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### 1NC T – Quid Pro Quo

#### Economic engagement must be quid-pro-quo

Shinn 96 [James Shinn, C.V. Starr Senior Fellow for Asia at the CFR in New York City and director of the council’s multi-year Asia Project, worked on economic affairs in the East Asia Bureau of the US Dept of State, “Weaving the Net: Conditional Engagement with China,” pp. 9 and 11, google books]

In sum, conditional engagement consists of a set of objectives, a strategy for attaining those objectives, and tactics (specific policies) for implementing that strategy. The objectives of conditional engagement are the ten principles, which were selected to preserve American vital interests in Asia while accommodating China’s emergence as a major power. The overall strategy of conditional engagement follows two parallel lines: economic engagement, to promote the integration of China into the global trading and financial systems; and security engagement, to encourage compliance with the ten principles by diplomatic and military means when economic incentives do not suffice, in order to hedge against the risk of the emergence of a belligerent China. The tactics of economic engagement should promote China’s economic integration through negotiations on trade liberalization, institution building, and educational exchanges. While a carrots-and-sticks approach may be appropriate within the economic arena, the use of trade sanction to achieve short-term political goals is discouraged. The tactics of security engagement should reduce the risks posed by China’s rapid military expansion, its lack of transparency, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and transnational problems such as crime and illegal migration, by engaging in arms control negotiations, multilateral efforts, and a loosely-structured defensive military arrangement in Asia.8 [To footnotes] 8. Conditional engagement’s recommended tactics of tit-for-tat responses are equivalent to using carrots and sticks in response to foreign policy actions by China. Economic engagement calls for what is described as symmetric tit-for-tat and security engagement for asymmetric tit-for-tat. A symmetric response is one that counters a move by China in the same place, time, and manner; an asymmetric response might occur in another place at another time, and perhaps in another manner. A symmetric tit-for-tat would be for Washington to counter a Chinese tariff of 10 percent on imports for the United States with a tariff of 10 percent on imports from China. An asymmetric tit-for-tat would be for the United States to counter a Chines shipment of missiles to Iran with an American shipment of F-16s to Vietnam (John Lewis Gaddis, Strategies of Containment: A critical Appraisal of Postwar American National Security Policy. New York: Oxford University Press, (1982). This is also cited in Fareed Zakaria, “The Reagan Strategy of Containment,” Political Science Quarterly 105, no. 3 (1990), pp. 383-88).

### 1NC CP

#### [CP TEXT: The United States federal government ought not pass the Outer Continental Shelf Transboundary Hydrocarbon Agreement between the United States and the United Mexican States unless Mexico adopts and enforces legislation for sea turtle conservation abiding by standards outlined in the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Flora and Fauna.]

#### “Implement” mandates certainty.

Kristen Taylor and Sharon Blackwood 13, CHC's professional consultants, “Putting “effective” into your compliance program: Implementation is more than a word,” <http://www.altegrahealth.com/pr/links/Putting_Effective_Into_Your_Compliance_Program.pdf>

The word implement is defined as “to put into effect according to or by means of a definite plan or procedure.”

#### CP’s conditional engagement solves the case and prevents sea turtle population extinction.

Center for Biological Diversity, 7-15-2013, a nonprofit membership organization known for its work protecting endangered species through legal action and scientific petitions, “Tell Mexico: Stop Killing Endangered Sea Turtles,” http://action.biologicaldiversity.org/o/2167/p/dia/action3/common/public/?action\_KEY=13749

Each year at least 2,000 endangered loggerhead sea turtles are caught by shark and halibut fishermen off the southern peninsula of Mexico's Baja California. The turtles drown after being accidentally hooked on longline gear or entangled in gillnets; then they're thrown back into the sea, only to wash up dead on shore. Sea turtle deaths reached record levels last year, and alarmingly high stranding rates continued this spring. Scientists and conservationists have urged Mexico to close fishing areas where sea turtle habitat and risky gear overlap -- but Mexico has failed to take action. The United States and Mexico share this loggerhead sea turtle population, which is listed as endangered in both countries. Please, act now using the form below. Tell Mexico you're fed up with its bycatch and that you support U.S. trade sanctions if Mexico doesn't step up and stop the killing. Stop the Bycatch of Loggerhead Sea Turtles I am writing to ask Mexico to act now and halt the ongoing loggerhead sea turtle bycatch off Baja California Sur. As you know, for two decades scientists have documented turtles becoming hooked or entangled in the Gulf of Ulloa's longline and gillnet fisheries. These fisheries kill an estimated 2,000 loggerheads each year. Last July 483 loggerheads were found stranded on just one stretch of beach -- a 600 percent increase over previous years' averages. And alarmingly high stranding rates have continued this spring. The United States and Mexico share the North Pacific loggerhead sea turtle population, which is listed as endangered in both countries. The United States has closed fishing areas where important sea turtle habitat and risky gear overlap and also requires its fishermen to adopt more sea turtle-friendly gear. Mexico can and must do the same -- or risk the population's extinction. If Mexico does not act, I fully support U.S. trade sanctions until Mexico reduces sea turtle mortality and adopts "comparable" turtle protection measures, as required by international treaty and U.S. law. Sea turtles need protection on both sides of the border, and I urge Mexico to act now to save these ancient and vanishing animals.

#### Destruction of the sea turtle population causes extinction – brink is now.

Todd Steiner, xx-xx-2010, Sea Turtle Restoration Project, Executive Director at Turtle Island Restoration Network, San Francisco Bay Area, “Are Sea Turtles Worth Saving?” http://www.bonaireturtles.org/explore/are-sea-turtles-worth-saving/

Sea turtles demonstrate the ultimate lesson of ecology – that everything is connected. Sea turtles are part of two vital ecosystems, beaches and marine systems. If sea turtles become extinct, both the marine and beach ecosystems will weaken. And since humans use the ocean as an important source for food and use beaches for many kinds of activities, weakness in these ecosystems would have harmful effects on humans. Though sea turtles have been living and thriving in the world’s oceans for 150 million years, they are now in danger of extinction largely because of changes brought about by humans. If we alter the oceans and beaches enough to wipe out sea turtles, will those changes make it difficult for us to survive? And if we choose to do what’s necessary to save sea turtles, might we save our own future? Beaches and dune systems do not get very many nutrients during the year, so very little vegetation grows on the dunes and no vegetation grows on the beach itself. This is because sand does not hold nutrients very well. Sea turtles use beaches and the lower dunes to nest and lay their eggs. Sea turtles lay around 100 eggs in a nest and lay between 3 and 7 nests during the summer nesting season. Not every nest will hatch, not every egg in a nest will hatch, and not all of the hatchlings in a nest will make it out of the nest. All the unhatched nests, eggs and trapped hatchlings are very good sources of nutrients for the dune vegetation. Even the left-over egg shells from hatched eggs provide nutrients. Dune plants use the nutrients from turtle eggs to grow and become stronger. As the dune vegetation grows stronger and healthier, the health of the entire beach/dune ecosystem becomes better. Healthy vegetation and strong root systems hold the sand in the dunes and protect the beach from erosion. As the number of turtles declines, fewer eggs are laid in the beaches, providing less nutrients. If sea turtles went extinct, dune vegetation would lose a major source of nutrients and would not be healthy or strong enough to maintain the dunes, allowing beaches to wash away. Sea turtles eat jellyfish, preventing the large “blooms” of jellyfish – including stinging jellyfish – that are increasingly wreaking havoc on fisheries, recreation and other maritime activities throughout the oceans. Research has shown that sea turtles often act as keystone species. Sea grass beds grazed by green sea turtles are more productive than those that aren’t. Hawksbill turtles eat sponges, preventing them from out-competing slow-growing corals. Both of these grazing activities maintain species diversity and the natural balance of fragile marine ecosystems. If sea turtles go extinct, it will cause declines in all the species whose survival depends on healthy seagrass beds and coral reefs. That means that many marine species that humans harvest would be lost. Sea turtles, and many species that are affected by their presence or absence, are an important attraction for marine tourism, a major source of income for many countries. These are some of the roles that we know sea turtles play in the essential health of ecosystems. Who knows what other roles we will discover as science reveals more about sea turtles? While humans have the ability to tinker with the “clockwork” of life, we don’t have the ability to know when it’s okay to lose a few of the working parts. If you disagree, try to take apart a clock and just throw away one of the pieces that doesn’t look that important. Put the clock back together and see if it still works.

### 1NC – Winnubst K

#### The presumption of an ethical relationship towards the goals of hegemony ignores the brutal underbelly of history – the victories of free societies have been the victories of white, straight males. The aff’s discourse seduces us into championing freedom and stability, only serving to entrench the gratuitous violence done to these bodies.

Winnubst 06 (Shannon, Phd, Associate Professor of Women’s Studies at Ohio State University, *Queering Freedom*, pg. 43-45)

Across the Atlantic and roughly two centuries after Locke’s writing of his Second Treatise, the post-bellum United States entered into some of the nastiest parts of U.S. history. **The operative nexus of racial and sexual difference surfaced with great clarity: black men were lynched on false allegations of raping white women.** These allegations, rarely if ever pursued, sufficed as ample cause for castration, dismemberment, burning at the stake, hanging. This horrific violence set the scene for two dynamics to emerge explicitly and continue with great force into the early twenty-first-century United States psyche: **the sexualizing of racial difference and the racializing of sexual difference.**18 The propertied Christian white male (straight) body19 alone **remained unmarked**, positioned not only as the politically and economically superior subject, but also as the rational, benevolent patriarch in whose hands the security of all bodies rested. Women and non-white men were accordingly positioned below him, most often pitted against one an other through the fear of alleged aggression and manipulation, as a great deal of twentieth-century African American literature shows all too graphically. 20 **The brutal and ugly underbelly of modernity thus surfaced**. A period that emerged philosophically as the triumph of rationality and politically as the victory of representative democracy and its liberal individual, modernity was also the period of the birth of global capitalism and its counterparts of colonialism and slavery.21 Many of the modern categories that we see at work in Locke’s texts emerged in the post-bellum United States with a defensive tenacity that bred political, cultural, psychic, and physical violence. For example, as political categories such as freedom and individualism began to be broadened through the emancipation of slaves, other structures of modernity asserted themselves to shape the exact contours and limits of the kinds of emergent freedoms and rights that would develop. Namely, as the battles around the Fifteenth Amendment and suffragist movements showed, racial and sexual difference emerged as primary fields of signification through which entry to the precious categories of freedom and individual rights had to be negotiated. **The categories of race and gender were being forged in the explicit terms of legal and political documents**. If one was raced or sexed, one had to fight—against other marked (raced, sexed) bodies—for one’s entry into these categories. But the fight turned on evidence of a specific form of rationality. Or, to put it in the language of race and sexual difference, it turned on one’s ability to approximate maleness or whiteness, the two social categories that govern the epistemological category of ‘proper rationality’ and, dialectically, the social category of property ownership. The disjunction of approximating either maleness or whiteness ensured that no set of marked bodies would achieve ‘true’ freedom or individuality: only the white male occupied both positions of power, maleness and whiteness.22 The seduction of freedom thereby became the seduction of **phallicized whiteness**. Consequently, raced and sexed bodies found themselves fighting against one another in a battle that neither of them could ultimately win: the terms were set by an external ‘overseer.’ This historical scene almost perfectly enacts the logic of power that both Nietzsche and Foucault diagnose so clearly: as the structures of modernity began to be contested philosophically (by Hegel and post-Hegelians, particularly Marx) and politically (by Emancipation), the less codified social and political structures emerged with greater clarity and rigidity to control the kinds of political subjectivities that could emerge.23 As freedom and individual rights, which had been acclaimed as universal, began to be exposed as small section of society, the broader and more vaguely articulated structures of racism and sexism began their slow processes of codification. And the singular standard for the legibility of that emergent political subjectivity of individual freedom remained the same: a propertied Christian white (straight) man, the singular subject position that inhabits both maleness and whiteness—and proper rationality. Broad cultural structures of race and sexual difference thus surface as a complicated nexus of power relations in post-bellum practices such as miscegenation, the one-drop rule, and lynching. In these practices, the intersections of race and sex produce a **confusing conflation of values that serve as smoke screens to *obfuscate* the protected, *unmarked subject position of the white man***. Values such as purity, virginity, and passivity are written on the female body as inherent qualities. In what should appear as an obvious contraposition, values such as bestiality, aggression, and uncivilized nature are written on the black body. The black female body, left in the wreckage of embodying these contradictory ‘natural’ traits, becomes a general aberration that is treated with confusion and fear. And the white male body emerges as the unmarked, normative mode of subjectivity. Or, to put this in the terms above, the white male body solidifies his position as the modern man—the rational, transcendental man in control of both nature and history. The mode of rationality that defines high modernity—namely, as instrumental, transcendental, and detached from history—expresses itself directly in **the mode of subjectivity inhabited by white propertied Christian (straight) men in the post-bellum United States. It is what** **enables and ensures their power over nature and the social field of relations, and their subsequent freedom**.

#### Their drive to drill more oil creates petro-states as a site of unsolvable spectacularized violence – petro-sexual politics is used to perpetuate war against racial and sexual deviants.

Turcotte 11 (Heather, Professor of Women's, Gender, & Sexuality Studies at UConn, Contextualizing Petro-Sexual Politics, Alternatives: Global, Local, Political, 8/24/2011)

My conceptualization of petro-sexual politics is rooted in the statist junctures of conflict–war,¶ through which sexual violence is linked to the security of petroleum production, and which pushes¶ the realms of gender–sexual violence beyond rape-as-tool-of-war into multiple frames of nationbuilding.¶ Not only does the state justify sexual violence in times of War, the existence of both the state and the petroleum industry, the latter the main source of the former’s growth, is possible only through gender and sexual violence. War becomes a moment of rupture in which linkages between¶ petroleum and the conditions of sexual–gender violence are made visible and material. Through histories¶ of War writ large, international discourses and practices of ‘‘security’’ reconfigure the Delta as¶ a constant site of naturalized and spectacularized gender violence. Women’s bodies then become the¶ means of and justification for securitization of both oil and state through intervention, suppression,¶ and ‘‘protection.’’ This state juncture locates petro-geographies in a constant state of conflict–War–¶ terror and shrinks the spaces between the public and private violence so often fabricated in the media¶ and other locations. War is a venue for explicitly institutionalizing state violence in the private realm¶ without having to address the state as a condition of sexual–gender violence.¶ Critical transnational and Africana feminisms argue that the nation-state, configured through¶ unequal and systemic relations of race, gender, sexuality and nation, relies routinely upon capitalist¶ and colonial violence.36 Transnational feminisms draw attention to gender violence as a fundamental¶ condition of nation-state building**—**in Nigeria as well as the United States. Importantly, transnational¶ feminisms also specify the ways in which women’s movements and feminist interventions¶ have shifted the frameworks of knowledge production, state policy, and global capital.37 By desegregating¶ that which is conventionally considered ‘‘distinct,’’ critical transnational feminisms provide¶ analytics to see how petroleum and gender violence are co-constructed through larger market economies¶ of violence that make up and perpetuate current global orders.

**Ethic and sexual violence is a part of petro-violence—the idea that fighting for oil is different from gender violence breeds passivity and leads to neverending war**

**Turcotte 11**

(Heather, Professor of Women's, Gender, & Sexuality Studies at UConn, Contextualizing Petro-Sexual Politics, Alternatives: Global, Local, Political, 8/24/2011)

In other words, **today**, as in the past, **the security forces of the state and interstate system** **protect**¶ **the oil industry through the regulation of petro-communities**.57 **Regulation relies on a constant fear**¶ **of injury and danger**, which are **substantiated as ‘‘real’’ through material acts of ethnoracial, gender,**¶ **sexual, environmental, economic, and political violence**.58 The militarization of the Delta, under the¶ rubric of petro-security, exacerbates violence and extends it into the multifaceted spaces of Delta¶ life, **as the interstate system rapes, kidnaps, beats, burns, and kills in petro-communities** in order¶ **to secure global petroleum interests**.59 **These are some of the systemic practices of postcolonial**¶ **state-building that create and maintain explicit links among the United States**, Delta communities,¶ and petro-sexual violence.¶ However, **if we can disentangle** (or disabuse) **the perception that sexual–gender violence**¶ **and petroleum violence are separate and distinct entities**, we can also destabilize claims that petro-violence is the result of ethnic–terrorist–gang activity endemic to the Delta. Instead, **we see**¶ **how petro-violence has been institutionalized**, throughout history and continuing today, **through**¶ **racial, gender, ethnic, sexual, and national violence.** In other words, **gender and petroleum must**¶ **be considered systemic threads of petro-violence.**

#### The alternative is an archaeology of “freedom” in society. This process constitutes a radical queering, an action against the grain, necessary to rupture the structural domination of the most privileged at the expense of all else.

**Winnubst 06** (Shannon, Phd, Associate Professor of Women’s Studies at Ohio State University, *Queering Freedom*, pg. 192-195)

While the service sector of the U.S. economy grows larger and the middle-class standard of living accordingly shrinks, “gated communities” are proliferating across cites and suburbs. Those who identify as middle-class seem to be living in greater and greater fear of losing that precious status, all the while not recognizing how **their own consumption practices are slowly chipping away at any semblance of security**: we hoard more and more goods to ward off the ever-present threat of scarcity. But **lives of poverty often seem to scoff at such fear,** just as they scoff at the mythical scarcity that drives it: the anxiety over the stock market’s effect on a 401K or even the ability to make the new mortgage payment appears as nothing but absurd alongside the scramble to find the next meal or adequate school clothes for a child **or reliable transportation to a minimum-wage job across town.** Moreover, lives of poverty also may not experience the flip side of that middle-class fear of scarcity—namely, the desire to move into the middle class. Despite the narcissistic middle-class assumption that everyone in poverty wants to be in the middle class, the iconography of advanced capitalist culture betrays no such trajectory. As the idolatry of sports and entertainment stars shows in this culture, those in poverty may direct their lives more by the wish to jump directly into the class of luxury, the other end of the spectrum that also disavows the concepts of the future and any economy of scarcity. Bataille’s point is that poverty and luxury sometimes inhabit the same psychic spaces. And yet the bourgeois values of advanced capitalist cultures reduce such luxury to its own narrow, sordid vision of the world. Our double standards are staggering: we pray at the altar of Donald Trump’s wealth, while refusing to give a dollar to the homeless man on the corner if he’s just going to go and buy another beer. But wouldn’t he be foolish to do anything else with it? Should he really try to save all those coins and bills to buy a fresh shirt that will need to be ironed? The self-edifying moralism of the good ole Protestant work ethic lingering always just below the surface, we demand that those “below” us on the economic scale learn to spend money every bit as anxiously as we do.10 To expose the fictional status of this myth of scarcity in bourgeois consciousness thus may be a critical wedge in dislodging the systems of domination at work in cultures of advanced capitalism, patriarchy, and white supremacism. Insofar as it grounds the twin values of utility and the future, ***revealing this historical fiction may become one of the most queer political acts available to us in this historical present***. And insofar as our practices of consumption have been eroticized as one of our most social expressions of desire, **the dislodging of the myth of scarcity which drives that desire strikes at the *heart of queering freedom***. It can radically jolt us from our normalized spatio-temporal orientations, **where we understand our lives and selves as discrete pieces of private property that we must protect and secure through constant projection into the future.** While such work requires many kinds of transformations, it may most of all require a cultivation of memory. Rather than assuming that the various objects of the market we consume on a daily basis were created ex nihilo for our particular needs or desires, we could undertake an archaeology of our own consumption practices.11 Such a practice would expose the multiple histories buried in each of these objects and the interplays of scarcity and excess at work in their production. Take, for example, the rather bizarre ritual in the U.S. of mass frenzied shopping the day after Thanksgiving. Ironically following the day devoted to excess and abundance, when good citizens of the U.S. celebrate our history by grossly overeating (and the cooks worry anxiously over whether they have prepared enough food), masses of people in the U.S. awaken early to storm all kinds of stores for their infamous sales. Images of these crazed shoppers, jamming through the doors of retailers as they open at oddly early hours, fill our televisions and newspapers: the ritual has become a nationwide, communal frenzy of combating scarcity. But if we undertake a brief archaeology of our consumption, we are faced with the fiction of this alleged scarcity. Let’s say we burst through the doors of Best Buy, a ‘big box’ electronics retailer in the U.S., at 6 a.m. the day after Thanksgiving. We want to get that RCA 27" television for its record sale price of $140, and we know there are not many of them to be had. We must have it: we live in the country that ranks second in the world for number of televisions owned, and we must do our part to make the U.S.A. #1 in all things!12 So we arrive at Best Buy well before dawn and we get it: scarcity vanquished, at least for us and our little individual piece of the pie. But if we trace the making of that television, we learn it was constructed in Thailand, whose gross domestic product per capita is $7,400 (#85 or #97 in the world), as compared to $37,800 (#2 or #3 in the world) in the U.S.13 Thirty-one percent of exports from Thailand are electronics products, and the U.S. is the largest market for Thailand’s total exports; meanwhile, citizens of Thailand own enough of those television sets they produce that Thailand is #17 in the world in number of televisions owned.14 And if we dig a bit deeper, we will likely find that there are human rights violations charged against the sweatshops that employ the laborers, underpaid and uninsured day-laborers transporting the televisions across oceans and lands, and perhaps even non-unionized workers stocking them at Best Buy. The scarcity at work in the production of our cheap consumer goods is not the scarcity of the middle class in the U.S. The United States is not a country of scarcity, but of a **remarkably lopsided distribution of immense wealth**.15 The excess that drives our market economy perpetuates inhuman scarcity in the lives that produce its goods. To excavate these lost pasts erased from our consuming consciousness opens middle-class consciousness onto the actual scarcities at work in the fictional scarcity of our consumption practices. **To cultivate these ‘memories’ opens onto a queer consciousness of how desire perpetuates systems of domination.** It can also open onto possibilities that things could be otherwise: we could consume differently, buying and growing and exchanging locally; we could even enjoy our lives without the onslaught of cheap consumer goods that increasingly keep most of the world’s population trapped in economic dependency and political subordination, while also locking us into the endless cycle of anxious consumption and future satiety. And we could recognize that the alleged scarcity of goods that sends us into buying frenzies and their promise of a more secure future is nothing but another marketing tool, one that depends on our not remembering how or where or why or for whom these objects are made. Our senses of power and freedom change when we begin to think and act in these queer ways. **Power is not about one class wielding economic and political power over another; it is about a web of interlocking values that perpetuate the domination of the most privileged at the expense of all other lives, most often through the narrative of desire and its myth of scarcity**. And freedom is not to own as much as we desire; it is not to gain an illusory and impossible security in George W. Bush’s “Ownership Society.” Freedom is to recognize the lost pasts embedded in our everyday practices and to cultivate pleasures that do not perpetuate these violences. It is to stop ignoring and erasing these lost pasts in our idolatry of the (market’s) future, and thereby open onto different kinds of pleasures. These snapshots of different subject positions’ responses to living life without a concept of the future give us some sense of how cultures of phallicized whiteness perceive a call to a politics without a future. To halt the temporality of the future anterior as the dominant mode in which we live our lives is to resist these cultures and their values. It presents a way of interrupting and disrupting the domination of phallicized whiteness, decentering its grip on us. At the same time, to halt the temporality of the future calls us to **risk radical uncertainty** in the politics and erotics of our lives, to open ourselves to not-knowing and unknowing as viable modes of experience. For bodies in power, such a call to risk will likely affront our deepest senses of our selves and worlds: it will likely fall on deaf ears. For oppressed and dominated bodies, this may already be how we are living and to embrace it consciously may be experienced as a call to joy and creativity or, at a minimum, a profound relief. (I use “we” on both sides of this division to express the multiple subject positions I hold on the social map of power.) The call to a politics without a future strikes us in varying ways; it can be decentering, or even a relief, hilarious, and a sense of grounding for movements already underway, giving voice and a space in which to cultivate unimaginable pleasures. How we respond may tell us much about how queerly multiple our “I” of identity can become.

### 1NC DA

#### Gulf drilling is low and decreasing now – saves the fishing industry.

Cindy Zipf, 4-12-2013, executive director of Clean Ocean Action Inc., based in Sandy Hook, N.J., “Should THe U.S. Expand Offshore Drilling,” http://stream.wsj.com/story/latest-headlines/SS-2-63399/SS-2-211080/

Expanded offshore drilling for oil in the U.S. would be an unnecessary, harmful step in the wrong direction. Recent trends in U.S. energy consumption and production suggest we don't need to find more oil offshore. Our investment dollars and energies are better spent on renewable energy, conservation and efficiencies such as improved mass transit, smart grids and clean-emission vehicles—an approach that creates jobs, doesn't damage the environment and addresses fossil-fuel-driven climate change. Along the Atlantic, Pacific, Alaskan and Gulf coasts, entire state budgets are built on revenues from clean-ocean economies. Fishing, boating, beach-going, surfing and tourism businesses rely on clean, healthy ecosystems. These businesses bring billions of dollars to coastal economies and provide jobs for millions of people. In light of recent superstorms and increasingly hostile ocean conditions, driven by climate change, shore-based economies are under enough stress without the added burdens imposed by offshore drilling. No Need According to the White House, U.S. demand for oil is at a 15-year low, and measures are in place to reduce it further by, for example, boosting fuel-economy standards for vehicles. The percentage of crude-oil consumption supplied by imports has declined, and if we stop exporting petroleum products like gasoline and heating oil—in 2011 the U.S. became a net exporter of petroleum products, sending 2.9 million barrels a day abroad—we further reduce our need for crude imports. These are all signs that we can and will break our dependence on oil, and that we're heading in that direction. Clearly, we don't need to expand offshore drilling to meet our needs.

#### Expansion of Gulf drilling kills the fishing industry.

Chris Carnevale, 4-20-2013, Southern Alliance for Clean Energy, works in advocacy for clearn energy development and coastal responses to climate change, “Why We Should Not Drill Offshore the South Atlantic,” http://blog.cleanenergy.org/2013/04/20/why-we-should-not-drill-offshore-the-south-atlantic/#sthash.2WNB0Hok.dpuf

Today, April 20, marks the 3rd anniversary of the tragic Deepwater Horizon Gulf oil disaster. In spite of how apparent it seemed three years ago that offshore drilling is a bad idea whose time has gone, today we are facing the threat of even more drilling off our beautiful coasts. As we’ve reported before, the federal government is considering opening the Atlantic coast to offshore oil and gas exploration for the first time in 30 years. Yet the lessons learned from the Deepwater Horizon blowout have not been fully incorporated into industry practice or government regulation. On this three year anniversary, we want to emphasize the reasons why it is a bad idea to drill off the Southeast Atlantic coast. Oil and gas exploration is bad for our region. The current proposal by the federal government to open the Atlantic to offshore oil and gas exploration includes the use of seismic airgun testing. This type of testing involves creating large blasts of noise that help show where petroleum deposits are. The noises are so loud, though, that they can damage hearing and navigation of marine mammals like whales and dolphins as well as other marine creatures. According to the federal government, allowing this testing would result in the death or injury of up to 138,500 marine mammals by 2020 and disrupt migratory and mating habits of many creatures including sea turtles. European studies have shown declines in catch rates for commercially important fish due to seismic airgun testing.

#### US fishing industry collapse kills the economy and global food security – causes conflict.

United States Coast Guard, 1-05-2010, lol – it’s the Coast Guard, “Protecting America’s Fisheries,” http://www.uscg.mil/history/articles/Fisheries.pdf

The recreational and commercial fishing industry has an economic impact of more than $20 billion to the United States, employing tens of thousands of people and providing a food source for millions of Americans. The United States has the largest EEZ in the world, 2.25 million square miles, containing an estimated 20 percent of the world's fisheries resources. There are also a significant number of marine mam­ mals at risk, or endangered, including the Northern Right Whale, with approximately 300 in existence. The United States is the fifth largest fishing nation in the world, with approximately 110,000 commercial vessels. The capacity of the U.S. fishing fleet alone far exceeds all fish stocks' capabilities to reproduce. Many U.S. fisheries are threatened by over-capitalization of the industry, exces­ sive incidental by-catch and habitat degradation. Increased effort by U.S. fishers results in a reduction of spawning stock and an increase in the harvest of immature fish. Habitat degl'adation has occurred due to massive water diversions for agricultural projects and the negative impact of urban development. In recent years on an international level, competition for declining resources has resulted in a number of violent confrontations as some of the world's fishers resort to ille­ gal activity. Some of these unfortunate incidents include: • Three Thai fishermen who were killed by Vietnamese maritime authorities. Two Spanish fishermen were injured when their vessel was fired on by a Portuguese patrol boat within Por­ tuguese waters. • The Canadian patrol vessel fired at a Spanish boat ille­ gally fishing in an internationally patrolled area in the North Atlantic. • A Russian Border Guard ship fired on two Japanese ves­ sels thought to be poaching; one ship was hit, and fish­ ers on board were injured. • An Argentine gunboat fired on and sank a Taiwan fishing vessel. • A patrol boat from the Falklands chased a Taiwan fishing vessel more than 4,000 miles. These, and other similar incidents underscore the high stakes being played out across the world as declining fish stocks put increasing pressure on fishing nations to under­ take more aggressive action. In the future, fishing treaties will become the source of greater diplomatic attention.

#### Food shortages destabilize Russia and China – cause global conflict.

Matthey Lynn, 1-26-2013, financial journalist based in London, “Food prices may be catalyst for 2013 revolutions,” <http://www.marketwatch.com/story/food-prices-may-be-catalyst-for-2013-revolutions-2013-01-16>

So if you figure that rising food prices create revolts, and prices will rocket this year, then where might we see political turmoil? It is a question that matters to investors, because a revolution means a collapse in stock-markets. Just take a look at Egypt in 2011 — the Cairo index plunged from 7,200 to 3,600 as the regime fell. If the revolt is big enough, markets may tumble globally. Algeria is one obvious candidate. It was the one country that didn’t get caught up in the Arab Spring. But it has many of the same issues as Libya and Egypt. Don’t be surprised to see demonstrations on the streets there. Morocco may well get caught up in the turmoil. And food shortages may spell the end for President Bashar Assad in Syria. Greece is the second possibility. Unemployment is now at 27%. Many people are on the breadline — and bread is about to get a lot costlier. There are increasing reports of people having to rely on food handout in Athens and other major cities. Taxes are constantly being pushed higher to meet the deficit targets and wages are still being cut and jobs slashed. More expensive food could easily be the spark for an extremist party to seize power and take the country out of the euro. More worrying still, Russia. There have already been protests against the autocratic rule of Vladimir Putin. Rising grain prices have toppled Russian leaders in the past — Putin could follow the czars into oblivion. It is the Russian grain harvest that has been especially badly hit, and this is still a country where poverty is widespread. Putin has stayed in power thanks to rising living standards. If they drop, his regime will be under pressure. Or, most seriously of all, China. It has grown much richer, but there are millions and millions of people who have moved to the new cities — if they start to go hungry that could prompt a wave of rebellions. Cold weather is playing havoc with food supplies there. Usually, it could import more food if it needed it. But this year that won’t be possible — or at least only at huge cost. Minor revolts in the Middle East don’t have the potential to knock more than local markets. Egypt was the major stock market in the region, and that has already been through a regime change. But a Greek exit from the euro, or a Russian or Chinese political rebellion, would massively destabilize the global economy — and send equity, bond and currency markets into turmoil. Whichever nation it is, it looks like food may be the most likely cause of turmoil in the markets this year.

### Case – Drilling

#### Article 19 Turn – the plan worsens US environmental and hydrocarbon drilling regulations in the Gulf – Article 19 of the TBHA makes accidents more likely.

John F. Kerry et al, 12-21-2012, Massachusetts Senator and Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, with the rest of the Committee on Foreign Relations (there are like a thousand of them lol I ain’t typing all that), “Oil, Mexico and the Transboundary Agreement,” <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CPRT-112SPRT77567/html/CPRT-112SPRT77567.htm>

Regardless of whether Congress considers the TBA as a treaty or executive agreement, Congressional hearings and thorough examination of the TBA and its implementing legislative proposals are needed. So far the Obama administration has declined to officially submit its proposed implementing legislation to the committees of jurisdiction for action through regular order. Congress has a duty and interest in overseeing international agreements. That holds for the TBA since several provisions of the TBA invite scrutiny and clarification, even as the overall agreement is in the interests of the United States. \9\ For example, TBA Article 16 establishes an ``expert determination'' that is binding whereas Article 17 establishes an arbitration mechanism without specifying whether the arbitration is binding. Both provisions could impact U.S. federal revenues, among other issues. In another example, the TBA is intended to improve environmental and safety protections, but the plain language makes no such guarantee. Article 19, for example, instructs adoption of common standards, but that could mean effectively lowering U.S. standards in the border region if the Interior Secretary is given unrestricted authority to implement that section.

#### Airguns Turn – the plan leads to seismic airgun testing – that kills sea turtles. ):

Chris Carnevale, 4-20-2013, Southern Alliance for Clean Energy, works in advocacy for clearn energy development and coastal responses to climate change, “Why We Should Not Drill Offshore the South Atlantic,” http://blog.cleanenergy.org/2013/04/20/why-we-should-not-drill-offshore-the-south-atlantic/#sthash.2WNB0Hok.dpuf

The current proposal by the federal government to open the Atlantic to offshore oil and gas exploration includes the use of seismic airgun testing. This type of testing involves creating large blasts of noise that help show where petroleum deposits are. The noises are so loud, though, that they can damage hearing and navigation of marine mammals like whales and dolphins as well as other marine creatures. According to the federal government, allowing this testing would result in the death or injury of up to 138,500 marine mammals by 2020 and disrupt migratory and mating habits of many creatures including sea turtles. European studies have shown declines in catch rates for commercially important fish due to seismic airgun testing.

#### That turns biodiversity – impact’s extinction.

Todd Steiner, xx-xx-2010, Sea Turtle Restoration Project, Executive Director at Turtle Island Restoration Network, San Francisco Bay Area, “Are Sea Turtles Worth Saving?” http://www.bonaireturtles.org/explore/are-sea-turtles-worth-saving/

Sea turtles demonstrate the ultimate lesson of ecology – that everything is connected. Sea turtles are part of two vital ecosystems, beaches and marine systems. If sea turtles become extinct, both the marine and beach ecosystems will weaken. And since humans use the ocean as an important source for food and use beaches for many kinds of activities, weakness in these ecosystems would have harmful effects on humans. Though sea turtles have been living and thriving in the world’s oceans for 150 million years, they are now in danger of extinction largely because of changes brought about by humans. If we alter the oceans and beaches enough to wipe out sea turtles, will those changes make it difficult for us to survive? And if we choose to do what’s necessary to save sea turtles, might we save our own future? Beaches and dune systems do not get very many nutrients during the year, so very little vegetation grows on the dunes and no vegetation grows on the beach itself. This is because sand does not hold nutrients very well. Sea turtles use beaches and the lower dunes to nest and lay their eggs. Sea turtles lay around 100 eggs in a nest and lay between 3 and 7 nests during the summer nesting season. Not every nest will hatch, not every egg in a nest will hatch, and not all of the hatchlings in a nest will make it out of the nest. All the unhatched nests, eggs and trapped hatchlings are very good sources of nutrients for the dune vegetation. Even the left-over egg shells from hatched eggs provide nutrients. Dune plants use the nutrients from turtle eggs to grow and become stronger. As the dune vegetation grows stronger and healthier, the health of the entire beach/dune ecosystem becomes better. Healthy vegetation and strong root systems hold the sand in the dunes and protect the beach from erosion. As the number of turtles declines, fewer eggs are laid in the beaches, providing less nutrients. If sea turtles went extinct, dune vegetation would lose a major source of nutrients and would not be healthy or strong enough to maintain the dunes, allowing beaches to wash away. Sea turtles eat jellyfish, preventing the large “blooms” of jellyfish – including stinging jellyfish – that are increasingly wreaking havoc on fisheries, recreation and other maritime activities throughout the oceans. Research has shown that sea turtles often act as keystone species. Sea grass beds grazed by green sea turtles are more productive than those that aren’t. Hawksbill turtles eat sponges, preventing them from out-competing slow-growing corals. Both of these grazing activities maintain species diversity and the natural balance of fragile marine ecosystems. If sea turtles go extinct, it will cause declines in all the species whose survival depends on healthy seagrass beds and coral reefs. That means that many marine species that humans harvest would be lost. Sea turtles, and many species that are affected by their presence or absence, are an important attraction for marine tourism, a major source of income for many countries. These are some of the roles that we know sea turtles play in the essential health of ecosystems. Who knows what other roles we will discover as science reveals more about sea turtles? While humans have the ability to tinker with the “clockwork” of life, we don’t have the ability to know when it’s okay to lose a few of the working parts. If you disagree, try to take apart a clock and just throw away one of the pieces that doesn’t look that important. Put the clock back together and see if it still works.

#### The Gulf of Mexico’s resilient to oil spills – microbes solve.

Berywn 13 (Bob, Summit County Voice, “Environment: Is the Gulf of Mexico resilient to oil spills?” April 9th, 2013, [http://summitcountyvoice.com/2013/04/09/environment-is-the-gulf-of-mexico-resilient-to-oil-spills/)](http://summitcountyvoice.com/2013/04/09/environment-is-the-gulf-of-mexico-resilient-to-oil-spills/)\)

Nearly three years after the Deepwater Horizon drill rig exploded and the busted Macondo Well spewed millions of gallons of crude into the Gulf of Mexico, scientists are still trying to figure out to what happened to all the oil. Only a tiny amount was captured or burned at the surface, and vast quantity — nobody knows exactly how much — was “dispersed” with chemicals injected directly into the stream of oil streaming out of the broken pipes, but a surprisingly large percentage of the oil may have been broken down by microbes. Some of the oil settled to the seafloor, damaging coral miles from the site of the disaster. There’s also evidence that the oil damaged Gulf of Mexico oysters growing in coastal areas, and sickened dolphins in Barataria Bay. And in Florida, researchers found remnants of the oil lingering in “scary high” concentrations in the splash zone along Gulf beaches. But overall, the Gulf may be more resilient than previously believed, according to Terry Hazen a bioremediation expert at the University of Tennessee-Oak Ridge National Laboratory. Hazen and his research team used a powerful new approach for identifying microbes in the environment to discover previously unknown and naturally occurring bacteria that consume and break down crude oil. They concluded that there was a population explosion among those bacteria already adapted to using oil as a food source. “It was surprising how fast they consumed the oil,” Hazen said. “In some locations, it took only one day for them to reduce a gallon of oil to a half gallon. In others, the half-life for a given quantity of spilled oil was six days … “The Deepwater Horizon oil provided a new source of nutrients in the deepest waters,” he said. Rather than culturing the microbes in a lab, the researchers combined genetic data and other analyses of the DNA, proteins and other footprints of bacteria to provide a more detailed picture of microbial life in the water. Their findings suggest that a great potential for intrinsic bioremediation of oil plumes exists in the deep sea and other environs in the Gulf of Mexico. Oil-eating bacteria are natural inhabitants of the Gulf because of the constant supply of oil as food. “The bottom line from this research may be that the Gulf of Mexico is more resilient and better able to recover from oil spills than anyone thought,” Hazen said. “It shows that we may not need the kinds of heroic measures proposed after the Deepwater Horizon spill, like adding nutrients to speed up the growth of bacteria that break down oil or using genetically engineered bacteria. The Gulf has a broad base of natural bacteria, and they respond to the presence of oil by multiplying quite rapidly.” Hazen recently presented his Deepwater Horizon disaster research findings at the 245th National Meeting and Exposition of the American Chemical Society, the world’s largest scientific society.

#### No impact – oceans are resilient.

Taylor 10 [James M. Taylor is a senior fellow of The Heartland Institute and managing editor of Environment & Climate News., “Ocean Acidification Scare Pushed at Copenhagen,” Feb 10 <http://www.heartland.org/publications/environment%20climate/article/26815/Ocean_Acidification_Scare_Pushed_at_Copenhagen.html>]

With global temperatures continuing their decade-long decline and United Nations-sponsored global warming talks falling apart in Copenhagen, alarmists at the U.N. talks spent considerable time claiming carbon dioxide emissions will cause catastrophic ocean acidification, regardless of whether temperatures rise. The latest scientific data, however, show no such catastrophe is likely to occur. Food Supply Risk Claimed The United Kingdom’s environment secretary, Hilary Benn, initiated the Copenhagen ocean scare with a high-profile speech and numerous media interviews claiming ocean acidification threatens the world’s food supply. “The fact is our seas absorb CO2. They absorb about a quarter of the total that we produce, but it is making our seas more acidic,” said Benn in his speech. “If this continues as a problem, then it can affect the one billion people who depend on fish as their principle source of protein, and we have to feed another 2½ to 3 billion people over the next 40 to 50 years.” Benn’s claim of oceans becoming “more acidic” is misleading, however. Water with a pH of 7.0 is considered neutral. pH values lower than 7.0 are considered acidic, while those higher than 7.0 are considered alkaline. The world’s oceans have a pH of 8.1, making them alkaline, not acidic. Increasing carbon dioxide concentrations would make the oceans less alkaline but not acidic. Since human industrial activity first began emitting carbon dioxide into the atmosphere a little more than 200 years ago, the pH of the oceans has fallen merely 0.1, from 8.2 to 8.1. Following Benn’s December 14 speech and public relations efforts, most of the world’s major media outlets produced stories claiming ocean acidification is threatening the world’s marine life. An Associated Press headline, for example, went so far as to call ocean acidification the “evil twin” of climate change. Studies Show CO2 Benefits Numerous recent scientific studies show higher carbon dioxide levels in the world’s oceans have the same beneficial effect on marine life as higher levels of atmospheric carbon dioxide have on terrestrial plant life. In a 2005 study published in the Journal of Geophysical Research, scientists examined trends in chlorophyll concentrations, critical building blocks in the oceanic food chain. The French and American scientists reported “an overall increase of the world ocean average chlorophyll concentration by about 22 percent” during the prior two decades of increasing carbon dioxide concentrations. In a 2006 study published in Global Change Biology, scientists observed higher CO2 levels are correlated with better growth conditions for oceanic life. The highest CO2 concentrations produced “higher growth rates and biomass yields” than the lower CO2 conditions. Higher CO2 levels may well fuel “subsequent primary production, phytoplankton blooms, and sustaining oceanic food-webs,” the study concluded. Ocean Life ‘Surprisingly Resilient’ In a 2008 study published in Biogeosciences, scientists subjected marine organisms to varying concentrations of CO2, including abrupt changes of CO2 concentration. The ecosystems were “surprisingly resilient” to changes in atmospheric CO2, and “the ecosystem composition, bacterial and phytoplankton abundances and productivity, grazing rates and total grazer abundance and reproduction were not significantly affected by CO2-induced effects.” In a 2009 study published in Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, scientists reported, “Sea star growth and feeding rates increased with water temperature from 5ºC to 21ºC. A doubling of current [CO2] also increased growth rates both with and without a concurrent temperature increase from 12ºC to 15ºC.” Another False CO2 Scare “Far too many predictions of CO2-induced catastrophes are treated by alarmists as sure to occur, when real-world observations show these doomsday scenarios to be highly unlikely or even virtual impossibilities,” said Craig Idso, Ph.D., author of the 2009 book CO2, Global Warming and Coral Reefs. “The phenomenon of CO2-induced ocean acidification appears to be no different.

### Case – Heg

#### Nieto Turn – the plan derails Nieto’s energy reforms and collapses US-Mexico relations.

Hennessey and Wilkinson 13 ~Kathleen Hennessey and Tracy Wilkinson, writers for the Los Angeles Times, LA Times, and#34;Obama, Mexico leader to avoid hot topics, at least publicly,and#34; 5/1/13, <http://articles.latimes.com/2013/may/01/world/la-fg-obama-mexico-20130502>

WASHINGTON — President Obama will seek to cement relations with Mexico's new president, Enrique Peña Nieto, over the next two days with vows of neighborly kinship and future cooperation. But the true test of their ability to work together may be whether they can hold their tongues. Obama's visit to Mexico City comes as the fight over border security and immigration reform has begun to consume Congress. Peña Nieto supports the effort but wants to avoid the mistakes of a predecessor, Vicente Fox, who lobbied for a 2001 immigration reform bill in Congress. Conservatives charged that Fox was meddling in U.S. affairs. Obama will try to avoid the same charge. The White House is monitoring Peña Nieto's calls to reform Mexico's vast energy industry. U.S. companies could benefit if it opens oil and gas exploration to foreign investors. But a public endorsement by Obama, or even a perception of one, could undermine the already fraught endeavor. "Mexicans have an understanding of noninterference. So they do not want us to talk about energy, and they will not talk about immigration," said Diana Negroponte, a senior fellow with the Latin America Initiative at the Brookings Institution. "It's a quid pro quo." If those issues are raised at length publicly, she said, it may signal a "degree of irritation" in private talks.

#### Heg is unsustainable – emerging powers, wealth transfer, and nonstate actors

US National Intel Council Report, ‘08

(National Intelligence Council, U.S. National Intelligence Agency Mid-Term and Long-Term Thinking, Global Trends 2025: A Transformed World, p.vi)

The international system—as constructed following the Second World War—will be almost unrecognizable by 2025 owing to the rise of emerging powers, a globalizing economy, an historic transfer of relative wealth and economic power from West to East, and the growing influence of nonstate actors. By 2025, the international system will be a global multipolar one with gaps in national power continuing to narrow between developed and developing countries. Concurrent with the shift in power among nation-states, the relative power of various nonstate actors—including businesses, tribes, religious organizations, and criminal networks—is increasing. The players are changing, but so too are the scope and breadth of transnational issues important for continued global prosperity. Aging populations in the developed world; growing energy, food, and water constraints; and worries about climate change will limit and diminish what will still be an historically unprecedented age of prosperity. Historically, emerging multipolar systems have been more unstable than bipolar or unipolar ones. Despite the recent financial volatility—which could end up accelerating many ongoing trends—we do not believe that we are headed toward a complete breakdown of the international system, as occurred in 1914-1918 when an earlier phase of globalization came to a halt. However, the next 20 years of transition to a new system are fraught with risks. Strategic rivalries are most likely to revolve around trade, investments, and technological innovation and acquisition, but we cannot rule out a 19th century-like scenario of arms races, territorial expansion, and military rivalries. This is a story with no clear outcome, as illustrated by a series of vignettes we use to map out divergent futures. Although the United States is likely to remain the single most powerful actor, the United States’ relative strength—even in the military realm—will decline and US leverage will become more constrained. At the same time, the extent to which other actors—both state and nonstate—will be willing or able to shoulder increased burdens is unclear. Policymakers and publics will have to cope with a growing demand for multilateral cooperation when the international system will be stressed by the incomplete transition from the old to a still-forming new order. Economic Growth Fueling Rise of Emerging Players In terms of size, speed, and directional flow, the transfer of global wealth and economic power now under way—roughly from West to East—is without precedent in modern history. This shift derives from two sources. First, increases in oil and commodity prices have generated windfall profits for the Gulf states and Russia. Second, lower costs combined with government policies have shifted the locus of manufacturing and some service industries to Asia. Growth projections for Brazil, Russia, India, and China (the BRICs) indicate they will collectively match the original G-7’s share of global GDP by 2040-2050. China is poised to have more impact on the world over the next 20 years than any other country. If current trends persist, by 2025 China will have the world’s second largest economy and will be a leading military power. It also could be the largest importer of natural resources and the biggest polluter. India probably will continue to enjoy relatively rapid economic growth and will strive for a multipolar world in which New Delhi is one of the poles. China and India must decide the extent to which they are willing and capable of playing increasing global roles and how each will relate to the other. Russia has the potential to be richer, more powerful, and more self-assured in 2025 if it invests in human capital, expands and diversifies its economy, and integrates with global markets. On the other hand, Russia could experience a significant decline if it fails to take these steps and oil and gas prices remain in the $50-70 per barrel range. No other countries are projected to rise to the level of China, India, or Russia, and none is likely to match their individual global clout. We expect, however, to see the political and economic power of other countries—such as Indonesia, Iran, and Turkey—increase. For the most part, China, India, and Russia are not following the Western liberal model for selfdevelopment but instead are using a different model, “state capitalism.” State capitalism is a loose term used to describe a system of economic management that gives a prominent role to the state. Other rising powers—South Korea, Taiwan, and Singapore—also used state capitalism to develop their economies. However, the impact of Russia, and particularly China, following this path is potentially much greater owing to their size and approach to “democratization.” We remain optimistic about the long-term prospects for greater democratization, even though advances are likely to be slow and globalization is subjecting many recently democratized countries to increasing social and economic pressures with the potential to undermine liberal institutions.

#### Heg can’t solve war

Mastanduno ‘9 Professor of Government at Dartmouth

(Michael, World Politics 61, No. 1, Ebsco)

During the cold war the United States dictated the terms of adjustment. It derived the necessary leverage because it provided for the security of its economic partners and because there were no viable alter natives to an economic order centered on the United States. After the cold war the outcome of adjustment struggles is less certain because the United States is no longer in a position to dictate the terms. The United States, notwithstanding its preponderant power, no longer enjoys the same type of security leverage it once possessed, and the very success of the U.S.-centered world economy has afforded America’s supporters a greater range of international and domestic economic options. The claim that the United States is unipolar is a statement about its cumulative economic, military, and other capabilities.1 But preponderant capabilities across the board do not guarantee effective influence in any given arena. U.S. dominance in the international security arena no longer translates into effective leverage in the international economic arena. And although the United States remains a dominant international economic player in absolute terms, after the cold war it has found itself more vulnerable and constrained than it was during the golden economic era after World War II. It faces rising economic challengers with their own agendas and with greater discretion in international economic policy than America’s cold war allies had enjoyed. The United States may continue to act its own way, but it can no longer count on getting its own way.

### Case – Dodd Frank

#### No afghan collapse

Walt ‘9

(Stephen M., Robert and Renée Belfer Prof of IR @ Harvard University, 12/3, “The "safe haven" myth,” *Foreign Policy*, http://walt.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2009/08/18/the\_safe\_haven\_myth)

This is a significant statement. In effect, the president was acknowledging that the only strategic rationale for an increased commitment in Afghanistan is the fear that if the Taliban isn't defeated in Afghanistan, they will eventually allow al Qaeda to re-establish itself there, which would then enable it to mount increasingly threatening attacks on the United States. This is the kind of assertion that often leads foreign policy insiders to nod their heads in agreement, but it shouldn't be accepted uncritically. Here are a few reasons why the "safe haven" argument ought to be viewed with some skepticism. First, this argument tends to lump the various groups we are contending with together, and it suggests that all of them are equally committed to attacking the United States. In fact, most of the people we are fighting in Afghanistan aren't dedicated jihadis seeking to overthrow Arab monarchies, establish a Muslim caliphate, **or mount attacks on U.S. soil**. Their agenda is focused on ***local affairs***, such as what they regard as the political disempowerment of Pashtuns and illegitimate foreign interference in their country. Moreover, the Taliban itself is more of a loose coalition of different groups than a tightly unified and hierarchical organization, which is why some experts believe we ought to be doing more to divide the movement and "flip" the moderate elements to our side. Unfortunately, the "safe haven" argument wrongly suggests that the Taliban care as much about attacking America as bin Laden does.

# 2NC

## Kritik

### 2NC Hegemony Link

#### Scientific justifications for hegemony foreclose change, instead framing domination and violent intervention as objective policies

Jytte Nhanenge, MA in Philosophy at the University of South Africa February 2007 (“Ecofeminism: Towards Integrating the Concerns of Women, Poor People, and Nature into Development,” pg. 241-242)

This means that power relations are generated by universal scientific truths about human nature, rather than by political and social debate. The consequence is that people cannot challenge the basis of the power structure because they believe it is the scientific truth, so it cannot be otherwise. In this way, militarism is justified as being unavoidable, regardless of its patent irrationality. Likewise, if the scientific "truth" were that humans would always compete for a greater share of resources, then the rational response to the environmental crisis would seem to be "dog-eat-dog" survivalism. This creates a self-fulfilling prophecy in which nature and community simply cannot survive. (Birkeland 1995: 59). This type of social and political power structure is kept in place by social policies. It is based on the assumption that if the scientific method is applied to public policy then social planning can be done free from normative values. However, according to Habermas (Reitzes 1993: 40) the scientific method only conceal pre-existing, unreflected social interests and pre-scientific decisions. Consequently, also social scientists apply the scientific characteristics of objectivity, value-freedom, rationality and quantifiability to social life. In this way, they assume they can unveil universal laws about social relations, which will lead to true knowledge. Based on this, correct social policies can be formulated. Thus, social processes are excluded, while scientific objective facts are included. Society is assumed a static entity, where no changes are possible. By promoting a permanent character, social science legitimizes the existing social order, while obscuring the relations of domination and subordination, which is keeping the existing power relations inaccessible to analysis. The frozen order also makes it impossible to develop alternative explanations about social reality. It prevents a historical and political understanding of reality and denies the possibility for social transformation by human agency. The prevailing condition is seen as an unavoidable fact. This implies that human beings are passive and that domination is a natural force, for which no one is responsible. This permits the state freely to implement laws and policies, which are controlling and coercive. These are seen as being correct, because they are based on scientific facts made by scientific experts. One result is that the state, without consulting the public, engages in a pathological pursuit of economic growth. Governments support the capitalist ideology, which benefits the elite only, while it is destroying nature and increasing poverty for women and lower classes. The priority on capitalism also determines other social policies. There are consequently no considerations for a possible conflict between the aims of the government for social control and economic efficiency and the welfare needs of various social groups. Without having an alternative to the existing order, people become dis-empowered. Ultimately, the reaction is public apathy, which legitimates authorative governments. Thus, social science is an ideology, which is affirming the prevailing social, political and economic order. (Reitzes 1993: 36-39, 41-42). In reality, it is a contradiction to apply the scientific method to social policy making. Any social policy change will alter social relations and affect the relative welfare of classes of people, which makes social decision making normative. Social policy is related to politics, which is an extension of ethics. Since values and facts are different categories, one cannot apply indisputable empirical facts to social values. It is therefore impossible to legitimize political decisions with reference to scientific knowledge. Social decision-making is a political process. When science is applied to political and normative questions, it becomes an ideology, which supports the dominant interests. Thus, the state reproduces conditions for domination. In case the contradictions become too pronounced, and the power of the state is challenged, then the ideology becomes violent. The consequence is totalitarianism. It is a situation where the state sets limits to what is permissible to think and teach, if necessary by coercion. Conclusively social science manipulates reality to serve the vested interests of specific social groups. The result is a dominant and violent ideology masked as science. (Reitzes 1993: 32, 34, 42-45).

### AT: Cede the Political

#### Turn—The more the right is opposed with liberal values, the more political authority it gains—we will reproduce it to sustain our moral equilibrium.

**Baudrillard 97** (Jean, Prof of Phil at EGS, May 7, “A Conjuration of Imbeciles”//shree)

There has been a shattering reformulation. The right used to embody moral values and the left, by contrast, used to represent an antagonistic mode of historical and political exigency. But today the left is deprived of its political energy. It has become a purely moralistic law-making structure, a representative of universal values, a sacred holder of the reign of Virtue, and an incarnation of antiquated values such as Good or Truth. It now acts as a jurisdiction which asks everyone to act responsibly while still granting itself the right to remain irresponsible. The political illusion of the left (which had remained frozen during twenty years of opposition) turned into a platform of historical morality (and not of historical direction) once it came to power. It then became the holder of a morality of truthfulness, basic rights, and good conscience, having thus reached a zero degree on the political scale and, undoubtedly, the lowest point of the genealogy of morals. Its moralization of all values marked its historical failure (and the failure of thinking in general). Since then, even reality, the principle of reality, has become an act of faith. Try to question the reality of war, for example, and you immediately become a betrayer of moral law. With the left and the traditional right both deprived of political substance, where has the political gone to? Well, simply, it has moved to the far right. As Bruno Latour so accurately noted the other day in Le Monde, the only political discourse today in France is that of Le Pen's Front National. All the rest is moral and pedagogic discourse, teachers' lessons and lecturers' tirades, managers' rhetoric and programmers' jargon. By contrast, having given himself to evil and immorality, Le Pen has been able to take over all of the political, the remnant of what has been abandoned or voluntarily rejected by a political ideology of Good deeds and Enlightenment values. The more he is antagonized by a moral coalition (a sign of political impotence), the more he enjoys the benefits of political immorality, the benefits which come with being the only one on the side of evil. In the past, whenever the traditional right decided to implement an ideology of morality and order, you could always count on the left, always attempting to antagonize those so-called moral values in the name of political claims. But today, the left is experiencing the same condition that once characterized the traditional right. Suddenly responsible for the defense of moral order, the left has no choice but to witness the slippage of abandoned political energies toward political forces which do not hesitate to antagonize its newly created order. Conversely, the left keeps on reactivating the source of evil by continuing to embody the rule of virtue, which of course is nothing more than the rule of supreme hypocrisy. If Le Pen did not exist, we would have to invent him! Indeed, it is thanks to him that we can get rid of our evil share, of what is the worst part of us. It is as such that we can curse Le Pen. If he were to disappear, however, we would be left begging for pity!We would be left struggling with our own racist, sexist, and nationalist (everyone's fate) viruses. Simply, we would be abandoned to the murderous negativity of society. As such, Le Pen is the perfect mirror of the political class which uses him to conjure up its own evils, just as every individual uses the political class to cast away any form of corruption inherent to society (both are similar types of corrupt and cathartic functions). Trying to put an end to this, trying to purify society and moralize public life, trying to eradicate what claims to embody evil is a complete misunderstanding of the way evil operates, of the way politics itself operates. Opting for a mode of unilateral denunciation, and ignoring the very principle of reversibility of evil, anti-Le Pen supporters have left him with a monopolistic control over the evil share. Having thus been cast away, Le Pen can no longer be dislodged. By demonizing him in the name of virtue, the political class simply offers him a most comfortable situation. Le Pen simply has to pick up and recycle the discourse of ambivalence, of denial of evil, and of hypocrisy that his opponents constantly throw at him in the course of their battle for the defense of law or the defense of a good cause. Le Pen's enemies provide him with the energy he needs. Too eager to discredit him, they simply transform his mistakes into (his own) victories. They do not see that good never comes from a purification of evil (evil always retaliates in a forceful way), but rather from a subtle treatment which turns evil against itself. All this shows us that Le Pen may be the embodiment of worthlessness and idiocy. No doubt! But he is above all the symptom of his opponents' stupidity. The imbeciles are those who, by denouncing him, blatantly reveal their own impotence and idiocy and glaringly demonstrate how absurd it is to antagonize him face to face. They simply have not understood the rules of evil that his game of musical chairs follow. By continuing to antagonize him, the

imbeciles give life to their own ghosts, their negative doubles. This shows, indeed, a terrifying lack of lucidity on their part. But what drives such a perverse effect, the fact that the left remains trapped in a discourse of denunciation whereas Le Pen maintains a privilege of enunciation? What pushes one to gain all the profits from the crime while the other suffers the negative effects of recrimination? What causes one to "get off" [s'eclatant] with evil when the other gets lost with the victim? Well, it's quite simple. By incarcerating Le Pen in a ghetto, it is in fact the democratic left which becomes incarcerated and which affirms itself as a discriminatory power. It becomes exiled within its own obsession and automatically grants a privilege of justice to what it demonizes. And, of course, Le Pen never misses an opportunity to claim republican legality and fairness on his behalf. But it is above all on the imaginary but very pregnant figure of the rebel and persecuted soul that he establishes his prestige. Thus, he can enjoy the consequences of both legality and illegality. A victim of ostracism, Le Pen has an incredible freedom of language and can deploy an unmatched arrogance of judgement, something that the left has deprived itself of. Let's give an example of such a magical thought that today stands in for political thought. Le Pen is blamed for the sentiment of rejection and exclusion of immigrants in France. But this is just a drop in an ocean of social exclusion that has overwhelmed all of society (recently, exclusion itself, as well as the "social breakdown" that politicians like to mention, were all excluded by the decree signed by the President of the Republic to dissolve the National Assembly). We are all both responsible and victim at the same time of this inextricable and complex process of exclusion. There is something typically magical in the need to conjure up this virus, which is everywhere to be found (it is a direct function of our social and technical "progress"), and in the desire to exorcise the curse of exclusion (and our impotence by the same token) through the figure of a hated man, institution, or organization, no matter who or what they are. It is as if we were faced with a tumor in need of extraction whereas, in fact, the metastases have already expanded everywhere. The Front National simply follows the course of the social metastases, and is all the more virulent since people think that they have eradicated the disease when, in fact, it has already infected the entire body. Not to mention that this process of magical projection of the Front National takes place along the same lines as this party's own process of demonization of immigrants. One must always be suspicious of the ruse of contamination, a ruse which, by means of the transparency of evil, mutates positivity into negativity, and a demand for liberty into "democratic despotism." As usual, it is a question of reversibility, of a subtle encirclement of evil whose rational intelligence is never suspected. While modern pathology tells us a lot about the physical body, we do not pay attention to this mode of analysis when it comes to the social body. To remain within the political, we must step away from ideology and look at things through the lens of social physics. Our democratic society is a stasis. Le Pen is a metastasis. Global society is dying of inertia and immune deficiency. Le Pen is simply the visible transcription of such a viral condition; he is the spectacular projection of the virus. This happens in dreams too. Le Pen is a burlesque, hallucinatory figuration of a latent state, of a silent inertia caused by forced integration and systematic exclusion. Since the hope of finally curing social inequalities has truly disappeared (by and large), it is no surprise if resentment has moved to the level of racial inequality. The failure of the social explains the success of the racial (and of all the other fatal strategies). As such, Le Pen is the only savage analyst in today's society. The fact that he is placed on the far right is merely the sad result of the fact that analysts are no longer to be found on the left or the far left. Judges, intellectuals no longer analyze. Only the immigrants perhaps, as polar opposites, could become analysts too. But they already have been recycled by a good and responsible humanitarian thought. Le Pen is the only one who operates a radical erasure of the so-called distinction between right and left. This is, no doubt, an erasure by default. But the harsh criticism of this conventional distinction which was unleashed in the 1960s (and culminated in 1968) has unfortunately disappeared from the political scene today. Le Pen simply recuperates a de facto situation that the political class refuses to confront (it even uses elections to deny it), but whose extreme consequences will be felt some day. If, one day, political imagination, political will, and political demand hope to rebound, they will have to take into account the radical abolition of the antiquated and artificial distinction between right and left, which, in fact, has been largely damaged and compromised over the past decades, and which only holds today through some sort of complicit corruption on both sides. This distinction is dead in practice but, by means of an incurable revisionism, is constantly reaffirmed. Thus, Le Pen is the only one who makes up the new political scene, as if everyone else had already agreed to destroy what's left of democracy, perhaps to produce the retrospective illusion that it actually used to mean something.

## Oil Spills

### 2NC Article 19 Turn – XT

#### Linear risk for us – US environmental standards may be horrible, but PEMEX’s are worse – adoption of “common standards” can only increase the risk of ecological disaster.

Greenpeace, 2-22-2012, non-governmental environmental organization, “Transboundary agreement spells disaster for the Gulf,” http://www.greenpeace.org/usa/en/media-center/news-releases/Transboundary-agreement-spells-disaster-for-the-Gulf/

“Deepwater exploration is a huge risk to the environment and a waste of resources for the country. Each oil spill at sea disrupts the ecosystem, causing ecological disturbances, some temporary, others permanent. State-owned oil company Pemex has a history of oil spills off the coast of Tamaulipas, Veracruz, Tabasco and Campeche and now with plans for deepwater exploration in the Gulf of Mexico, the potential for disaster increases exponentially,” said Greenpeace Mexico Climate Campaigner Beatriz Olivera.

### 2NC GMR – Recency

#### Microbes can and will solve – prefer our evidence, only we cite the most recent research and international studies, and it’s Gulf-specific.

Tilo Arnhold, 9-30-2013, writer-reporter for The Daily Fusion, “Oil-Eating Bacteria May Be Used to Clean Up Petroleum Spills,” <http://dailyfusion.net/2013/09/oil-eating-bacteria-may-be-used-to-clean-up-petroleum-spills-21446/>

Teams of international scientists have decrypted the effectiveness of two types of oil-eating bacteria, which could be used in the future to help combat oil spill disasters. According to a report written by scientists from the Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research and the Helmholtz Centre for Infection Research in the peer-reviewed journal Applied and Environmental Microbiology, Alcanivorax borkumensis converts hydrocarbons into fatty acids which then form along the cell membrane. New insights on the bacteria Oleispira antarctica are important to understand their adaptation to low temperatures and could help in mitigation strategies for oil spills in polar seas or the deep sea, according to comments made by an international team in the peer-reviewed journal Nature Communications. Until now, chemicals have often been used to clean up oil disasters, to break up the oil/water emulsion, making oil more soluble and thus removing it from the surface water. According to data from the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) around seven million liters of such chemicals were used to combat oil pollution in the Gulf of Mexico, resulting from a spill of about 700,000 tons of crude oil into the sea from the offshore oil drilling platform “Deepwater Horizon” in 2010. Some of the most well-known of these were dispersants with the brand name Corexit—developed following the notorious tanker accident of the Exxon Valdez in Alaska in 1989. These substances have been heavily criticized however because of their side effects on humans and the environment.

## Hegemony

### 2NC Hegemony – Collapse Inevitable – Asymmetry

#### We’ll magnify it – asymmetry will cause serial policy failure and loss of faith in power

Newmann ‘8

(William, L. Douglas Wilder School of Government and Public Affairs, Virginia Commonwealth University, Hegemonic Competition, Hegemonic Disruption and the Current War, p.. 2-4)

Al- Qaeda’s network and ideology is less likely to produce a national champion, such as communism had in the form of the USSR, than to instigate or take advantage of a series of flashpoints where its ideology squares off with local or regional opponents in insurgency or civil war. The conflicts in Iraq, Somalia, and Afghanistan could be seen as visions of the future for many states. Such disruption can be an initial indication of hegemonic decline, leading second-tier powers to sense vulnerability in the US, a vulnerability which may change their calculus of the costs and benefits of balancing against the US or posing a direct challenge. It could also lead the US into overextension, miscalculations in foreign policy priorities, and provocative policies which could alienate allies, threaten fence sitters, and play into the hands of critics or enemies of US hegemony, again changing the cost and benefit estimates for second-tier powers of balancing or challenging the US. A third possibility emerges if the American public loses its commitment to the duties of hegemony and begins to ask its leaders to minimize US involvement in troublesome regions. This too would lead to a reassessment of US hegemony by second-tier powers. The situation in Iraq today provides evidence for all three of these scenarios. In addition, the unique features of US unipolar dominance complicate the strategic calculus of US hegemony. Following the demise of the USSR, the US has taken upon itself, on an inconsistent basis, the task of reconstructing the world in its own image. Both the Clinton and George W. Bush administrations have committed the US to a revisionist goal of spreading of liberal-democratic norms around the globe as a first order foreign policy priority.4 As a revisionist hegemon, US power and policy directly challenges non-liberal-democratic nations and ideological movements – an ideological contest that raises the stakes for the US. The survival of al-Qaeda and its revolutionary ideology undermines the foundation of US hegemonic policies as it seeks to spread democracy and free trade. The US cannot ignore al-Qaeda and al-Qaeda is not likely to ignore the US. In this sense, unless the US moves away from its revisionism, accepting a more status quo realist hegemony, its hegemonic future depends, in part, on how well it can compete with al-Qaeda’s revolutionary ideology in nations with substantial Muslim populations. The first section of this essay develops a model of hegemonic disruption in which the al-Qaeda led and inspired global insurgency presents an asymmetric challenge to US hegemony through its violent activities, organizational efforts, and ideological inspiration. A second section places the al-Qaeda network and its role as the vanguard of a revolutionary movement within the context of this model by defining it as a strategic sub-national actor; its firm ideological roots and its power projection capabilities justify its elevation to this status. Third, a discussion of al-Qeada’s “national security strategy” illustrates how its objectives and strategies to achieve those objectives make it a global insurgency acting against US hegemony. Based upon the model of hegemonic disruption and al-Qeada’s strategic relevance, a fourth section presents scenarios of how recent events and potential developments throughout Africa and Asia may impact US hegemony.

### 2NC Hegemony – Collapse Inevitable – Empirics

#### History proves American hegemony is unsustainable

Christopher **Layne** (Associate Professor in the Bush School of Government and Public Service at Texas A&M University) **2007** “American Empire: A Debate” p 63

States are ever-vigilant when it comes to maintaining their security because they want to survive as independent players in international politics. Up to a point, therefore, it is a good thing for a state to be powerful. But when a state becomes too powerful, it frightens others; in self-defense, they seek to offset and contain those great powers that aspire to primacy. And the ironclad lesson of history is clear: states that bid for hegemony (primacy) invariably fail.As Henry A. Kissinger has said, "hegemonic empires almost automatically elicit universal resistance, which is why all such claimants have sooner or later exhausted themselves."34Indeed, the history of modern international politics is strewn with the geopolitical wreckage of states that bid unsuccesfully for primacy: The Hapsburg Empire under Charles V, France under Louis XI V and Napoleon, Victorian Britain, Germany under Hitler. By pursuing a strategy of primacy, the United States today risks the same fate that has befallen other great powers that have striven to dominate the international political system.

### 2NC Hegemony – No Solve War – History

#### Historical statistics prove

Geller and Singer ‘99 \*Chair of the Department of Political Science @ Wayne State University

(Daniel S and Joel David, Nations at war: a scientific study of international conflict, p. 116-117)

Hopf (1991) and Levy (1984) examine the frequency, magnitude and severity of wars using polarity (Hopf) and “system size” (Levy) as predictors. Hopf’s database includes warfare in the European subsystems for the restricted temporal period of 1495–1559. The system [world] is classified as multipolar for the years 1495–1520 and as bipolar for the years 1521–1559. Hopf reports that the amount of warfare during those two periods was essentially equivalent. He concludes that polarity has little relationship to patterns of war for the historical period under examination. Levy (1984) explores a possible linear association between the number of great powers (system size) and *war for the extended temporal span of 1495 – 1974*. His findings coincide with those of Hopf; he reports that the frequency, magnitude and severity of war in the international system is unrelated to the number of major powers in the system.

# 1NR

## CP

### AT: Add-On

#### Internal problems check escalation

Tom Fries, Arctic Institute, MBA at Georgetown, “Perspective Correction: How we Misinterpret Arctic Conflict,” April 18th, 2012, VK

But there's a bigger misconception that underlies the predictions of future Arctic conflict that we read every week. This is the (usually) unspoken assumption that the governments of these states are capable of acting quickly, unilaterally and secretly to pursue their interests in the Arctic. False. This idea that some state might manage a political or military smash-and-grab while the rest of us are busy clipping our fingernails or walking the dog is ridiculous. The overwhelming weight of evidence suggests that the governments of the Arctic states are, like most massive organizations, bureaucratic messes. Infighting between federal agencies is rampant all around, as are political shoving matches between federal and state/provincial/ regional governments. Money is still scarce, and chatter about military activism isn’t backed up by much: Canada is [engaged in a sad debate](http://www.nunatsiaqonline.ca/stories/article/65674western_arctic_mp_criticizes_government_plans_for_nanisivik_naval_port/) over the downgrading of the proposed Nanisivik port; the [United States’ icebreaker fleet](http://www.thearcticsounder.com/article/1202icebreaker_fleet_in_us_lags_behind) is barely worth mentioning and shows little sign of new life in the near-term future; US Air Force assets are being [moved 300+ miles south](http://www.alaskadispatch.com/article/concerned-air-force-move-could-devastate-fairbanks-area) from Fairbanks to Anchorage; and Russia’s [talk about a greater Arctic presence](http://www.time.com/time/printout/0,8816,2110165,00.html) has been greatly inflated for the sake of the recent elections. In a more general sense, we have viciously polarized governments in the US and, to a lesser extent, Canada, as well as numerous “hotter” wars elsewhere that will take the lion’s share of our blood and treasure before the Arctic gets a drop of either.

## Dodd-Frank

### 2NC Afghanistan Defense

#### No overthrow

Walt ‘9

(Stephen M., Robert and Renée Belfer Prof of IR @ Harvard University, 12/3, “The "safe haven" myth,” *Foreign Policy*, http://walt.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2009/08/18/the\_safe\_haven\_myth)

This is a significant statement. In effect, the president was acknowledging that the only strategic rationale for an increased commitment in Afghanistan is the fear that if the Taliban isn't defeated in Afghanistan, they will eventually allow al Qaeda to re-establish itself there, which would then enable it to mount increasingly threatening attacks on the United States. This is the kind of assertion that often leads foreign policy insiders to nod their heads in agreement, but it shouldn't be accepted uncritically. Here are a few reasons why the "safe haven" argument ought to be viewed with some skepticism. First, this argument tends to lump the various groups we are contending with together, and it suggests that all of them are equally committed to attacking the United States. In fact, most of the people we are fighting in Afghanistan aren't dedicated jihadis seeking to overthrow Arab monarchies, establish a Muslim caliphate, **or mount attacks on U.S. soil**. Their agenda is focused on ***local affairs***, such as what they regard as the political disempowerment of Pashtuns and illegitimate foreign interference in their country. Moreover, the Taliban itself is more of a loose coalition of different groups than a tightly unified and hierarchical organization, which is why some experts believe we ought to be doing more to divide the movement and "flip" the moderate elements to our side. Unfortunately, the "safe haven" argument wrongly suggests that the Taliban care as much about attacking America as bin Laden does.

#### And public support for Taliban is collapsing

ISAF 8/20

(International Security Assistance Force, “Afghan and Coalition Force Targets Taliban Commander in Kunduz,” http://www.isaf.nato.int/article/isaf-releases/afghan-and-coalition-force-targets-taliban-commander-in-kunduz.html)

KABUL, Afghanistan (Aug. 21) - An Afghan and coalition security force conducted operations in Kunduz province Friday in pursuit of the Taliban district commander for Aliabad, who is directly involved in the planning of attacks against coalition forces. During the operation, several suspected insurgents were detained and two were killed. Afghan and coalition forces went to a series of compounds in Chahar Darah district to search for the commander. As the security force approached the first targeted building, two armed insurgents engaged the combined force from a nearby ditch. The security force returned fire and killed the insurgents. After the area was secure, Afghan and coalition forces went to two separate compounds and, using a loudspeaker, called for all occupants to exit the compounds peacefully and then secured the areas. After questioning the residents on scene, the security force detained the suspected insurgents.  "The population sees that corrupt Taliban insurgents in key Afghan districts are held accountable for their terrorist tactics," said U.S. Army Col. Rafael Torres, International Security Assistance Force Joint Command Combined Joint Operations Center director. "We're seeing the Afghan public support for the insurgency decreasing amongst the population and the Taliban's ability to influence them is seriously degraded." The security force protected the women and children throughout the search.

#### Empirics over theory – Afghan instability doesn’t escalate

Finel ‘9

(Dr. Bernard I. Finel, an Atlantic Council contributing editor, is a senior fellow at the American Security Project, “Afghanistan is Irrelevant,” Apr 27 http://www.acus.org/new\_atlanticist/afghanistan-irrelevant)

It is now a deeply entrenched conventional wisdom that the decision to “abandon” Afghanistan after the Cold War was a tragic mistake. In the oft-told story, our “abandonment” led to civil war, state collapse, the rise of the Taliban, and inevitably terrorist attacks on American soil. This narrative is now reinforced by dire warnings about the risks to Pakistan from instability in Afghanistan. Taken all together, critics of the Afghan commitment now find themselves facing a nearly unshakable consensus in continuing and deepen our involvement in Afghanistan. The problem with the consensus is that virtually every part of it is wrong. Abandonment did not cause the collapse of the state. Failed states are *not* always *a threat* to U.S. national security. And Pakistan’s problems have little to do with the situation across the border. First, the collapse of the Afghan state after the Soviet withdrawal had little to do with Western abandonment. Afghanistan has always been beset by powerful centrifugal forces. The country is poor, the terrain rough, the population divided into several ethnic groups. Because of this, the country has rarely been unified even nominally and has never really had a strong central government. The dominant historical political system in Afghan is warlordism. This is not a consequence of Western involvement or lack thereof. It is a function of geography, economics, and demography. Second, there is no straight-line between state failure and threats to the United States. Indeed, the problem with Afghanistan was not that it failed but rather that it “unfailed” and becameruled by the Taliban. Congo/Zaire is a failed state. Somalia is a failed state. There are many parts of the globe that are essentially ungoverned. Clearly criminality, human rights abuses, and other global ills flourish in these spaces. But the notion that any and all ungoverned space represents a core national security threat to the United States is simply unsustainable. Third, the problem was the Taliban regime was not that it existed. It was that it was allowed to fester without any significant response or intervention. We largely sought to ignore the regime — refusing to recognize it despite its control of 90% of Afghan territory. Aside from occasional tut-tutting about human rights violations and destruction of cultural sites, the only real interaction the United States sought with the regime was in trying to control drugs. Counter-drug initiatives are not a sound foundation for a productive relationship for reasons too numerous to enumerate here. Had we recognized the Taliban and sought to engage the regime, it is possible that we could have managed to communicate red lines to them over a period of years. Their failure to turn over bin Laden immediately after 9/11 does not necessarily imply an absolute inability to drive a wedge between the Taliban and al Qaeda over time. Fourth, we are now told that defeating the Taliban in Afghanistan is imperative in order to help stabilize Pakistan. But, most observers seem to think that Pakistan is in worse shape now — with the Taliban out of power and American forces in Afghanistan — than it was when the Taliban was dominant in Afghanistan. For five years from 1996 to 2001, the Taliban ruled Afghanistan and the Islamist threat to Pakistan then was unquestionably lower.

This is not surprising actually. Insurgencies are at their most dangerous — in terms of threat of contagion — when they are fighting for power. The number of insurgencies that actually manage to sponsor insurgencies elsewhere after taking power is surprising low. The domino theory is as dubious in the case of Islamist movements as it was in the case of Communist expansion. There is a notion that “everything changed on 9/11.” We are backing away as a nation from that concept in the case of torture. Perhaps we should also come to realize that our pre-9/11 assessment of the strategic value and importance of Afghanistan was closer to the mark that our current obsession with it. We clearly made some mistakes in dealing with the Taliban regime. But addressing those mistakes through better intelligence, use of special forces raids, and, yes, diplomacy is likely a better solution than trying to build and sustain a reliable, pro-Western government in Kabul with control over the entire country.

## DA

### 2NC Impact Kata

#### Russia collapse causes nuclear war.

Filger 9 – Sheldon, author and blogger for the Huffington Post, “Russian Economy Faces Disastrous Free Fall Contraction” <http://www.globaleconomiccrisis.com/blog/archives/356>

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

#### China food shocks cause lash-out.

Thomas Kane1 and Lawrence Serewicz2, Fall-xx-2001, Security Studies from Hull1, Foreign Policy Analyst2, “China's Hunger: The Consequences of a Rising Demand for Food and Energy,” <http://strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pubs/parameters/Articles/01autumn/Kane.htm>

Despite China's problems with its food supply, the Chinese do not appear to be in danger of widespread starvation. Nevertheless, one cannot rule out the prospect entirely, especially if the earth's climate actually is getting warmer. The consequences of general famine in a country with over a billion people clearly would be catastrophic. The effects of oil shortages and industrial stagnation would be less lurid, but economic collapse would endanger China's political stability whether that collapse came with a bang or a whimper. PRC society has become dangerously fractured. As the coastal cities grow richer and more cosmopolitan while the rural inland provinces grow poorer, the political interests of the two regions become ever less compatible. Increasing the prospects for division yet further, Deng Xiaoping's administrative reforms have strengthened regional potentates at the expense of central authority. As Kent Calder observes, In part, this change [erosion of power at the center] is a conscious devolution, initiated by Deng Xiaoping in 1991 to outflank conservative opponents of economic reforms in Beijing nomenclature. But devolution has fed on itself, spurred by the natural desire of local authorities in the affluent and increasingly powerful coastal provinces to appropriate more and more of the fruits of growth to themselves alone.[ 49] Other social and economic developments deepen the rifts in Chinese society. The one-child policy, for instance, is disrupting traditional family life, with unknowable consequences for Chinese mores and social cohesion.[ 50] As families resort to abortion or infanticide to ensure that their one child is a son, the population may come to include an unprecedented preponderance of young, single men. If common gender prejudices have any basis in fact, these males are unlikely to be a source of social stability. Under these circumstances, China is vulnerable to unrest of many kinds. Unemployment or severe hardship, not to mention actual starvation, could easily trigger popular uprisings. Provincial leaders might be tempted to secede, perhaps openly or perhaps by quietly ceasing to obey Beijing's directives. China's leaders, in turn, might adopt drastic measures to forestall such developments. If faced with internal strife, supporters of China's existing regime may return to a more overt form of communist dictatorship. The PRC has, after all, oscillated between experimentation and orthodoxy continually throughout its existence. Spectacular examples include Mao's Hundred Flowers campaign and the return to conventional Marxism-Leninism after the leftist experiments of the Cultural Revolution, but the process continued throughout the 1980s, when the Chinese referred to it as the "fang-shou cycle." (Fang means to loosen one's grip; shou means to tighten it.)[ 51] If order broke down, the Chinese would not be the only people to suffer. Civil unrest in the PRC would disrupt trade relationships, send refugees flowing across borders, and force outside powers to consider intervention. If different countries chose to intervene on different sides, China's struggle could lead to major war. In a less apocalyptic but still grim scenario, China's government might try to ward off its demise by attacking adjacent countries.

#### China war goes nuclear.

Hunkovic ‘09 (Lee J. Hunkovic, American Military University, “The Chinese-Taiwanese Conflict: Possible Futures of a Confrontation between China, Taiwan and the United States of America,” 2009, <http://www.lamp-method.org/eCommons/Hunkovic.pdf>)

A war between China, Taiwan and the United States has the potential to escalate into a nuclear conflict and a third world war, therefore, many countries other than the primary actors **could be affected** by such a conflict, including Japan, both Koreas, Russia, Australia, India and Great Britain, if they were drawn into the war, as well as all other countries in the world that participate in the global economy, in which the United States and China are the two most dominant members. If China were able to successfully annex Taiwan, the possibility exists that they could then plan to attack Japan and begin a policy of aggressive expansionism in East and Southeast Asia, as well as the Pacific and even into India, which could **in turn** create an international standoff **and deployment of military forces to contain the threat. In any case, if China and the United States engage in a full-scale conflict, there are few countries in the world that will not be economically and/or militarily affected by it.** However, China, Taiwan and United States are the primary actors in this scenario, whose actions will determine its eventual outcome, therefore, other countries will not be considered in this study., with 331 deaths.

### 2NC L – Top Level

#### The plan decimates Gulf marine biodiversity – this evidence is specific to the Transboundary Hydrocarbons Agreement

Greenpeace, 2-22-2012, non-governmental environmental organization, “Transboundary agreement spells disaster for the Gulf,” http://www.greenpeace.org/usa/en/media-center/news-releases/Transboundary-agreement-spells-disaster-for-the-Gulf/

In response to the United States and Mexico signing an agreement to develop oil and gas reservoirs that cross the international maritime boundary between the two countries in the Gulf of Mexico Greenpeace United States and Mexico have signed their own transboundary agreement. Greenpeace US and Mexico signed the agreement concerning their governments continued obsession with helping the gas and oil industry profit off polluting the climate and devastating the Gulf of Mexico. “The US and Mexican governments say their agreement is “designed to enhance energy security in North America,” an impossibility given the continued support for fossil fuel production over secure, renewable energy sources. President Obama's failure to permanently reject the Keystone XL pipeline, his expanding coal mining on public lands, and approval of oil exploration in the Arctic lay the groundwork for this new policy,” said Greenpeace US Climate Campaigner Kyle Ash. “This agreement opens new areas to dangerous, expensive, and controversial offshore drilling techniques. This is what led to the deaths of eleven workers and over 200 million gallons of oil spewing into the Gulf just two years ago,’ said Mr Ash. “The US-Mexican joint statement called for “the highest degree of safety and environmental standards,” which the US Congress has failed to improve since the Deepwater disaster. A recent report from the National Research Council reaffirmed that deepwater drilling remains unsafe.” Drilling could take place in the Gulf at depths typically greater than 8,500 feet, deeper than at any drilling site in the world. The BP Deepwater Horizon catastrophe occurred in water 5,000 feet deep “Deepwater exploration is a huge risk to the environment and a waste of resources for the country. Each oil spill at sea disrupts the ecosystem, causing ecological disturbances, some temporary, others permanent. State-owned oil company Pemex has a history of oil spills off the coast of Tamaulipas, Veracruz, Tabasco and Campeche and now with plans for deepwater exploration in the Gulf of Mexico, the potential for disaster increases exponentially,” said Greenpeace Mexico Climate Campaigner Beatriz Olivera.

### 2NC L – AT: LNU – US Drill Inev

#### US Gulf drilling is down – Obama regulations – this card’s specific to the Gulf.

Peter Morici, 2-27-2012, professor at the Smith School of Business, University of Maryland School, and former Chief Economist at the U.S. International Trade Commission, “The Wisdom of Drilling for Oil,” http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2012/02/27/mr\_president\_oil\_drilling\_could\_make\_a\_big\_difference\_113263.html

When Barack Obama assumed the presidency, gas prices were less than $2 a gallon. He proceeded to shut down deep-water drilling in the Gulf, tightened other federal restrictions on petroleum development, and vetoed the Keystone Pipeline. Now, even with Americans driving not a lot more than three years ago and global growth slowing, gas is nearing $4 a gallon. The liberal theocracy in academia, the media and the Democratic Party leadership relentlessly expounds that drilling for oil in the United States won’t much affect U.S. gas prices, because petroleum prices are set in global markets. And, more domestic oil production or U.S. access to Canadian petroleum won’t much change global supplies, or the pace of economic recovery and unemployment.

# 2NR

## New

### AT: Rape Metaphors K

Grimachu 12-06-2012, <http://talesofgrim.wordpress.com/2012/06/12/in-defence-of-rape/>

Does the existence of rape stories, even as a cheap jab to get someone’s emotions involved, somehow trivialise or normalise rape? I’m going to pin my colours to the mast pretty firmly on this one and say no it doesn’t. How can I assert that with such confidence? Simply this. If rape were trivialised it would not have the power to move us, involve us and activate our emotions. If we had become inured to it, it would not work to establish a character’s evil credentials. If it had become normalised it wouldn’t serve its purpose in a narrative. It wouldn’t be a big deal. It wouldn’t upset the characters because it wouldn’t upset us. Ironically, the very fact that people get up in arms about a threat to Lara Croft in a video game, the rape of Daenerys’ by Khal Drogo in GRRM’s book and the resulting TV show or, fate help us, the existence of half-orcs in D&D, demonstrates that it is not trivial. It shows that it still has the power to shock and engage, to elicit the very reactions that make it attractive as a narrative element in the first place. It also shows that no, it’s not acceptable or trivialised any more than mass murder – also common in books, RPGs, films and games is. Hopefully the people making spurious rape culture arguments will end up in the same mirth-laden cultural waste-basket as Jack Chick, Fredric Wertham and Jack Thompson.