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### 1

#### ‘Economic engagement’ must be quid pro quo.

Helweg 2k – International Affairs Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations (M. Diana Helweg, 2000, “Taking Sanctions into the Twenty-First Century,” Economic Strategy and National Security: a next generation approach, ed. Patrick DeSouza, p. 143-145)

To fill the policy vacuum left by the reduced use of sanctions, the United States should adhere to a policy of political and economic engagement that balances "sticks" such as sanctions and other restrictive measures with additional "carrots" of trade and aid. Only broader economic engagement can open up the relationship with a country and create the mutual economic and strategic benefits that will enable subsequent restrictive policies to encourage the targeted regime to change its undesirable behavior. / Stated most simply, engagement is the opposite of isolation. It includes the flow of ideas, goods, and money under the umbrella of official diplomatic relations. Engagement can be effected through strategic and political dialogue, investment, trade, and even joining forces on appropriate issues in multilateral fora. Since the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, the United States has pursued a policy of political and economic engagement with some previously isolated regimes through dialogue, investment, and support of free trade. In doing so, the United States has indirectly helped promote democracy, freedom of association, freedom of speech, and civil and human rights. To be sure, progress has occurred slowly and with differing degrees of success. Although difficult to measure, engagement with democracies provides the citizens of closed countries the opportunity to learn what types of political freedoms and economic successes are possible. The past decade is replete with instances of ordinary people using that education to try to change their political worlds from Eastern Europe to Latin America and from Africa to Asia. / Countries that have initiated trade and diplomatic relations with the United States have definitely benefited more than those that remain isolated from the United States. For example, compare the civil reforms that have accompanied economic reforms in the former Soviet Union that have been triggered by Western investment and trade, against those that have yet to occur in an isolated Cuba. The same dichotomy can be seen when comparing the improvements in quality of life in a virtually capitalist China thriving on foreign investment with an unstable, famine-stricken North Korea. This argument does not suggest that further significant reforms are still not needed in Russia and China, but there have been improvements over the last decade. One of the keys to the gradual improvements in the Chinese and Russian regimes has been the coupling of economic and political engagement with economic restrictions for behavior incompatible with international norms.

### 2

#### US-Brazil Relations are high now.

John Kerry, 8-13-2013, Secretary of State of the United States, “Remarks With Brazilian Foreign Minister Antonio de Aguiar Patriota After Their Meeting,” <http://www.state.gov/secretary/remarks/2013/08/213105.htm>

Now, obviously we have also had some moments of disagreement, and I’m sure I’ll have an occasion in the questions to be able to address some of that with you. But the United States and Brazil – I want to emphasize, rather than focus on an area of disagreement – the United States and Brazil share a remarkable and dynamic partnership. Every single day we work together to advance economic opportunity, human rights, environment protection, regional peace and security, democracy, as well as major global challenges in the Middle East and elsewhere – Syria for instance and the question of the humanitarian challenge in Syria. The United States respects and appreciates that Brazil is one of the world’s largest free market democracies, and our partnership is only made stronger as all of the world continues to grow. The United States recognizes and welcomes and greatly appreciates the vital leadership role, the increasing leadership role, that Brazil plays on the international stage – excuse me – and that ranges from its participation in global peace initiatives to its stability operations and promotion of human rights and its efforts to try to help either promote the peace or keep the peace in certain parts of the world. Through the Global Peace Operations Initiative, we are working with Brazil and the United Nations to build the capacity of countries to be able to contribute themselves to peacekeeping operations. Brazil has provided more than 1,400 uniformed personnel to the stabilization mission in Haiti. We’re very grateful for that. And we’re also exploring opportunities for closer collaboration on peacekeeping in Africa. It’s fair to say that protecting universal rights is at the very heart of the shared values between Brazil and the United States. And together, we remain committed to advancing those rights and to advancing the cause of equality for all people. The United States also supports a very vibrant and active Organization of American States, and the OAS Charter reminds us of our responsibilities to offer our citizens liberty and to create the conditions in which all people can reach their aspirations, can live their aspirations. We believe that it is important that Brazil engage fully with the OAS and use its strong voice for a hemispheric vision of democracy and fundamental freedoms. Now, our relationship is not only rooted in shared values, it is literally strengthened every single day by our citizens. Each year thousands of people travel between the United States and Brazil, forging new ties between our countries. Student exchanges under President Rousseff’s Scientific Mobility Program, which I had the privilege of visiting this morning and sensing firsthand the amazing energy and excitement and commitment of these young people, that’s something we share in common. And together with President Rousseff’s program and President Obama’s 100,000 Strong in the Americas Initiative, we are encouraging together approaches to address the shared concerns of our young people to include social inclusion and to work towards things like environmental sustainability.

#### Unilateral interference in Latin America greatly upsets Brazil – collapses relations.

David Rothkopf, 3-xx-2009, President and CEO of Garten Rothkopf, an international advisory firm specializing in transformational global trends, notably those associated with energy, security, and emerging markets, “The Perils of Rivalry,” <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2009/03/pdf/brazil.pdf>

There are other areas in which tension could enter the relationship. How the United States interacts with the Americas writ large under President Obama will shape relations and create potential pitfalls, and so will domestic political considerations both in the United States and Brazil. Any real or perceived interference in the region by the United States would greatly upset Brazil. If the United States decided that heavy-handed political pressure or intervention were required in regard, for example, to Venezuela, Bolivia, or Ecuador, this could put Brazil in an uncomfortable position where it has to choose between the United States and its neighbors. Since Brazil has spent years arguing for South American unity, it would likely choose its neighbors or—even more likely—choose to interject itself as a third party with a third point of view.

#### US-Brazil relationship is key to successful Asia pivot.

Zachary Keck, 5-03-2012, deputy editor of e-International Relations and an editorial assistant at The Diplomat, “With Eye on Asia, U.S. Seeks Greater Global Security Role for Brazil,” <http://www.opeal.net/index.php?option=com_k2&view=item&id=10961%3Awith-eye-on-asia-us-seeks-greater-global-security-role-for-brazil&Itemid=149>

With Eye on Asia, U.S. Seeks Greater Global Security Role for Brazil Last week’s inaugural U.S.-Brazilian Defense Cooperation Dialogue was the latest example of the Obama administration’s efforts to enhance defense cooperation with Brazil. Though improving broader relations with Brazil has been a priority for the Obama administration, the U.S. emphasis on bilateral defense ties should also be seen as part of Washington’s ongoing effort to get Brazil to increase its global security profile as the U.S. focuses more of its strategic attention and shrinking defense resources on the Western Pacific. Even before announcing the U.S. pivot to Asia last fall, the Obama administration had actively pursued expanded security ties with Brazil. The two countries signed a defense cooperation agreement in April 2010 and another agreement the following November to facilitate information-sharing. Both agreements have already resulted in greater military-to-military cooperation, at times in new domains. Although the U.S.-Brazilian navies have a long history of cooperation, most recently jointly participating in a maritime security exercise near Africa in February, cooperation between their air forces is a relatively new phenomenon. In 2010, the U.S. Air Force participated in Brazil’s annual Cruzex multinational air exercise for the first time. Next year, Brazil will reciprocate by joining the annual multilateral Red Flag exercise in Nevada. Since the Asia pivot, however, the Obama administration’s efforts have taken on a greater urgency. The White House dispatched Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. Martin Dempsey to Brasilia last March to further expand military-to-military ties. It has also been urging Congress to loosen restrictions on technology transfers to Brazil. The bilateral Defense Cooperation Dialogue was subsequently publicly unveiled during Brazilian President Dilma Rousseff’s trip to Washington last month. The first meeting of the new initiative took place April 24, during the Brazilian leg of U.S. Defense Secretary Leon Panetta’s weeklong trip to Latin America. During his two-day visit, Panetta repeatedly called on Brazil to increase its role in global security. Washington’s interest in such an expanded Brazilian role stems from its need to increase its force posture in Asia while reducing overall defense spending. Brazil can help facilitate this shift in two ways. First, the U.S. will need to increase its arms sales if it hopes to maintain its defense industrial base in the face of its own budgetary constraints. Brazil’s robust economic growth and responsible global track record make it an attractive defense customer from Washington’s perspective. Brazil’s GDP in current dollars grew from $558 billion in 2000 to $1.78 trillion in 2010, a roughly 220 percent increase over the decade. Brazil is also wealthy relative to other large rising powers. As the world’s fifth-most-populous country, its GDP per capita is nearly equal to China and India’s combined. Brazil is already looking to purchase 36 multirole combat aircraft at a cost of $4 billion to $7 billion. The U.S.-based Boeing Corporation’s F/A-18 Super Hornet is competing with the French Rafale and Swedish Gripen for the contract. With Brazil’s decision expected in the coming weeks, Panetta wasn’t bashful in pushing for the Super Hornet during his trip, stating, “With the Super Hornet, Brazil's defense and aviation industries would be able to transform their partnerships with U.S. companies and . . . plug into worldwide markets." Second, by expanding its participation in international security operations, Brazil can help free up U.S. forces for the Western Pacific. The most obvious roles for the Brazilian military are in hemispheric security and patrolling the Atlantic Ocean. The latter is especially crucial as Washington stations more of its shrinking fleet in the Pacific. Interestingly, last week Panetta also said the U.S. wants Brazil to play a larger role in training African security forces. While the defense secretary justified this on the basis of Brazil’s historical ties to Africa -- Brazil was the largest destination of the Atlantic Slave Trade -- the main driver of U.S. policy is its pivot to Asia. Since the attacks of Sept. 11, U.S. Marines have taken the lead in training African partner nations for counterterrorism operations. With the U.S. looking to station more of its Marines in Asia, even as terrorist groups flourish in Africa, Washington needs others to perform this role. Once again, the Obama administration sees Brazil as a viable candidate.

#### Successful Asia pivot solves China war.

Friedberg 11 Princeton IA professor, 9-4-11, (Aaron L., “China’s Challenge at Sea,” http://www.nytimes.com/2011/09/05/opinion/chinas-challenge-at-sea.html?\_r=1, accessed 9-30-11)

If the United States and its Asian friends look to their own defenses and coordinate their efforts, there is no reason they cannot maintain a favorable balance of power, even as China’s strength grows. But if they fail to respond to China’s buildup, there is a danger that Beijing could miscalculate, throw its weight around and increase the risk of confrontation and even armed conflict. Indeed, China’s recent behavior in disputes over resources and maritime boundaries with Japan and the smaller states that ring the South China Sea suggest that this already may be starting to happen. Many of China’s neighbors are more willing than they were in the past to ignore Beijing’s complaints, increase their own defense spending and work more closely with one another and the United States. They are unlikely, however, to do those things unless they are convinced that America remains committed. Washington does not have to shoulder the entire burden of preserving the Asian power balance, but it must lead.

#### Otherwise, it goes nuclear.

Glaser 11 GW University Political Science Professor, 11 (Charles, HARLES GLASER is Professor of Political Science and International Affairs and Director of the Institute for Security and Conflict Studies at the Elliott School of International Affairs at George Washington University., "Will China's Rise Lead to War? ", Foreign Affairs, Mar/April 2011, Vol. 90, Issue 2, factiva, accessed 11-9-11, )

The prospects for avoiding intense military competition and war may be good, but growth in China's power may nevertheless require some changes in U.S. foreign policy that Washington will find disagreeable- particularly regarding Taiwan. Although it lost control of Taiwan during the Chinese Civil War more than six decades ago, China still considers Taiwan to be part of its homeland, and unification remains a key political goal for Beijing. China has made clear that it will use force if Taiwan declares independence, and much of China's conventional military buildup has been dedicated to increasing its ability to coerce Taiwan and reducing the United States' ability to intervene. Because China places such high value on Taiwan and because the United States and China-whatever they might formally agree to-have such different attitudes regarding the legitimacy of the status quo, the issue poses special dangers and challenges for the U.S.-Chinese relationship, placing it in a different category than Japan or South Korea. A crisis over Taiwan could fairly easily escalate to nuclear war, because each step along the way might well seem rational to the actors involved. Current U.S. policy is designed to reduce the probability that Taiwan will declare independence and to make clear that the United States will not come to Taiwan's aid if it does. Nevertheless, the United States would find itself under pressure to protect Taiwan against any sort of attack, no matter how it originated. Given the different interests and perceptions of the various parties and the limited control Washington has over Taipei's behavior, a crisis could unfold in which the United States found itself following events rather than leading them. Such dangers have been around for decades, but ongoing improvements in China's military capabilities may make Beijing more willing to escalate a Taiwan crisis. In addition to its improved conventional capabilities, China is modernizing its nuclear forces to increase their ability to survive and retaliate following a large-scale U.S. attack. Standard deterrence theory holds that Washington's current ability to destroy most or all of China's nuclear force enhances its bargaining position. China's nuclear modernization might remove that check on Chinese action, leading Beijing to behave more boldly in future crises than it has in past ones. A U.S. attempt to preserve its ability to defend Taiwan, meanwhile, could fuel a conventional and nuclear arms race. Enhancements to U.S. offensive targeting capabilities and strategic ballistic missile defenses might be interpreted by China as a signal of malign U.S. motives, leading to further Chinese military efforts and a general poisoning of U.S.-Chinese relations.

### 3

#### Ex-Im has green-lighted loans for oil refinery development in Turkey—but fire from environmental groups puts funding on the brink.

Keith **Goldberg**, **12-06**-2013, reporter for Law360, a LexisNexis company, “Ex-Im Bank OKs $641M Loan For Turkey Oil Refinery Project,” <http://www.law360.com/articles/493793/ex-im-bank-oks-641m-loan-for-turkey-oil-refinery-project> \*\*it might not give access to the full article the first time; just search the title and you can get the whole thing cached from google lol

The U.S. **Ex**port**-Im**port **Bank** said Thursday that it's greenlighted a $640.7 million direct **loan** to the Turkish arm of the State Oil Co. of Azerbaijan Republic to **finance** the **export** of **American**-made **oil refinery equipment** that will be used to build a **refinery** on **Turkey's western coast**. The loan is for Star Rafineri AS, which is constructing an natural gas-fired oil refinery that the company claims will be capable of processing up to 10 million tons of crude oil per year. The refinery, which is scheduled to be up and running by 2017, will also process up to 1.6 million tons of naphtha per year, as well as petroleum products such as diesel oil and jet fuel. It will be the **first new refinery** to start operating **in Turkey** **since 1972**, according to the company. The Ex-Im Bank said the loan will support approximately 3,000 U.S. jobs, citing data from the U.S. departments of Commerce and Labor. "This important transaction will support the export of cutting-edge American equipment," Ex-Im Bank Chairman and President Fred P. Hochberg said in a statement Thursday. "Moreover, the transaction will help a vital industry in Turkey and support 3,000 U.S. jobs across America. The growth we see in the energy sector around the globe bolsters jobs here at home." Star Rafineri is a unit of SOCAR Turkey Enerji AS, the Turkish arm of SOCAR, which was established in 2008 as part of the deepening of economic ties between Turkey and Azerbaijan. Historically, the Ex-Im Bank has relied on loans to help foreign companies and governments buy U.S. goods. But under President Barack Obama, the bank has been more aggressive in support of U.S. exports, and has rolled out a new bond program meant to give foreign borrowers more flexibility and make Ex-Im — and, in turn, U.S. exports — more competitive. The bank has funded several energy-related projects in recent years, including providing $1.5 billion in August to guarantee a bond offering by Mexican national oil company Petroleos Mexicanos, or Pemex, to buy drilling services, chemicals, platforms, pumps and other equipment from American companies. Last month, the bank approved a $61.1 million direct loan to a unit of Costa Rica-based wind generation company Globeleq Mesoamerica Energy for the purchase of wind turbine generators for a 50-megawatt wind farm in the Central American nation. However, the Ex-Im Bank has **come under fire** from **environmental groups** over its financing of fossil fuel projects. In July, the bank was sued by six environmental groups that claimed it didn't consider health impacts involved with the transport of coal tabbed for export to Asia or prepare environmental impact reports required under federal law before approving a $90 million loan guarantee to Xcoal Energy & Resources.

#### Ex-Im financing for clean energy and fossil fuel projects is zero-sum—the plan would force a tradeoff.

William R. **DiBenedetto**, 8-17-20**10**, freelance writer and editor, “Ex-Im Bank Financing Boosts Dirty Energy Projects,” <http://www.triplepundit.com/2010/08/ex-im-bank-financing-boosts-dirty-energy-projects/>

The club notes that Ex-Im provides **billions of dollars** in **public financing** every year for “destructive **fossil fuel projects** abroad.” Last December Ex-Im approved a record $3 billion in financing for ExxonMobil’s Papua New Guinea Liquid Natural Gas project. That was done the same week that nations met in Copenhagen to work on a global climate change agreement. In addition to the pending Sasan project in India, **Ex-Im Bank support** could go to the Kusile coal power project in South Africa. “If constructed, Sasan and Kusile would be among the world’s largest coal power projects with combined 56.9 million tons of annual CO2 emissions, plus extensive pollution to local water and air, causing community dislocation and health problems including increased rates of cardiopulmonary diseases and cancer deaths.” Sierra Club adds that this apparent bias is “egregious given that fact that clean energy exports can produce roughly three times the number of American jobs in comparison with fossil fuel related project job generation per $1 million in investment.” Is there a pattern here? Admittedly there are **tough choices and trade-offs** **between** boosting needed **export activity**, which helps the economy and creates jobs, and the **need to** curb CO2 emissions while **switch**ing **to clean energy** plants. In the Sasan case, 250 MW (renewable) vs. 3,960 MW (coal-fired) is not nearly the balanced win for the environment that Ex-Im trumpets. It takes U.S. taxpayer money away from potential clean energy projects and jobs while supporting dirty energy.

#### Investment in new refineries by Ex-Im is key to Turkey’s economy—supports vital industries.

Michael **Bastasch**, **12-06**-2013, writer for the Daily Caller, Daily Caller News Foundation, “Feds finance $641 million refinery in Turkey,” <http://dailycaller.com/2013/12/06/feds-finance-641-million-refinery-in-turkey/>

Despite President Barack Obama’s promise that the U.S. government would not fund coal plants overseas, the U.S. **Ex**port**-Im**port Bank authorized a nearly $641 million loan to build an **oil refinery in Turkey** that will use American-made equipment. “This **important transaction** will support the **export** of **cutting-edge American equipment**,” Ex-Im Bank Chairman and President Fred P. Hochberg said in a statement. “Moreover, the transaction will help a **vital industry in Turkey** and support 3,000 U.S. jobs across America. The growth we see in the energy sector **around the globe** bolsters jobs here at home.” According to the bank, american-made equipment will be used to build the refinery which will be completed in 2017. The facility will **refine crude oil** as well as **other petrochemicals**. However, while the federal government is offering millions for an oil refinery overseas, only one new refinery has been built in the U.S. since 1977.

#### Strong Turkish economy is key to regional credibility—solves war in the Balkans and Caucasus.

Mensur **Boydas**, xx-xx-20**09**\*\*, CEO, Boydas Marketing Inc., professional marketing counselor, “Strategic Importance of Turkey,” [http://mensur-boydas.blogcu.com/strategic-importance-of-turkey/7861648#](http://mensur-boydas.blogcu.com/strategic-importance-of-turkey/7861648) \*\*couldn’t get anything more specific—upload date was listed as “4 years ago,” sorry about that

Turkey is in the middle of the four regions which are seen as predicament; **Balkans, Caucasus**, **middle East and Gulf**. This position puts Turkey as indispensable for the ones who have expedience in these regions. Turkey is located on the Anatolian peninsula, has three seas around: Black Sea, Mediterranean Sea and Aegean Sea. According to Aribogan “Anatolia has a central location in the World Island at the meeting point of three continents - Asia, Europe and Africa via the Mediterranean and over centuries was used as an express passage for invaders both going from West to East and from East to West”. Especially, in the period of globalization the endurance of **U**nited **S**tates as military actions in these regions, and the distance to these regions, establishes the strategic importance of Turkey in the world. In other words, in the light of this battle Turkey has been carrying on the role of a **regional power**. From the strategic aspect is another power Russia, after the separation of Soviet Union, from the aspect of the arisen independent countries and autonomous governments, the **potentialities of Turkey in economic**al, cultural and political **binders**. In the case of intelligent usage of these potentialities, these will **add to the credibilit**y of Turkey as a **regional power.** The **political**, **economic**al, and **military chaos in these** four **regions** is likely to **continue** in the future. For this reason, the regional power characteristic of **Turkey** is likely to continue for many years from now. “The region has become a center of energy supplies in the 20th century. Since the regional countries are the biggest energy suppliers of the World, the region continues to play the **most important role** in the global political economy” (Aribogan, p.17).

#### War in the Caucasus draws in global powers—goes nuclear.

Stephen J. **Blank**, 6-xx-2000, **2k**, Strategic Studies Institute’s expert on the Soviet bloc and the post-Soviet world since 1989, was Associate Professor of Soviet Studies at the Center for Aerospace Doctrine, Research, and Education, Maxwell Air Force Base, B.A. in History @ UPenn, M.A. and Ph.D. in History @ UChicago, “U.S. Military Engagement with Transcaucasia and Central Asia,” <http://www.bits.de/NRANEU/docs/Blank2000.pdf>

Washington’s **burgeoning military-political-economic involvement** seeks, inter alia, to demonstrate the U.S. ability to project military power even into this region or for that matter, into Ukraine where NATO recently held exercises that clearly originated as an anti-Russian scenario. Secretary of Defense William Cohen has discussed strengthening U.S.-Azerbaijani military cooperation and even training the Azerbaijani army, certainly alarming Armenia and Russia. 69 And Washington is also training Georgia’s new Coast Guard. 70 However, Washington’s well-known ambivalence about committing force to Third World ethnopolitical conflicts suggests that U.S. military power will not be easily committed to saving its economic investment. But this **ambivalence** about committing forces and the dangerous situation, where Turkey is allied to Azerbaijan and Armenia is bound to Russia, create the potential for wider and more protracted regional conflicts among local forces. In that connection, Azerbaijan and Georgia’s growing efforts to secure NATO’s lasting involvement in the region, coupled with Russia’s determination to exclude other rivals, foster a polarization along very traditional lines. 71 In 1993 Moscow even **threatened World War III** to deter Turkish intervention on behalf of Azerbaijan. Yet the new Russo-Armenian Treaty and Azeri-Turkish treaty suggest that Russia and Turkey could be dragged into a confrontation to rescue their allies from defeat. 72 Thus **many** of the **conditions** for conventional war or protracted ethnic conflict in which third parties intervene are present in the **Transcaucasus**. For example, many Third World conflicts generated by local structural factors have a great potential for unintended escalation. **Big powers** often feel **obliged** to **rescue** their **lesser proteges** and proxies. One or another big power may fail to grasp the other side’s stakes since interests here are not as clear as in Europe. Hence commitments involving the **use** **of nuclear weapons** to prevent a client’s defeat are not as well established or apparent. Clarity about the nature of the threat could prevent the kind of rapid and almost uncontrolled escalation we saw in 1993 when Turkish noises about intervening on behalf of Azerbaijan led Russian leaders to **threaten a nuclear war** in that case. 73 Precisely because Turkey is a NATO ally, Russian nuclear threats could trigger a potential **nuclear blow** (not a small possibility given the erratic nature of Russia’s declared nuclear strategies). The real threat of a Russian **nuclear strike** against Turkey to defend Moscow’s interests and forces in **the Transcaucasus** makes the danger of **major war** there **higher** **than** almost **everywhere else**. As Richard Betts has observed, The greatest danger lies in areas where (1) the potential for serious instability is high; (2) both superpowers perceive vital interests; (3) neither recognizes that the other’s perceived interest or commitment is as great as its own; (4) both have the capability to inject conventional forces; and, (5) neither has willing proxies capable of settling the situation. 7

### 4

#### [CP TEXT: The United States federal government should join and implement the Kyoto Protocol and any new international climate change initiatives. The United States federal government should offer substantial financing for non-corn biofuels in Mexico through the Clean Development Mechanism of the Kyoto Protocol or any new international climate change initiatives. The United States federal government should lead United Nations climate talks.]

#### The Clean Development Mechanism of the Kyoto Protocol solves Mexico biofuels financing and climate leadership—their author.

Stephanie **Miller**1 **and** Rudy **DeLeon**2**; 1AC authors**, 4-xx-20**09**, consultant on U.S.-Latin America relations, formerly the Research Associate for the Americas Project on the National Security Team, degree in International Comparative Studies @ Duke1, Senior Vice President of National Security and International Policy at American Progress2, “Transcending the Rio Grande,” <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2009/04/pdf/mexico.pdf>

In addition, the **U**nited **S**tates must become a **signatory of the Kyoto Protocol** and any **new international climate change initiatives** on the horizon. The **U**nited **S**tates should take advantage of **substantial financing opportunities** **in Mexico** through the Kyoto Protocol’s **Clean Development Mechanism.** The Clean Development Mechanism allows **emission reduction**—or emission-removal—**projects** in developing countries to earn certified emission-reduction credits, which can then be traded and sold and used by industrialized countries to meet a part of their emission-reduction targets under the Kyoto Protocol. As of January 2008, Mexico accounted for 100 of the nearly 900 CDM projects registered worldwide, having been awarded with 2.3 million carbon emission reduction credits, making Mexico the second-largest creator of carbon credits in Latin America. In the pages that follow, this report will first examine the key economic and political trends and issues affecting the U.S.-Mexico relationship before exploring in more detail the policy recommendations presented above. We believe policymakers who come to grips with the importance of this bilateral relationship will then understand why our recommendations would put us on the road to a **more engaging** and **mutually beneficial relationship** on **both sides** of the border.

### 5

#### [CP TEXT: The United States federal government should---

#### ---substantially increase its Export-Import Bank financing of non-biofuel renewable energy

#### ---remove restrictions hindering the operation and investment of American firms on Mexican agricultural lands, and request that Mexico take similar action

#### ---substantially increase its agricultural development assistance towards Mexico

#### ---offer to provide Petróleos Mexicanos with any necessary technology in order to undertake deepwater oil drilling, and

#### ---substantially increase its incentives for production and export of soybean crops for global consumption.]

#### Letting US firms operate on Mexican farmlands solves the Mexican economy—their author.

Jeff McDonald; 1AC author, xx-xx-2009, JD and MBA @ U Mississippi, LLM in International Legal Studies @ American, “Corn, Sugar, and Ethanol: How Policy Change Can Foster Sustainable Agriculture and Biofuel Production in Mexico and the United States,” <http://www.wcl.american.edu/journal/ilsp/v1/3/mcdonald.pdf>

The devastation of Mexican agriculture post-NAFTA, while problematic, may have been an inevitable development.117 The resulting downfall of the Mexican ejido, while initially displacing Mexican farm workers and further weakening Mexican agricultural production, might be viewed as a market correction demanding efficient production and modernization while providing a better economic quality of life for rural Mexicans.118 However, because the Mexican economy may not be able to survive such a correction, the country might benefit from the help of its Northern neighbor. U.S. assistance should consist of both direct aid and investment in Mexico, and concurrent changes in domestic agricultural practices and subsidization. Under comparative trade theory, the U.S. should become Mexico’s supplier of basic grains, and Mexico should supply most, if not all, of U.S. fruits and vegetables.119 However, special consideration should be given to the socio-economic conditions of the rural Mexican farmer, and Mexican producers of traditional varieties of maize must be protected from market intrusion.120 Part of any agreement must be an inherent interest in mutual socio-cultural preservation. In trade, nations must recognize the higher responsibility to protect vulnerable aspects of one another’s culture and heritage. As this analysis will demonstrate, the effects of protecting Mexican farmers of white corn will be marginal to U.S. yellow corn farmers as inflated demand for U.S. corn will be eliminated, and any income lost in the Mexican market will be recouped by environmental credits, and the harvesting of biomass for domestic biofuel production. Notwithstanding the need to protect this sector of Mexican agriculture, recent land reforms in Mexico has given rise to increased U.S. interest in contract farming and marketing arrangements. 121 Permitting U.S. firms to operate on Mexican agricultural lands, and invest in its development, will likely enhance Mexican agricultural efficiency, productivity, and profitability, while facilitating land ownership for the Mexican farmer. With Mexican sugar production becoming ever-important in the establishment of a North American biofuel industry, FDI from the United States should focus on the supply and development of agricultural technology, the engineering of biofuel production facilities, and the infrastructure necessary to transport ethanol throughout both countries, and to points of export.

#### Giving Mexico deepwater drilling tech solves the warrant for why PEMEX collapse is inevitable—their author.

Stephanie **Miller**1 **and** Rudy **DeLeon**2**; 1AC authors**, 4-xx-20**09**, consultant on U.S.-Latin America relations, formerly the Research Associate for the Americas Project on the National Security Team, degree in International Comparative Studies @ Duke1, Senior Vice President of National Security and International Policy at American Progress2, “Transcending the Rio Grande,” <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2009/04/pdf/mexico.pdf>

Mexico’s **oil industry suffers** from an outmoded, although recently modestly reformed, fiscal policy that places enormous obligations on Petróleos Mexicanos, or Pemex, Mexico’s state-run oil company, to provide almost one-fifth of federal revenue from exports,21 as well as generate nearly 40 percent of all public-sector income.22 Complicating matters is the fact that Cantarell, Mexico’s **largest oil field**, is in **decline** and **exploration activities** have found **no suitable replacement** because **Pemex lacks the technological capacity to drill in deep waters** where new reserves may potentially be located. Furthermore, Mexico’s almost spiritual connection to its oil makes partnering with foreign companies that do have the technological capacity to undertake deep water drilling constitutionally challenging if not politically impossible.

#### Increasing US soy production and exports solves food scarcity.

Southeast Farm Press, 12-23-2009, Southeast Agricultural Information Paper, “U.S. soybean farmers feeding the world,” <http://southeastfarmpress.com/soybeans/us-soybean-farmers-feeding-world>

The United Soybean Board (USB) and soybean checkoff provides U.S. soybean farmers with tools and support to help them in their desire to help feed this growing population. An impressive 82 percent of U.S. soybean farmers polled in a recent soybean checkoff-funded survey said they felt a responsibility to feed the global population. “It’s encouraging, but not surprising, to see the number of U.S. soybean farmers who know it is part of their mission to feed the world,” says Chuck Myers, a soybean farmer from Lyons, Neb., and past USB chairman. “The soybean checkoff will do its part to provide tools to help U.S. soybean farmers with this.” One example of this support that USB provides to the increase food production is through production research. In 2009, soybean checkoff-funded research helped to map the soybean genome. This milestone will help researchers expedite the development and release of new soybean varieties. USB also established standards in seed varieties that claim soybean cyst nematode resistance to ensure U.S. soybean farmers receive the best tools to protect their yields from this pest. In addition, soybean checkoff funds assisted in the development of drought-tolerant soybeans. This new line of soybeans will allow farmers to produce food with less water. All of these achievements could lead to increased soybean production to aid in feeding the global population. “These advancements in research are important in increasing U.S. soybean production to meet global demand,” adds Myers. “This coming challenge will present a great opportunity for U.S. soybean farmers.” The soybean checkoff’s Biotechnology Initiative also plays a role in giving U.S. soybean farmers the tools they need to feed the growing population.

This initiative works to improve market access for U.S. biotech soybeans and to educate about the importance biotech crops will have in feeding the world. Through partnerships with organizations such as the World Food Prize, USB continues to spread this message about the safety and potential of biotechnology. “U.S. soybean farmers have an important responsibility in producing safe, reliable food supply for our growing population,” says Myers. “The soybean checkoff will support these efforts through issues such as research, market access and creating demand and preference for U.S. soy.”

## Ex-Im

### 1NC—Status Quo Solves

#### Status quo solves—Obama’s Climate Action Plan has already ‘greened’ the Ex-Im bank.

Vrinda Manglik, 8-02-2013, Sierra Club International Campaign Intern, “Is the Export-Import Bank Turning Over a New Leaf?” <http://sierraclub.typepad.com/compass/2013/08/is-the-export-import-bank-turning-a-new-leaf.html>

On July 18, the Export-Import Bank of the United States (Ex-Im) [gave an encouraging signal](http://content.sierraclub.org/press-releases/2013/07/us-export-import-bank-votes-against-funding-vietnam-coal-plant) that it would be taking President Obama's Climate Action Plan to heart. In line with the president's call to end U.S. government support for coal-fired power plants abroad,[delivered in a speech](http://sierraclub.typepad.com/compass/2013/06/video-cementing-his-climate-legacy-president-obama-speaks-on-climate-change.html) at Georgetown University on June 25, Ex-Im [announced](http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/07/18/usa-vietnam-coal-idUSL1N0FO1HZ20130718) that it would not be funding the proposed Thai Binh II coal-fired power plant in Vietnam. This is great news. Historically, Ex-Im has financed many fossil fuel projects, including coal projects in South Africa and India, and a liquefied natural gas project in Papua New Guinea. While Ex-Im’s finance for renewable energy exports has increased in recent years, the bank still continues to fall short of the congressionally mandated 10 percent target for renewable energy and environmentally beneficial exports. The Sierra Club is thrilled that the president's Climate Action Plan is setting a new norm for the financing of energy projects abroad, and we expect Ex-Im to continue moving in this positive direction and to make its dirty, unsustainable financing of fossil fuels a thing of the past

### Warming

#### No warming – newest data, sun, and oceans prove

Hudson, 9

Paul Hudson, Climate Correspondent, BBC News, 10/9, “What happened to global warming?”, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/science/nature/8299079.stm

This headline may come as a bit of a surprise, so too might that fact that the warmest year recorded globally was not in 2008 or 2007, but in 1998. / But it is true. For the last 11 years we have not observed any increase in global temperatures. / And our climate models did not forecast it, even though man-made carbon dioxide, the gas thought to be responsible for warming our planet, has continued to rise. / So what on Earth is going on? / Climate change sceptics, who passionately and consistently argue that man's influence on our climate is overstated, say they saw it coming. / They argue that there are natural cycles, over which we have no control, that dictate how warm the planet is. But what is the evidence for this? / During the last few decades of the 20th Century, our planet did warm quickly. / Sceptics argue that the warming we observed was down to the energy from the Sun increasing. After all 98% of the Earth's warmth comes from the Sun. / But research conducted two years ago, and published by the Royal Society, seemed to rule out solar influences. / The scientists' main approach was simple: to look at solar output and cosmic ray intensity over the last 30-40 years, and compare those trends with the graph for global average surface temperature. / And the results were clear. "Warming in the last 20 to 40 years can't have been caused by solar activity," said Dr Piers Forster from Leeds University, a leading contributor to this year's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). / But one solar scientist Piers Corbyn from Weatheraction, a company specialising in long range weather forecasting, disagrees. / He claims that solar charged particles impact us far more than is currently accepted, so much so he says that they are almost entirely responsible for what happens to global temperatures. / He is so excited by what he has discovered that he plans to tell the international scientific community at a conference in London at the end of the month. / If proved correct, this could revolutionise the whole subject. / Ocean cycles / What is really interesting at the moment is what is happening to our oceans. They are the Earth's great heat stores. / According to research conducted by Professor Don Easterbrook from Western Washington University last November, the oceans and global temperatures are correlated. / The oceans, he says, have a cycle in which they warm and cool cyclically. The most important one is the Pacific decadal oscillation (PDO). / For much of the 1980s and 1990s, it was in a positive cycle, that means warmer than average. And observations have revealed that global temperatures were warm too. / But in the last few years it has been losing its warmth and has recently started to cool down. / These cycles in the past have lasted for nearly 30 years. / So could global temperatures follow? The global cooling from 1945 to 1977 coincided with one of these cold Pacific cycles. / Professor Easterbrook says: "The PDO cool mode has replaced the warm mode in the Pacific Ocean, virtually assuring us of about 30 years of global cooling." / So what does it all mean? Climate change sceptics argue that this is evidence that they have been right all along. / They say there are so many other natural causes for warming and cooling, that even if man is warming the planet, it is a small part compared with nature.

## Mexico

### Mexico

#### No Asia war.

Bitzinger and Desker 9 [Why East Asian War is Unlikely Richard A. Bitzinger and Barry Desker Richard A. Bitzinger is a Senior Fellow at the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies. Barry Desker is Dean of the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies and Director of the Institute of Defense and Strategic Studies, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore. Survival | vol. 50 no. 6 | December 2008–January 2009 | pp. 105–128 DOI 10.1080/00396330802601883]

Yet despite all these potential crucibles of conflict, the Asia-Pacific, if not an area of serenity and calm, is certainly more stable than one might expect. To be sure, there are separatist movements and internal struggles, particularly with insurgencies, as in Thailand, the Philippines and Tibet. Since the resolution of the East Timor crisis, however, the region has been relatively free of open armed warfare. Separatism remains a challenge, but the break-up of states is unlikely. Terrorism is a nuisance, but its impact is contained. The North Korean nuclear issue, while not fully resolved, is at least moving toward a conclusion with the likely denuclearisation of the peninsula. Tensions between China and Taiwan, while always just beneath the surface, seem unlikely to erupt in open conflict any time soon, espe- cially given recent Kuomintang Party victories in Taiwan and efforts by Taiwan and China to re-open informal channels of consultation as well as institutional relationships between organisations responsible for cross-strait relations. And while in Asia there is no strong supranational political entity like the European Union, there are many multilateral organisations and international initiatives dedicated to enhancing peace and stability, includ- ing the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum, the Proliferation Security Initiative and the Shanghai Co-operation Organisation. In Southeast Asia, countries are united in a common geopolitical and economic organi- sation – the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) – which is dedicated to peaceful economic, social and cultural development, and to the promotion of regional peace and stability. ASEAN has played a key role in conceiving and establishing broader regional institutions such as the East Asian Summit, ASEAN+3 (China, Japan and South Korea) and the ASEAN Regional Forum. All this suggests that war in Asia – while not inconceivable – is unlikely.

#### Barriers check nuke terror

GSN ‘9

(Global Security Newswire, “Experts Debate Threat of Nuclear, Biological Terrorism,” http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw\_20090113\_7105.php)

In even the most likely scenario of nuclear terrorism, there are 20 barriers between extremists and a successful nuclear strike on a major city, said John Mueller, a political science professor at Ohio State University / The process itself is seemingly straightforward but exceedingly difficult -- buy or steal highly enriched uranium, manufacture a weapon, take the bomb to the target site and blow it up. Meanwhile, variables strewn across the path to an attack would increase the complexity of the effort, Mueller argued / Terrorists would have to bribe officials in a state nuclear program to acquire the material, while avoiding a sting by authorities or a scam by the sellers. The material itself could also turn out to be bad / "Once the purloined material is purloined, [police are] going to be chasing after you. They are also going to put on a high reward, extremely high reward, on getting the weapon back or getting the fissile material back," Mueller said during a panel discussion at a two-day Cato Institute conference on counterterrorism issues facing the incoming Obama administration / Smuggling the material out of a country would mean relying on criminals who "are very good at extortion" and might have to be killed to avoid a double-cross, Mueller said. The terrorists would then have to find scientists and engineers willing to give up their normal lives to manufacture a bomb, which would require an expensive and sophisticated machine shop / Finally, further technological expertise would be needed to sneak the weapon across national borders to its destination point and conduct a successful detonation, Mueller said / Every obstacle is "difficult but not impossible" to overcome, Mueller said, putting the chance of success at no less than one in three for each. The likelihood of successfully passing through each obstacle, in sequence, would be roughly one in 3 1/2 billion, he said, but for argument's sake dropped it to 3 1/2 million / "It's a total gamble. This is a very expensive and difficult thing to do," said Mueller, who addresses the issue at greater length in an upcoming book, Atomic Obsession. "So unlike buying a ticket to the lottery ... you're basically putting everything, including your life, at stake for a gamble that's maybe one in 3 1/2 million or 3 1/2 billion." / Other scenarios are even less probable, Mueller said / A nuclear-armed state is "exceedingly unlikely" to hand a weapon to a terrorist group, he argued: "States just simply won't give it to somebody they can't control." / Terrorists are also not likely to be able to steal a whole weapon, Mueller asserted, dismissing the idea of "loose nukes." Even Pakistan, which today is perhaps the nation of greatest concern regarding nuclear security, keeps its bombs in two segments that are stored at different locations, he said (see GSN, Jan. 12) / Fear of an "extremely improbable event" such as nuclear terrorism produces support for a wide range of homeland security activities, Mueller said. He argued that there has been a major and costly overreaction to the terrorism threat -- noting that the Sept. 11 attacks helped to precipitate the invasion of Iraq, which has led to far more deaths than the original event / Panel moderator Benjamin Friedman, a research fellow at the Cato Institute, said academic and governmental discussions of acts of nuclear or biological terrorism have tended to focus on "worst-case assumptions about terrorists' ability to use these weapons to kill us." There is need for consideration for what is probable rather than simply what is possible, he said. /

### 1NC—Dutch Disease

#### Dutch Disease Turn—plan causes Mexican Dutch Disease—collapses their economy.

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

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

### 1NC—Resiliency

#### Resiliency—no impact to PEMEX collapse or Mexican agricultural failure—their economy’s resilient.

Tom Wainwright, 11-24-2012, writer for The Economist, “From darkness, dawn,” <http://www.economist.com/news/special-report/21566773-after-years-underachievement-and-rising-violence-mexico-last-beginning>

THE APOCALYPSE WAS on its way, and it would begin in Mexico. Where else? When archaeologists dug up Mayan calendars that ominously seemed to run out in the final days of 2012, some doomsayers predicted the end of the world. To many Mexicans it seemed like just another example of their country’s unending run of bad luck. The steepest recession on the American mainland, a plague of H1N1 swine flu and a deepening war against organised crime had made the preceding few years fairly grim. In 2009 the Pentagon had given warning that Mexico could become a “failed state”. Armageddon would be the icing on the cake. But it turns out that the Mayan glyphs were misunderstood. The men with magnifying glasses now say that the world is not about to end—in fact, it seems that the Mayans were predicting something more like a renewal or a fresh start. Could the same be true of Mexico? This special report will argue that there is a good chance of it. Some awful years are giving way to what, if managed properly, could be a prosperous period for Latin America’s second-largest economy. Big, irreversible trends, from a falling birth rate at home to rising wages in China, are starting to move in Mexico’s favour. At the same time the country’s leaders are at last starting to tackle some of the home-grown problems that have held it back. Many of the things that the world thinks it knows about Mexico are no longer true. A serially underachieving economy, repeatedly trumped by dynamic Brazil? Mexico outpaced Brazil last year and will grow twice as fast this year. Out-of-control population growth and an endless exodus to the north? Net emigration is down to zero, if not negative, and the fertility rate will soon be lower than that of the United States. Grinding poverty? Yes, but alleviated by services such as universal free health care. A raging drug war? The failure of rich countries’ anti-drugs policies means that organised crime will not go away. But Mexico’s murder rate is now falling, albeit slowly, for the first time in five years. A vast country with deeply ingrained problems and unreformed corners, Mexico could yet squander the opportunities that are coming its way. But there are signs that it is beginning to realise its potential. With luck, the dire predictions made by the Pentagon and others may turn out to be as reliable as a misread Mayan calendar.

## Ethanol

### Ag

#### Won’t go to war over food – empirics and innovations solve

Gordon Chang, 2-21-11, Cornell Law School, “Global Food Wars,” http://blogs.forbes.com/gordonchang/2011/02/21/global-food-wars/

In any event, food-price increases have apparently been factors in the unrest now sweeping North Africa and the Middle East. The poor spend up to half their disposable income on edibles, making rapid food inflation a cause of concern for dictators, strongmen, and assorted autocrats everywhere. So even if humankind does not go to war over bad harvests, Paskal may be right when she contends that climate change may end up altering the global map. This is not the first time in human history that food shortages looked like they would be the motor of violent geopolitical change. Yet amazing agronomic advances, especially Norman Borlaug’s Green Revolution in the middle of the 20th century, have consistently proved the pessimists wrong. In these days when capitalism is being blamed for most everything, it’s important to remember the power of human innovation in free societies—and the efficiency of free markets.

#### Laundry list of alt causes

Tipson 12 (Frederick, Jennings Randolph Senior Fellow special advisor to the Center for Science, Technology and Peacebuilding at the U.S. Institute of Peace, worked previously for the UN Development Programme, Microsoft, the MarkleFoundation, the Council on Foreign Relations, Hongkong Telecom,AT&T, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and the University ofVirginia School of Law “Global Food Insecurity and "Political Malnutrition",” June 2012, Number 7, German Marshall Fund Connections, http://www.gmfus.org/wp-content/blogs.dir/1/files\_mf/1339595984Tipson\_GlobalFoodInsecurity\_Jun12.pdf)

Meanwhile, the political dimensions of “food insecurity” go well beyond our compassion for people in the poorest countries who are most vulnerable to famine and malnutrition. Even during the remainder of this decade, we face a transition from localized food shortages and insecurities toward a more pervasive environment of global “food shocks” that have serious political consequences even for the richer world. 3 The combined effects of population trends, climate changes, water shortages, soil erosion or contamination, increased meat consumption, fisheries depletion, major livestock epidemics, or serious crop failures in overlapping and cascading ripple effects will strain already-vulnerable economies and political systems. Sudden price increases or shortages could prompt volatile popular reactions, especially if citizens even in “well-fed” locations lose trust in markets and governments to assure their access to adequate food supplies.

### 1NC—Beef Prices

#### Beef turn—corn scarcity crushes global beef production—low prices bolster it.

Hibah Yousuf, 7-18-2012, writer for CNN Money, “Your burger is about to get pricier,” <http://money.cnn.com/2012/07/18/investing/corn-prices-food-inflation/index.htm>

NEW YORK (CNNMoney) -- As the widespread drought continues to damage grain crops across the Midwest, consumers could soon be facing steeper bills at the grocery store. "We haven't seen any rain at all, and based on that, food inflation is definitely a real threat," said Phil Flynn, senior energy analyst at the Price Futures Group in Chicago. The dry, scorching heat has had the most severe impact on corn crops. Nearly 40% of the corn planted across the nation is in poor or very poor condition, compared to just 11% at this time last year, according to to the U.S. Department of Agriculture The drought and the fear that conditions could worsen, further pressuring crop yields, has triggered a 50% spike in the prices of corn futures over the past month to $7.79 per bushel. Related: Severe U.S. drought slams small businesses On average, food prices typically rise 1% overall for every 50% jump in corn prices, said Richard Volpe, an economist for the Economic Research Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, but particular categories of food are impacted more severely. Analysts and economists predict that prices of beef, pork and poultry will jump the most, as corn is the main feedstock for chicken, cattle and pigs. Prior to the drought, analysts had predicted a 4% to 6% rise in retail beef prices, said Michael Miller, senior vice president of global research for the National Cattlemen's Beef Association. But if the drought lingers and the high cost of corn continues to weigh on farmers, consumers could face an increase as high as 10% for fresh protein at the grocery store, said Miller. That means beef prices could jump from an average of $4.35 per pound in 2011 to an average of nearly $4.80 per pound this year. Related: 6 best performing ETFs The true extent of the increases won't be known until the crops are harvested later this year, and prices won't jump overnight of course. In fact, consumers will likely face the trickle down effect toward the end of this year, and into the start of 2013, Miller added. "We're in one of those situations where everyone is watching the weather and corn prices from the edge of their seats," said Miller. "This is the first time in a long time that we've had a drought this significant in the Corn Belt, and that's why the market is so nervous." Weather experts aren't at all optimistic in their forecasts. According to AccuWeather.com senior meteorologist Alex Sosonowski, "the combination of too much hit and too little rain moving forward into the middle of August will prove to be too much for corn to take." While the price of meat and milk products will likely rise as a result of higher corn prices, other products, like a box of corn flakes, will remain relatively steady, according to the USDA's Economic Research Service, as prices for those types of foods are more heavily impacted by packaging, processing, advertising, and transportation. In fact, a 49% increase in corn prices only raises the price of a box of corn flakes by about 0.5%.

#### The beef production process yields massive amounts of methane—turns global warming.

Yasmine Kamel, 7-06-2012, staff writer for Intellectualyst, <http://intellectualyst.com/scientists-say-reducing-beef-consumption-can-help-save-the-planet-192/>

Beef production doesn’t only require more land to produce, it also yields more waste. During their digestive process cattle produce methane, which the report defines as “a potent heat trapping gas that exits the cow from both ends and causes about 23 times as much global warming

per molecule as carbon dioxide.” The report adds that cattle also produce large amounts of manure which is an additional source of methane and a leading cause of water pollution. The US Department of Agriculture estimates that US livestock and poultry generate 63.8 tons of manure every year. Since the 1800s meat production has increase by 25 times, and since the 1960s meat consumption has tripled, with the US today consuming more than 120 KG (264.5 lbs) of meat per capita. The USDA valued the American cattle and beef industry at $74 billion in 2010. The UCS report concludes with suggested solutions to the climate effects of meat production. Among them, that meat producers exhaustively use land already deforested and acquired, and that policy makers eliminate subsidies or any tax incentives that encourage beef production on new lands. The report emphasizes the influence of increasing global demand for beef and urges consumers to shift from beef as a staple in their diet.

# 2NC

## Brazil DA

### AT: Econ Add-On

#### *Downswings don’t cause war* – 93 empirical examples

Miller 2K

(Morris Miller, economist, adjunct professor in the University of Ottawa’s Faculty of Administration, consultant on international development issues, former Executive Director and Senior Economist at the World Bank, Winter 2000, Interdisciplinary Science Reviews, Vol. 25, Iss. 4, “Poverty as a cause of wars?” p. Proquest)

The question may be reformulated. Do wars spring from a popular reaction to a sudden economic crisis that exacerbates poverty and growing disparities in wealth and incomes? Perhaps one could argue, as some scholars do, that it is some dramatic event or sequence of such events leading to the exacerbation of poverty that, in turn, leads to this deplorable denouement. This exogenous factor might act as a catalyst for a violent reaction on the part of the people or on the part of the political leadership who would then possibly be tempted to seek a diversion by finding or, if need be, fabricating an enemy and setting in train the process leading to war. According to a study undertaken by Minxin Pei and Ariel Adesnik of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, there would **not appear to be** any **merit in this** hypothesis. After studying *ninety-three episodes* of economic crisis in twenty-two countries in Latin America and Asia in the years since the Second World War they concluded that:19 Much of the conventional wisdom about the political impact of economic crises may be wrong ... The severity of **economic crisis** - as measured in terms of inflation and negative growth - bore *no relationship* to the *collapse of regimes* ... (or, in democratic states, rarely) to an *outbreak of violence* ... In the cases of dictatorships and semidemocracies, the ruling elites responded to crises by increasing repression (thereby using one form of violence to abort another).

## Ex-Im Tradeoff DA

### 2NC I—Caucasus—Turns Counterbalancing

#### Caucasus instability turns counterbalancing.

Ariel **Cohen**, 3-26-20**12**, Senior Research Fellow for Russian and Eurasian Studies and International Energy Policy, The Kathryn and Shelby Cullom Davis Institute for International Studies, “A Threat to the West: The Rise of Islamist Insurgency in the Northern Caucasus and Russia’s Inadequate Response,” <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2012/03/a-threat-to-the-west-the-rise-of-islamist-insurgency-in-the-northern-caucasus>

Islamist **terrorists** from the self-proclaimed **Caucasus** Emirate have already **attacked** energy **infrastructure**, trains, planes, theaters, and hospitals. They are **increasingly involved** in terrorist activities **in** Western Europe and Central **Asia**, including Afghanistan. North Caucasus Islamist insurgency is part of the global radical Islamist movement, which is **deeply and implacably inimical** to the West and the **U**nited **S**tates.

### 2NC I—Caucasus—Russia Relations

#### Caucasus instability kills US-Russia relations.

Ariel **Cohen**, 3-26-20**12**, Senior Research Fellow for Russian and Eurasian Studies and International Energy Policy, The Kathryn and Shelby Cullom Davis Institute for International Studies, “A Threat to the West: The Rise of Islamist Insurgency in the Northern Caucasus and Russia’s Inadequate Response,” <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2012/03/a-threat-to-the-west-the-rise-of-islamist-insurgency-in-the-northern-caucasus>

The **danger** from North **Caucasian instability** is threefold. First, the presence of such an ungovernable enclave in Southeastern Europe compromises the border stability of U.S. friends and allies, such as Georgia and Azerbaijan. **Unrest** in the North **Caucasus** increases the **security threats** to the two countries, where border security is already problematic due to the Georgia–Russia and Azerbaijan–Armenia conflicts. Poorly guarded borders increase the risk of cross-border terrorist activities. For example, Pankisi Gorge in Georgia served as a staging area for Chechen insurgents during the Second Chechen War and provided “a vital link to the outside world which was not under the direct control of Russia.”[3] Porous borders also provide a convenient route for **illegal trafficking** in drugs, weapons, people, and even nuclear materials. Such activities may **negatively influence America’s relations with Russia**, the states of the South Caucasus, and Europe, and they could disrupt U.S. logistical support for operations in Afghanistan.

#### US-Russia relations solve miscalculation and nuclear war.

**Gottemoeller**, 20**08** (Rose Gottemoeller was appointed Director of carnegie moscow center in January 2006. formerly, Gottemoeller was a senior associate at the carnegie endowment, where she held a joint appointment with the Russian and eurasian Program and the Global Policy Program. a specialist on defense and nuclear issues in Russia and the other former soviet states, Gottemoeller’s research at the endowment focused on issues of nuclear security and stability, nonproliferation, and arms control, the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace is a private, nonprofit organization dedicated to advancing cooperation between nations and promoting active international engagement by the United States, “Russia-US Security Relations after Georgia” available at <http://www.carnegieendowment.org/files/russia_us_security_relations_after_georgia.pdf>)

No holds barred, no rules—the **U**nited **S**tates **and Russia** may be **heading to a confrontation** more unpredictable and dangerous than any we have seen since the Cuban missile crisis. A **confrontation today** would be different—the two countries are in constant and intense communication, unlike the situation in 1962—but if those exchanges provoke mutual anger and recrimination, they have the potential to spark a **dangerous crisis.** This effect is especially dangerous because both countries are in presidential transitions. Russia, whose government is riven by corruption, internal competition, and disorder, is attempting an unprecedented tandem leadership arrangement. The United States is in the midst of its quadrennial election season, with both political parties competing to show that their man is more skilled and tough on national security issues than his opponent. The **unpredictability** of these two transitions stokes the potential for **misunderstanding** and **descent into crisis.** We must avoid such a crisis, because we have **never succeeded** in escaping the **nuclear existential threat** that we each pose to the other. We never even came close to transforming the U.S.–Russian relationship into one that is closer to that which the United States has with the United Kingdom or France. What if Russia had refused to confirm or deny that no nuclear weapons were on the bombers it flew to Venezuela? Our nuclear weapons are still faced off to launch on warning of an attack, and in a no-holds-barred confrontation between us, we could come close to nuclear catastrophe before we knew it. What next? Is it possible to **outrun confrontation** and return to a **pragmatic working relationship** in pursuit of mutual interests? Clearly the answer should be “yes,” if the Russian Federation completely withdraws its troops from Georgian territory according to the Sarkozy–Medvedev plan. But, following Russia’s recognition of the independence of Abkhazia and South Ossetia, that process may take months and perhaps years. Some Russian commentators have been arguing that a relevant time frame to consider is how long Cyprus has been the site of an unresolved territorial dispute between Turkey and Greece: nearly thirty years. In the meantime, the United States and Russia have about six months of intense political transition to get through, until the new U.S. president settles into place. This begs for a short-term modus vivendi that would enable the two countries to avoid a potential crisis and establish an agenda to confront some of the severe problems that have emerged in their relationship. Ultimately, the **U**nited **S**tates and Russia should want to re-create a book of rules that both will embrace, corresponding to international law and in fact strengthening it. Seize the Superstructure The **first step** in this process, and the **best way to begin** it, is to grab onto the existing superstructure of the U.S.–Russia relationship. This is the system of established and well-understood treaties, agreements, and arrangements that has been built up over time. Beginning in the 1950s, many efforts have been made to **insert** predictability and **mutual confidence** into the relationship in the form of both bilateral and multilateral arrangements. For the next six months, both governments need to **take advantage** of this established and well understood system. Derided in recent years as a Cold War relic not worthy of the friendship the two countries had developed, it could now be a lifeline.

#### That’s the only existential threat.

**Bostrum**, 20**02** (Nick, professor of philosophy - Oxford University, March, Existential Risks: Analyzing Human Extinction Scenarios and Related Hazards, Journal of Evolution and Technology, p. <http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html>

A much **great**er **existential risk** emerged with the build-up of **nuclear arsenals** in the **US** and the USSR. An all-out nuclear war was a possibility with both a substantial probability and with consequences that might have been persistent enough to qualify as global and terminal. There was a real worry among those best acquainted with the information available at the time that a nuclear Armageddon would occur and that it might annihilate our species or permanently destroy human civilization.[4] Russia and the US retain large nuclear arsenals that could be used in a future confrontation, either accidentally or deliberately. There is also a risk that other states may one day build up large nuclear arsenals. Note however that a **smaller nuclear exchange**, between India and Pakistan for instance, is **not an existential risk**, since it would not destroy or thwart humankind’s potential permanently. Such a war might however be a local terminal risk for the cities most likely to be targeted. Unfortunately, we shall see that nuclear Armageddon and comet or asteroid strikes are mere preludes to the existential risks that we will encounter in the 21st century.

### 2NC I—Balkans—Top Level

#### Independently—Balkans instability causes extinction—highest risk of global war—turns US leadership.

Zbigniew **Brzezinski**, winter-xx-20**03**, Prof. American Foreign Policy @ Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies, “Hegemonic Quicksand,” <http://www.kas.de/upload/dokumente/brzezinski.pdf>

FOR THE next several decades, the **most volatile and dangerous region of the world**—with the **explosive potential** to plunge the **world into chaos**—will be the crucial swathe of Eurasia between Europe and the Far East. Heavily inhabited by Muslims, we might term this crucial subregion of Eurasia **the** new “Global **Balkans**.”1 It is here that America could slide into a **collision** with the **world** of Islam while American-European policy differences could even cause the **Atlantic Alliance** to come **unhinged**. The two eventualities together could then put the prevailing **American global hegemony at risk.**

### 2NC L—Must Read—Tradeoff

#### Investing in clean technology forces a tradeoff—their author.

Pacific Environment, xx-xx-2012, [QUALS NEEDED], “FACT SHEET: U.S. Export-Import Bank’s Fossil Fuel and Renewable Energy Financing,” [http://pacificenvironment.org/downloads/FACT%20SHEET:%20ExIm%20Bank%20fossil%20fuel%20financing.pdf](http://pacificenvironment.org/downloads/FACT%20SHEET%3A%20ExIm%20Bank%20fossil%20fuel%20financing.pdf)

Worse, in July 2010, the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report which found that Ex-Im Bank has failed to meet a Congressional directive to allocate 10% of its total annual financing to renewable energy and energy efficient end-use technologies. Among its chief criticisms, GAO found that Ex-Im Bank is failing to follow strategic planning practices and allocate sufficient staff and other agency resources to promote renewable energy and energy efficiency. Ex-Im Bank’s fast-growing fossil fuel subsidies worsen climate change, damage world-class environmental and cultural resources, and harm human health and well-being. Ex-Im Bank should redirect public financing to the fast-growing renewable energy sector—alleviating climate change pressures, spurring sustainable job growth, and quickening the distribution of clean energy technologies across the world.

# 1NR

## Ex-Im Advantage

### 2NC SQS—Top Level

#### The Ex-Im bank is already financing renewables—they’re successfully shifting to a green energy agenda.

Katherine Rosario, 7-16-2013, [QUALS NEEDED], “Ex-Im Bank Wants to Back Loans for Chinese Renewable Energy with our Taxpayer Dollars,” <http://heritageaction.com/2013/07/ex-im-bank-wants-to-back-loans-for-chinese-renewable-energy-with-our-taxpayer-dollars/>

Fred P. Hochberg, the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank of the U.S., who is currently awaiting confirmation by the Senate of his nomination for a second term, recently sent out the following Tweet: #China looking to increase imports of #renewableenergy #environmental equipment from the US @EximBankUS — Fred P. Hochberg (@fredhochberg) July 11, 2013 It comes as a mild surprise that Hochberg would see this as an opportunity for the Ex-Im Bank. After all, we have been told time and time again that China is leading the way when it comes to renewable energy. If they have been so successful and implementing the green energy agenda, why would the Ex-Im Bank need to backstop loans for even more renewable infrastructure?

### Counterbalancing Defense

#### No impact to Russia China counterbalancing**Fettweis, ’11** [September, 2011, Christopher J. Fettweis, Department of Political Science, Tulane University, “The Superpower as Superhero: Hubris in U.S. Foreign Policy”, <http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1902154>]

First, the hegemonic-stability argument shows the classic symptom of hubris: It overestimates the capability of the United States, in this case to maintain global stability. No state, no matter how strong, can impose peace on determined belligerents. The U.S. military may be the most imposing in the history of the world, but it can only police the system if the other members generally cooperate. Selfpolicing must occur, in other words; if other states had not decided on their own that their interests are best served by peace, then no amount of international constabulary 8work by the United States could keep them from fighting. The five percent of the world’s population that lives in the United States simply cannot force peace upon an unwilling ninety-five percent. Stability and unipolarity may be simply coincidental. In order for U.S. hegemony to be the explanation for global stability, the rest of the world would have to expect reward for good behavior and fear punishment for bad. Since the end of the Cold War, the United States has not been especially eager to enforce any particular rules. Even rather incontrovertible evidence of genocide has not been enough to inspire action. Hegemonic stability can only take credit for influencing those decisions that would have ended in war without the presence, whether physical or psychological, of the United States. Since most of the world today is free to fight without U.S. involvement, something else must be preventing them from doing so.71 Stability exists in many places where no hegemony is present. Ethiopia and Eritrea are hardly the only states that could go to war without the slightest threat of U.S. intervention, yet few choose to do so. Second, it is worthwhile to repeat one of the most basic observations about misperception in international politics, one that is magnified by hubris: Rarely are our actions as consequential upon their behavior as we believe them to be. The ego-centric bias suggests that while it may be natural for U.S. policymakers to interpret their role as crucial in the maintenance of world peace, they are almost certainly overestimating their own importance. At the very least, the United States is probably not as central to the myriad decisions in foreign capitals that help maintain international stability as it thinks it is. Third, if U.S. security guarantees were the primary cause of the restraint shown by the other great and potentially great powers, then those countries would be demonstrating an amount of trust in the intentions, judgment and wisdom of another that would be without precedent in international history. If the states of Europe and the Pacific Rim detected a good deal of danger in the system, relying entirely on the generosity and sagacity (or, perhaps the naiveté and gullibility) of Washington would be the height of strategic irresponsibility. Indeed it is hard to think of a similar choice: When have any capable members of an alliance virtually disarmed and allowed another member to protect their interests? It seems more logical to suggest that the other members of NATO and Japan just do not share the same perception of threat that the United States does. If there was danger out there, as so many in the U.S. national security community insist, then the grand strategies of the allies would be quite different. Even during the Cold War, U.S. allies were not always convinced that they could rely on U.S. security commitments. Extended deterrence was never entirely comforting; few Europeans could be sure that United States would indeed sacrifice New York for Hamburg. In the absence of the unifying Soviet threat, their trust in U.S. commitments for their defense would presumably be lower – if in fact that commitment was at all necessary outside of the most pessimistic works of fiction. Furthermore, in order for hegemonic stability logic to be an adequate explanation for restrained behavior, allied states must not only be fully convinced of the intentions and capability of the hegemon to protect their interests; they must also trust that the hegemon can interpret those interests correctly and consistently. As discussed above, the allies do not feel that the United States consistently demonstrates the highest level of strategic wisdom. In fact, they often seem to look with confused eyes upon our behavior, and are unable to explain why we so often find it necessary to go abroad in search of monsters to destroy. They will participate at times in our adventures, but minimally and reluctantly.

## Mexico Advantage

### 2NC T—AT: No Link to Biofuels

#### Yes link to biofuels—Brazil proves that countries developing biofuels get crushed by the resource curse.

William Sapp, xx-xx-2012, writer, Geopolitical Monitor, “The Fragility of Brazil’s Economic Strength,” <http://www.geopoliticalmonitor.com/the-fragility-of-brazils-economic-strength-4657>

When a significant segment of a country’s economy is based around raw material exports, inflows of foreign capital tend to artificially raise the value of the domestic currency. The result is inflation and an increased reliance on international savings to finance growth. In theory, capital flows from developed nations should be welcomed in developing economies like Brazil. After all, foreign capital can improve social welfare and increase industrial diversification. But, in practice, the negative effects of a commodity based economy often outweigh the positive. Dutch disease is not a new phenomenon in Brazil. Whether sugar, coffee, gold or rubber, the Brazilian economy has frequently been a prisoner of the boom and bust nature of commodities.

## Ethanol Advantage

### 1NC—HFCS Turn

#### Also, corn scarcity’s key to a global transition away from high-fructose corn syrup—low prices cause mass production.

William G. Moseley, 8-07-2012, op-ed writer, New York Times, “The Silver Lining in the Drought,” <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/08/08/opinion/the-droughts-alert-for-corn.html>

Cheap corn enabled the proliferation of high fructose corn syrup, an ingredient that is almost impossible to avoid in the American diet today. Farmers also produced less fodder for their own animals as they increasingly purchased relatively inexpensive corn-based feeds. When the cheap price of corn alone could not open up new opportunities, government policies and quotas encouraged the development of corn-based ethanol production and markets, to the point where 40 percent of the corn crop is now devoted to this use. America’s corn surpluses also drove global market prices so low that many countries found it cheaper to import grain rather than grow their own. Corn’s weakness is that it is highly susceptible to drought. As an open pollinator, corn has a critical seven-day window (which varies across the Corn Belt depending on planting time) when it really needs sufficient rainfall in order to successfully cross-fertilize with other corn plants. Given this summer’s drought, the worst since the 1950s, it is not surprising that the corn crop has taken a beating. Most estimates suggest that only about a quarter of the crop is in good condition. The problem is not so much the drought but our over-reliance on this single crop. As droughts are predicted to become more frequent with global climate change, we must rethink our increasingly vulnerable agri-food system. As such, the failing corn crop may not be such a bad thing if it prompts a push for change.

#### High-fructose corn syrup causes rampant spread of AIDS.

Faith R Michaels, 7-13-2010, herbalist and writer for redacted news, “WTF? More HIV Fructose Corn Syrup Please! AIDS, Africa ---- and corn?” <http://redactednews.blogspot.com/2010/06/wtf-more-hiv-fructose-corn-syrup-please.html>

It is reasonable to presume that since AIDS attacks the immune system that a compromised immune system would allow this disease to run rampant. (there has been recent research into HIV positive people producing anti-bodies that are being researched for AIDS treatments)..... Recent research also shows that High Fructose Corn syrup is a toxin in the human being and has the same breakdown in the liver problem that Alcohol does... and when a body is full of toxins its immune system is compromised...a lowered immune system would allow AIDS to run rampant

 in people who had been exposed but whom were not clinically HIV positive because it had not reached the point of showing up yet in the blood… remember that HIV can lie dormant for years before showing up. Also humans are very susceptible to funguses and molds so that anything that added these to the body system would compromise the health...since Cancers are a altered cell program and genetically altered foods produce a toxin to kill pests .... then this could easily compromise the immune system among other things and would almost without question be a high risk factor for cancer or AIDS in people who were already susceptible to these diseases. Can they CAUSE these diseases?? More research will be required for a determination of facts. But our bodies for thousands upon thousands of years have been genetically arranged to process and use the foods upon this planet...and now for the very first time human bodies are being asked to process "new foods" that are similar enough to "old foods" but altered genetically enough to be something new for the body to process... It is NOT a coincidence that disease rates skyrocket in every country that implements these "new foods" to their dietary intake.

#### That means AIDS goes airborne and destroys global society.

Tom Kerns, 11-23-1999, Professor of Philosophy, Social Science Division, North Seattle Community College, “AIDS and Apocalyptics For Questioning Millennium Madness,” http://www.bioethicscourse.info/aidsite/lec-millemad.html

Joshua Lederberg considers the possibility of HIV "learning the tricks of airborne transmission:" / "We know that HIV is still evolving. Its global spread has meant there is far more HIV on earth today than ever before in history. What are the odds of its learning the tricks of airborne transmission? The short answer is "No one can be sure." ... [A]s time passes, and HIV seems settled in a certain groove, that is momentary reassurance in itself. However, given its other ugly attributes, it is hard to imagine a worse threat to humanity than an airborne variant of AIDS. No rule of nature contradicts such a possibility; the proliferation of AIDS cases with secondary pneumonia [and TB] multiplies the odds

 of such a mutant, as an analog to the emergence of pneumonic plague." -effective modes of transmission -destroys the immune system -viral reservoir expanding / William McNeill's concluding thoughts about epidemics which kill people in their middle years: / "The disruptive effect of such an epidemic is likely to be greater than the mere loss of life, severe as that may be. Often survivors are demoralized, and lose all faith in inherited custom and belief which had not prepared them for such a disaster. Sometimes new infections actually manifest their greatest virulence among young adults, owing, some doctors believe, to excessive vigor of this age-group's antibody reactions to the invading disease organism. Population losses within the twenty to forty age bracket are obviously far more damaging to society at large than comparably numerous destruction of either the very young or the very old. Indeed, any community that loses a substantial percentage of its young adults in a single epidemic finds it hard to maintain itself materially and spiritually. When an initial exposure to one civilized infection is swiftly followed by similarly destructive exposure to others, the structural cohesion of the community is almost certain to collapse."