Until this moment, the world was on the cusp of eliminating one of the unholy trinity of weapons of mass destruction. Quietly, steadily, we had been approaching the point where we would one day be able to say we had eliminated chemical weapons.

**\*\*UQ\*\***

**Here’s predictive evidence – momentum for a strike is building in Congress – Obama is key to build that momentum**

**Today Online, 9/4**

“Obama gets top Republican support on Syria strike,” 9/4/2013, https://www.todayonline.com/world/americas/obama-gets-top-republican-support-syria-strike //bghs-ms

**Plans for US military strike on Assad regime wins significant momentum but doubts remain within ranks of both Democrats and Republicans** WASHINGTON — United States President Barack Obama’s call for a military strike in Syria won significant momentum yesterday (Sept 3), with leaders of both parties in Congress saying they are convinced that Syrian President Bashar Assad used chemical weapons against his own people and that the US should respond. The top Republican in Congress, House of Representatives Speaker John Boehner, said taking action is something “the United States as a country needs to do”. Mr Boehner emerged from a meeting at the White House and said the United States has “enemies around the world that need to understand that we’re not going to tolerate this type of behaviour”. Mr Obama on Saturday unexpectedly stepped back from ordering a military strike under his own authority and announced he would seek congressional approval. The president urged Congress to hold a prompt vote once it returns from holiday next week. He also tried to assure the public that involvement in Syria will be a “limited, proportional step”. “This is not Iraq, and this is not Afghanistan,” Mr Obama said. He met with top lawmakers hours before he leaves on a three-day trip to Europe, with a visit to Sweden and a G-20 summit in Russia The US says it has proof that the Assad regime is behind sarin gas attacks that Washington claims killed at least 1,429 people, including more than 400 children. The Britain-based Syrian Observatory for Human Rights, which collects information from a network of anti-regime activists, says it has so far only been able to confirm 502 dead. The Obama administration argues that the US must exert global leadership in retaliating for what apparently was the deadliest use of chemical weapons anywhere over the past 25 years. Mr Boehner’s support is key, but opposition Republicans in Congress do not speak with one voice. Democrats, too, were divided, although it appeared the administration’s biggest concern was winning support among deeply conservative Republicans who have battled with the president on issue after issue since winning control of the House three years ago. And after a decade of war in Iraq and Afghanistan, polls show most Americans opposed to any new military action overseas.

**Obama is focusing his PC on Syria now – that’s key to Congressional approval of strikes**

**Calmes et al, 9/2**

Jackie Calmes, foreign events writer for the New York Times; “Obama Plans to Meet With Key Lawmakers to Push Syria Plan,” 9/2/2013, http://www.nytimes.com/2013/09/03/world/middleeast/syria.html //bghs-ms

WASHINGTON — The Obama administration pushed forward on Monday for Congressional approval of its plan to carry out a punitive strike against the Syrian government. The lobbying blitz was to continue in the afternoon, with President Obama set to meet at the White House with two key Republican lawmakers, Senator John McCain of Arizona and Senator Lindsey Graham of South Carolina, who have pressed Mr. Obama to intervene more aggressively in Syria. Mr. McCain and Mr. Graham said over the weekend that they might vote against a resolution authorizing military action in Syria because they view the president’s plan as too limited. But many more lawmakers in both parties were taking the oppositie approach of Mr. McCain and Mr. Graham, saying they were wary of a strike on Syria, no matter how limited. The White House was moving aggressively to gain support among the president’s own party, with a 70-minute telephone briefing Monday morning to the House Democratic Caucus by Secretary of State John Kerry, Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel, Gen. Martin E. Dempsey, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Susan E. Rice, the national security adviser, and James R. Clapper Jr., the director of national intelligence. There were 127 House Democrats on the call, nearly two-thirds of their total number. On Tuesday, Mr. Obama is to meet with the leadership of the Senate Armed Services Committee, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, and their counterparts in the House. Administration officials said the influential pro-Israel lobby group AIPAC was already at work pressing for military action against the government of President Bashar al-Assad, fearing that if Syria escapes American retribution for its use of chemical weapons, Iran might be emboldened in the future to attack Israel. In the House, the majority leader, Eric Cantor of Virginia, the only Jewish Republican in Congress, has long worked to challenge Democrats’ traditional base among Jews. One administration official, who, like others, declined to be identified discussing White House strategy, called AIPAC “the 800-pound gorilla in the room,” and said its allies in Congress had to be saying, “If the White House is not capable of enforcing this red line” against the catastrophic use of chemical weapons, “we’re in trouble.” Another official, who acknowledged having deep doubts when the president disclosed on Friday night his desire for a Congressional vote — he said he first thought, “Whoa, why are we doing this?” — by Sunday had joined some other doubters in deciding the gambit was a good one, and would succeed. “At the end of the day, **we’re not going to lose the vote**,” said a third official. Given the risks, however, Mr. Obama’s White House team is wasting no time seeking lawmakers’ support. Although Congress is still in its summer recess, some administration officials traveled to Capitol Hill to meet with House members who might be available and wanted a briefing on Syria.

**-- Dems Key (Link Booster)**

**Democrats key to Congressional approval of a Syria strike – PC is key**

**Everett et al, 9/6**

Burgess Everett, congressional reporter for POLITICO, and Seung Min Kim and Ginger Gibson, reporters for POLITICO; “**Undecided Dems key to Syria decision**,” 9/6/2013, http://www.politico.com/story/2013/09/syria-democrats-congress-96396.html //bghs-ms

Democratic lawmakers are confronting an unpleasant reality: It will be up to them to support military strikes in Syria if they want to save President Barack Obama from a dramatic defeat in Congress. It’s a big ask. Take Tulsi Gabbard, a Hawaii Democrat who doesn’t yet know how she’ll vote on the measure. Gabbard worries about the unintended consequences of a strike in the Middle Eastern nation, which is riven by a complex civil war. “If this authorization is approved and this limited strike occurs as the president has presented, there are a number of things outside of our control that could occur, which could potentially further obligate us into something within Syria and the region,” Gabbard told POLITICO Friday morning after leaving a classified briefing. (WATCH: Timeline of Syria crisis response) If Obama hopes for victory in Congress, he must gain the support of undecided Democrats like Gabbard, who served in the military in Iraq and remains active in the National Guard. Democrats are expected to shoulder a Senate vote, if it’s successful. Few rank-and-file Democrats have taken the step of publicly expressing their support for Obama and his Syria mission, even though Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.) predicts the legislation will ultimately pass the Senate. And the House simply cannot pass — at this time — a use-of-force measure without support from the vast majority of the House Democratic Caucus. A vote in the House is expected in the “next two weeks,” Majority Leader Eric Cantor (R-Va.) wrote in a memo to colleagues Friday. Many Democrats remain in a defensive crouch leaning no, and several House members and senators are publicly stating their opposition. But a president who ran on an anti-war platform endorsing action in Syria may actually help the administration’s case, said Rep. Elijah Cummings (D-Md.), a key Obama ally who remains undecided. (Also on POLITICO: Syria: It's not about the oil) “I think that may be to his advantage. That he in the past has taken the stance he has taken on war, because I think people will say: ‘Okay, here’s somebody who has had this stance for a long time and now he’s saying because of these particular circumstances, I believe that we must do this,’” Cummings said. And other House Democrats want to ensure Congress is playing a major role in the ongoing debate over whether to strike Syria in response to the Assad regime’s alleged use of chemical weapons. “The one thing I would say is that the president should understand … that Congress’s role in matters of war and peace is not just an advisory role,” said Rep. Rush Holt (D-N.J.), who is leaning against military action in Syria. (PHOTOS: Syria: Where politicians stand) Obama and his lieutenants have engaged in a “flood the zone” approach, **contacting** as many as one-third of **lawmakers** individually over the congressional recess and holding several classified briefings on the Hill. Senior administration officials will address the whole House on Monday evening, while White House chief of staff Denis McDonough, who remains highly popular among lawmakers, will meet with the House Democratic Caucus on Tuesday morning. National Security Adviser Susan Rice is meeting with the Congressional Black Caucus on Monday and a full Senate briefing is planned for Monday evening. Several Democrats said Senate leadership is not yet actively drumming up support for Syria, leaving much of heavy lifting to the Obama administration. For some, the White House’s approach is working. One of those Senate leaders, Sen. Chuck Schumer (D-N.Y.), said Friday that he will support authorization of military action, calling the resolution in the Senate “clear, limited and specific.” (See POLITICO’s full Syria coverage) “To me, there is enough evidence that there has been a chemical weapons attack, that it was authorized by the regime and I believe that we have to demonstrate that you can’t do that. So I’m leaning in that direction,” said Sen. Al Franken (D-Minn.), adding that he wanted to make sure the final resolution was narrow enough. Undecided Sen. Tom Carper (D-Del.) said he trusted the administration’s intelligence and its approach. But he said he needed to look at all the evidence himself before he could take the leap into the Syrian conflict. “I trust Barack Obama. I trust Joe Biden. I trust John Kerry. There’s a need to verify, and I’m going through that verification process. It includes briefings, it includes actually reading top secret information,” Carper said.

### Winners Win

#### Winners lose for Obama

Jackie Calmes, NYTimes, 11/12/12, In Debt Talks, Obama Is Ready to Go Beyond Beltway, mobile.nytimes.com/2012/11/12/us/politics/legacy-at-stake-obama-plans-broader-push-for-budget-deal.xml

That story line, stoked by Republicans but shared by some Democrats, holds that Mr. Obama is too passive and deferential to Congress, a legislative naïf who does little to nurture personal relationships with potential allies - in short, not a particularly strong leader. Even as voters re-elected Mr. Obama, those who said in surveys afterward that strong leadership was the most important quality for a president overwhelmingly chose Mr. Romney. George C. Edwards III, a leading scholar of the presidency at Texas A & M University who is currently teaching at Oxford University, dismissed such criticisms as shallow and generally wrong. Yet Mr. Edwards, whose book on Mr. Obama's presidency is titled "Overreach," said, "He didn't understand the limits of what he could do." "They thought they could continuously create opportunities and they would succeed, and then there would be more success and more success, and we'd build this advancing-tide theory of legislation," Mr. Edwards said. "And that was very naïve, very silly. Well, they've learned a lot, I think." "Effective leaders," he added, "exploit opportunities rather than create them." The budget showdown is an opportunity. But like many, it holds risks as well as potential rewards. "This election is the second chance to be what he promised in 2008, and that is to break the gridlock in Washington," said Kenneth M. Duberstein, a Reagan White House chief of staff, who voted for Mr. Obama in 2008 and later expressed disappointment. "But it seems like this is a replay of 2009 and 2010, when he had huge majorities in the House and Senate, rather than recognizing that 'we've got to figure out ways to work together and it's not just what I want.' " For now, at least, Republican lawmakers say they may be open to raising the tax bill for some earners. "We can increase revenue without increasing the tax rates on anybody in this country," said Representative Tom Price, Republican of Georgia and a leader of House conservatives, on "Fox News Sunday." "We can lower the rates, broaden the base, close the loopholes." The challenge for Mr. Obama is to use his postelection leverage to persuade Republicans - or to help Speaker John A. Boehner persuade Republicans - that a tax compromise is in their party's political interest since most Americans favor compromise and higher taxes on the wealthy to reduce annual deficits. Some of the business leaders the president will meet with on Wednesday are members of the new Fix the Debt coalition, which has raised about $40 million to urge lawmakers and their constituents to support a plan that combines spending cuts with new revenue. That session will follow Mr. Obama's meeting with labor leaders on Tuesday. His first trip outside Washington to engage the public will come after Thanksgiving, since Mr. Obama is scheduled to leave next weekend on a diplomatic trip to Asia. Travel plans are still sketchy, partly because his December calendar is full of the traditional holiday parties. Democrats said the White House's strategy of focusing both inside and outside of Washington was smart. "You want to avoid getting sucked into the Beltway inside-baseball games," said Joel Johnson, a former adviser in the Clinton White House and the Senate. "You can still work toward solutions, but make sure you get out of Washington while you are doing that." The president must use his leverage soon, some Democrats added, because it could quickly wane as Republicans look to the 2014 midterm elections, when the opposition typically takes seats from the president's party in Congress.

### -- A2 Hirsch

#### Even if winners win is true, he concedes an independent agenda crowd-out link

Michael Hirsh, National Journal, 2/7/13, There’s No Such Thing as Political Capital, www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207

Presidents are limited in what they can do by time and attention span, of course, just as much as they are by electoral balances in the House and Senate. But this, too, has nothing to do with political capital. Another well-worn meme of recent years was that Obama used up too much political capital passing the health care law in his first term. But the real problem was that the plan was unpopular, the economy was bad, and the president didn’t realize that the national mood (yes, again, the national mood) was at a tipping point against big-government intervention, with the tea-party revolt about to burst on the scene. For Americans in 2009 and 2010—haunted by too many rounds of layoffs, appalled by the Wall Street bailout, aghast at the amount of federal spending that never seemed to find its way into their pockets—government-imposed health care coverage was simply an intervention too far. So was the idea of another economic stimulus. Cue the tea party and what ensued: two titanic fights over the debt ceiling. Obama, like Bush, had settled on pushing an issue that was out of sync with the country’s mood. Unlike Bush, Obama did ultimately get his idea passed. But the bigger political problem with health care reform was that it distracted the government’s attention from other issues that people cared about more urgently, such as the need to jump-start the economy and financial reform. Various congressional staffers told me at the time that their bosses didn’t really have the time to understand how the Wall Street lobby was riddling the Dodd-Frank financial-reform legislation with loopholes. Health care was sucking all the oxygen out of the room, the aides said.

### Strikes Inevitable

#### Even if Obama has the authority, he wouldn’t strike Syria without Congress – our ev cites Obama’s national security adviser – independently Congressional rejection is sufficient to cause the impact

ABC, 9/6

ABC News, citing White House deputy national security adviser Tony Blinken; “No Syria Attack Without Congressional Approval, Obama Aide Says,” 9/6/2013, http://abcnews.go.com/blogs/politics/2013/09/no-syria-attack-without-congressional-approval-obama-aide-says //bghs-ms

The answer, according to one of his top national security advisers, is no — the president does not intend to go forward without Congress. “The president, of course, has the authority to act, but it is neither his desire nor his intention to use that authority absent Congress backing him,” Deputy National Security Adviser Tony Blinken told NPR’s Steve Inskeep this morning. Privately, other senior administration officials have been saying the same thing for days: Absent another major development in Syria, they find it inconceivable that the president would move forward with an attack if Congress fails to authorize it. When President Obama was asked about this on Wednesday at a press conference in Sweden, he said he retains the authority to act, but he said the Congressional vote was more than just symbolic. “I did not take this to Congress just because it’s an empty exercise,” he said. “I think it’s important to have Congress’s support on it.” White House officials say the implications of a no vote go far beyond Syria. If Congress fails to approve this

MARKED

small targeted action, officials believe it would signal a significant pullback of US operations around the world including a quicker withdrawal of US forces in Afghanistan. It would also, officials say, effectively rule out any potential military action against Iran even if the Iranian government moves forward in developing nuclear weapons.