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#### Oil prices will stay high in 2013

FT 13 – Financial Times, 1/28/13, “Opec upbeat on 2013 crude oil price,” http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/e120ef26-6968-11e2-9246-00144feab49a.html#axzz2JaTs55Cy

Opec has struck an an upbeat tone about the oil market for this year, anticipating prices of around $110 a barrel on average for 2013.¶ Abdalla El-Badri, Opec secretary-general, added that the oil cartel, which accounts for 40 per cent of global oil supplies, would probably keep its production stable for the time being, after member countries cut output in November and December.¶ “As of now I think the situation is really improving,” he said. Speaking about the outlook for the oil market, he added: “When I see growth in China is improving, growth in India is improving, when I see growth in the US is improving, I think that unless something dramatic happens in 2013, it will be a repetition of 2012.”¶ Brent crude oil, the global benchmark, set a record annual average in 2012 of roughly $111.5 a barrel. The benchmark closed at or above $100 every trading day last year, bar 24 days in late June and early July.¶ Weak global growth and increased domestic oil production in the US, traditionally Opec’s largest customer, have led some analysts to forecast downward pressure on the price of oil this year, as well as an erosion of Opec’s ability to influence prices.¶ Saudi Arabia, Opec’s largest producer, cut production to its lowest in a year in December. The kingdom supplied more than 10m barrels a day in mid-2012 to meet a seasonal increase in demand and offset the loss of Iranian production. But it has since cut output to 9.3m b/d, according to the International Energy Agency.¶ But Mr El-Badri denied Opec was reducing production to accommodate increased US supply, and said the organisation welcomed increased diversity of supply.¶ “US unconventional production is evolutionary for the market not revolutionary,” he said. “Forecasts suggest 3m b/d in 20 years – that is not a threat to us,” he said on the sidelines of an oil conference organised by Chatham House, the London-based think tank. Between them Opec countries produce around 37.5m b/d.

#### Plan collapses prices

Poruban 12 – Steven Poruban "API: Raising US oil supplies key to lowering gasoline prices" 3/26 www.ogj.com/articles/print/vol-110/issue-3c/general-interest/api-raising-us-oil.html

A major component to relieving upward pressure on gasoline prices in the US will come from increasing domestic oil production and not from raising taxes, American Petroleum Institute Pres. and Chief Executive Officer Jack Gerard told reporters Mar. 20 during a conference call from Washington, DC.¶ He said President Barack Obama's administration needs a "reality check" as well as a revision to the unclear signals it is sending the market. This is something that US voters understand as well, Gerard noted, citing statistics from a poll conducted earlier this month by Harris Interactive on behalf of API among 1,009 registered voters in the US.¶ "Voters understand that raising taxes is not a solution for high gasoline prices," Gerard said, adding, "No economist in the world will tell you gas prices can be reduced by increasing taxes, and the Congressional Research Service just released a study saying so," Gerard said.¶ "A true all-of-the-above energy strategy would include greater access to areas that are currently off limits, a regulatory and permitting process that supported reasonable timelines for development, and immediate approval of the Keystone XL pipeline to bring more Canadian oil to US refineries. This would send a positive signal to the market and could help put downward pressure on prices," he said.¶ A large majority of these polled voters, API said, "also believe that more US oil and natural gas development could reduce gasoline prices (81%), lead to more American jobs (90%), and enhance America's energy security (84%)."¶ Gerard said, "Most US resources have been placed off-limits. The US oil and natural gas industry is currently allowed to explore, develop, and produce on less than 15% of the federal offshore areas. More than 85% of those areas are off limits, denying all Americans the benefits of producing those resources—benefits like greater supplies of crude oil and natural gas, job creation, and significant returns on our treasury in taxes, rents, royalties, and bonus bids."¶ Market perception¶ The very notion that the Obama administration is proposing the release of oil supplies from the nation's Strategic Petroleum Reserve or asking other countries, such as Saudi Arabia, to boost oil production, is a "clear admissions that supply matters" in the case of relieving gasoline price pressure, Gerard said.¶ Markets are largely driven by perception, Gerard said, and when Obama in his early days in office sent out the message to the market that oil and gas production from the Gulf of Mexico, for example, would be higher today than it was then, that is part of the reason we're experiencing higher gasoline prices in the US.¶ To illustrate this point about clear market signals, Gerard recalled the example of when US gasoline prices were surpassing $4/gal during George W. Bush's presidency, his administration lifted the moratorium on offshore drilling and in a matter of days, oil prices fell by $15-16/bbl.

#### High oil prices are key to Russia’s economy

RB 12 – Russia Briefing is a magazine and daily news service about doing business in Russia. "Russia Could Face Political Flux if Oil Prices Sink" May 28 russia-briefing.com/news/russia-could-face-political-flux-if-oil-prices-sink.html/

Russia Could Face Political Flux if Oil Prices Sink Russia’s political stability risks being being shaken if Greece leaves the Euro area and triggers a sinking in the price of oil, according to a new report from an influential Moscow think tank, released on Thursday.¶ “There’s a big chance of a Greek exit, which would lead to more countries pulling out of the currency union,” said Mikhail Dmitriev, head of the Center for Strategic Studies.¶ Russia relies on oil and gas exports for half of its budget revenue and Europe as a market for more than 50 percent of its exports and 42 percent of imports, according to official data.¶ “If energy prices plunge, Russia may suffer a worse recession than in 2009, which would swell anti-Putin sentiment and we will see the escalation of political violence and repression on one hand, and the worst economic crisis on the other,” said Dmitriev, a deputy economy minister of Russia from 2000 to 2004. “This may lead to Putin losing control and a chaotic political transformation.”¶ Brent, the grade that underpins prices for Russia’s Urals oil blend, may decline to US$80 a barrel if Greece leaves the currency union without triggering crises in other euro members or as low as US$60 if there is a “disorderly” breakup of the euro region, according to a Bank of America report dated May 17. Urals today traded at US$103.95, the lowest since last December.¶ As for nation’s gross domestic product, it may shrink to 2.1 percent, when inflation will speed up to 6.7 percent, according to the Sberbank’s Center of Macroeconomic Research. Bank of America Merrill Lynch predicts even higher inflation which might be as much as 7.6 percent.¶ “If the oil price will slump to US$80 per barrel, Russia may experience zero growth in GDP,” Julia Tseplyaeva, leading economist with BNP Paribas said to Russian business daily Vedomosti.¶ The study is being closely watched because Dmitriev’s center was the only major one to accurately predict early last year that support for the regime was plunging and that it would face a crisis as early as December’s parliamentary elections.¶ “A deteriorating global economy would threaten to wipe out capital that Russian investors and businesses moved to Europe in search of safety,” Dmitriev said, adding that there is already “large-scale capital flight from Russia, despite the economic recovery.”¶ In a worst-case scenario following a Greek exit from the euro area, Russia’s economy would contract 2.1 percent with the potential for US$95 billion in capital leaving the country in a year, Ksenia Yudaeva, chief economist at Moscow-based OAO Sberbank, the country’s biggest lender, said to Bloomberg.

#### 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
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#### 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).

#### Violation – the aff unilaterally signs a treaty with Mexico – it’s not quid pro quo

#### Vote negative – LIMITS – there are a near infinite range of “one exception” affs – conditionality forces to find significant deals that Mexico will accept

#### GROUND – unconditional engagement denies us “say no” and backlash arguments which are a crucial part of the engagement debate.

## Brazil Relations DA

### 1NC Brazil

#### 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.

## Sea Turtles Conditions CP

### 1NC Turtles

#### [CP TEXT: The United States federal government ought not <substantially increase its economic engagement towards Mexico> 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.]

#### The US should condition engagement and threaten sanctions based on Mexican adoption of international sea turtle conservation standards; similar policies towards Mexico empirically solve for protection of marine biodiversity.

Edith Brown Weiss1, John Howard Jackson2 and Nathalie Bernasconi-Osterwalder3, 4-30-2008, Francis Cabell Brown Professor of International Law @ Georgetown, A.B., Stanford; J.D., Harvard; Ph.D., University of California, Berkeley; LL.D.(Hon.), Chicago-Kent; LL.D. (Hon.), University of Heidelberg1, Director; Institute of International Economic Law, University Professor @ Georgetown, A.B., Princeton; J.D., University of Michigan; LL.D. (Hon.), Hamburg University, Germany; LL.D. (Hon.), European University Institute, Florence, Italy2, a senior international lawyer and heads the Investment Program of the International Institute on Sustainable Development (IISD)3, “Reconciling Environment and Trade,” http://books.google.com/books?id=PeTVvZW7JRoC&dq=Sea+Turtles+MExico+Sanctions&source=gbs\_navlinks\_s

Several international agreements upon which a similar treaty for the sea turtles could be based exist. These international agreements include CITES and the Convention on Biodiversity. Using CITES is an obvious choice because sea turtles are listed in both Appendices I and II of CITES, demonstrating the recognition by its signatories that sea turtles are endangered and need to be protected. In the Shrimp-Turtle case, the United States could select an agreement that all parties to the dispute have signed, and use it as a foundation for a more expansive treaty. However, the question remains whether or not this kind of agreement, enforced through trade sanctions, would be GATT compliant. IMPLICATIONS FOR THE FUTURE This Case Does Not Provide the United States with Guidance in Avoiding Future Conflict Between Its Domestic Court System and the WTO Despite the shortcomings of negotiated solutions, in this case a nego-tiated solution could enable the United States to satisfy the requirements of both the WTO and the CIT. If the complainants agreed to comply vol-untarily with the requirements under Section 609 by implementing tur-tle-safe harvesting methods in exchange for U.S. technical assistance, the United States would be able to comply with the mandate of CIT. A negotiated solution in this case, however, does not offer the United States a predictable model to follow in potential future conflicts. The lack of guidance for future cases will further muddle the U.S. analysis of avail-able tools for environmental protection. In the United States, similar con-flicts between national laws (like Section 609) and the mandates of a multinational organization (WTO) will likely increase as the government views environmental protection as an important area. For example, 143 After the Tuna-Dolphin opinion, the parties, through the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC), established in 1949, negotiated a dolphin accord, the International Dolphin Conservation Act (IDCA) of 1992. The IDCA lifted the tuna import ban against Mexico and Venezuela but provided for unilateral trade sanc-tions if they failed to comply with the moratorium. The Declaration of Panama was signed on October 4, 1995, giving multinational effect to the IDCA. Finally, on August 15, 1997, the U.S. Congress amended the Marine Mammal Protection Act to recognize the IDCA and to lift the ban on tuna imports from signatories of the Declaration of Panama. See Cadeddu, supra note 53.

#### Conditioning economic engagement with Mexico on adoption of sea turtle protection policy prevents 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.

## Advantage CP

### 1NC CP

#### Text: The United States Federal Government should enact Comprehensive Immigration Reform and The United States federal government should export to Mexico US technology necessary for emergency oil flow suppression, spill containment and clean up, and hold joint exercises with Mexico to coordinate oil emergency responses.

#### Immigration reform solves Mexican relations and Mexican stability

Castaneda 3 (Castañeda, Jorge G. Source: Foreign Affairs; May/Jun2003, Vol. 82 Issue 3, p67-81, 15p, 4 Black and White Photographs)

Dealing with Mexico is in many ways the most important regional task facing the Bush administration. The matter can be summed up simply: President Vicente Fox's consolidation of Mexico's first democratic transfer of power must be-and be seen to be-a success. There is nothing more important to the United States than a stable Mexico, and today a stable Mexico means a democratic one. And the United States has a huge role in making Mexico's transition to democracy a success, or in contributing to its failure. The success or failure of this experiment will be judged in Mexico ultimately in the light of the country's economic performance-which has not been impressive these past two years. But Mexicans will also judge the state of their country's relations with the United States. They will look to see whether Presidents Fox and Bush deliver on the ambitious bilateral agenda they sketched out at their historic February 2001 meeting at Fox's ranch in Guanajuato, Mexico. On issues of trade, drug enforcement, the border, building a North American Economic Community, energy, and, most significant, immigration, the two countries set out a bold series of goals to meet by the end of Bush's first term, if not sooner. Indeed, in the first eight months of their respective presidencies, Bush and Fox achieved a fundamental breakthrough on immigration. By the time of the Guanajuato meeting, both sides had identified the core policies needed to tackle undocumented migration flows from Mexico to the United States: an expanded temporary-worker program; increased transition of undocumented Mexicans already in the United States to legal status; a higher U.S. visa quota for Mexicans; enhanced border security and stronger action against migrant traffickers; and more investment in those regions of Mexico that supplied the most migrants. The speed with which both governments carried out these negotiations certainly captured the political imagination of both societies. Fox's resounding state visit to Washington on the eve of the September 11 terrorist attacks further lifted the new initiatives and underscored both leaders' commitment to them. But the symmetry ends there: Fox staked much more on this partnership than Bush did. And since the Mexican president has little to show for his gamble, he has paid a high domestic political price for his willingness to bring about a sea change in Mexico's relations with the United States and the rest of the world. Indeed, this change has been on the order of what President Carlos Salinas did with Mexico's economy or what President Ernesto Zedillo did with the nation's political system. Hence the centrality of immigration in the bilateral relationship today: both Bush and Fox stated dramatic goals and raised expectations enormously. The United States understandably was forced to put the issue on hold for a time. But what was initially portrayed as a brief interlude will now probably stretch through Bush's entire first term. It will be almost impossible to point to success in the bilateral relationship without a deal on immigration. And unless there is such a breakthrough, Fox's six-year term in office, nearly half over, may well be seen in Mexico as an exercise in high expectations but disappointing results. To avoid a breakdown in relations, Bush must make a state visit to Mexico City this year. He should take with him sufficient progress on key issues-immigration; trade concerns relating to sugar, tuna, trucking, and the North American Free Trade Agreement's agricultural chapter; and funding for heightened security and the expedited passage of people and cargo at the border-to show that Mexico remains a top priority for his administration. Bush must also show that he is willing to spend political capital to ensure the success of Fox's push for true Mexican democracy. Washington may have so far missed an opportunity to present its relationship with Mexico City as a model for the rest of the hemisphere and, indeed, for the rest of the developing world-an example of how a rich and powerful neighbor and a still relatively poor and weak one can get along and contribute to each other's success. But the window of opportunity has not been shut. In the aftermath of the current conflict with Iraq, the United States would benefit hugely by demonstrating that it can construct alliances beyond its traditional circle of friends.

#### Counterplan solves risk of spills

Piñon & Muse 10 – Jorge R. Piñon, Visiting Research Fellow with the Cuban Research Institute at Florida International University and former president of Amoco Oil Latin America, and Robert L. Muse, D.C. based attorney with long and substantial experience in U.S.-Cuba legal matters, May 2010, “Coping with the Next Oil Spill: Why U.S.-Cuba Environmental Cooperation is Critical,” online: http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/Files/rc/papers/2010/0518\_oil\_spill\_cuba\_pinon/0518\_oil\_spill\_cuba\_pinon.pdf

Establishing specific protocols cannot wait because nothing in U.S.-Cuba relations is ever simple. For example, disaster response coordination between Cuba and the United States will involve various government departments such as the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the National Ocean and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), the U.S. Coast Guard and the Department of Commerce because U.S.-origin equipment requires licenses for even temporary export to Cuba. The allocation of responsibilities and the development of interagency cooperation will take time. That luxury exists now, but will end very soon when the first drill bit hits the Cuban seabed.¶ On the subject of the legal basis for proactive regulatory action to deal with a future oil disaster in Cuba, the Obama Administration, irrespective of the current embargo, has the power to license the sale, lease or loan of emergency relief and reconstruction equipment to Cuba following an oil spill. It also has the authority to license U.S. citizens to perform emergency response and subsequent reconstruction services in Cuba in the wake of such a disaster.3¶ Recommendations for U.S. Policy¶ The appropriate place for U.S. policymakers to begin is with an expedited identification of all current regulatory prohibitions on the transfer of the U.S. equipment, technology and personnel to Cuba that will be needed to combat an oil spill—whether it originates there or here. Once identified, those regulations should be rescinded or amended, as required. In particular, the Obama Administration should complete the following actions as soon as possible:¶ 1. Proactive licensing by the Department of Commerce of temporary exports to Cuba of any U.S. equipment and technology necessary to emergency oil flow suppression, spill containment and clean-up. Examples include the licensing of submersibles and ROVs (remote operated vehicles), as well as booms and chemical dispersants.¶ 2. The pre-approval of licenses for travel to Cuba by qualified U.S. citizens to contribute to emergency relief and clean-up efforts. For example, petroleum engineers, environmental specialists and others should be authorized for such travel.¶ 3. Plans should be made for providing Cuba with the most up-to-date information, including satellite imagery and predictive models, to assess the potential impact of an oil disaster and to prepare for the worst eventualities.¶ 4. The U.S. should hold joint exercises with Cuba to coordinate emergency responses, the deployment of resources and the identification of the specialized oil well technologies and clean-up equipment that will be needed to be shipped to Cuba in the event of an oil spill.¶ 5. The U.S. should encourage and facilitate scientific exchanges at both government and NGO levels that will identify the nature and sequencing of effective responses to a marine disaster and the mitigation of environmental harm.¶ The President should also instruct the Department of State’s Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs (OES) and NOAA to meet with Cuban lead agencies such as the Transport Ministry’s Dirección de Seguridad e Inspección Marítima, and the Science, Technology and Environment Ministry’s Agencia del Medio Ambiente. The goal of such meetings should be a bilateral agreement on the protocols of cooperation needed to respond quickly and effectively to any incident that threatens either country’s marine and coastal habitats.

## Oil Spills Advantage

### 1NC Spills

Turn – drilling in the gulf causes oil spills – the aff doesn’t solve

Greenpeace 13 (Greenpeace, February 22, 2013, “Transboundary agreement spells disaster for the Gulf”, http://www.greenpeace.org/usa/en/media-center/news-releases/Transboundary-agreement-spells-disaster-for-the-Gulf/)//moxley

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.

Gulf is resilient

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/)

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

Climate change proves Oceans and marine bioD are resilient – alarmist predictions empirically denied

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.

Environment is resilient

Easterbrook 95 (Gregg, Distinguished Fellow – Fullbright Foundation, A Moment on Earth, p. 25)

In the aftermath of events such as Love Canal or the Exxon Valdez oil spill, every reference to the environment is prefaced with the adjective "fragile." "Fragile environment" has become a welded phrase of the modern lexicon, like "aging hippie" or "fugitive financier." But the notion of a fragile environment is profoundly wrong. Individual animals, plants, and people are distressingly fragile. The environment that contains them is close to indestructible. The living environment of Earth has survived ice ages; bombardments of cosmic radiation more deadly than atomic fallout; solar radiation more powerful than the worst-case projection for ozone depletion; thousand-year periods of intense volcanism releasing global air pollution far worse than that made by any factory; reversals of the planet's magnetic poles; the rearrangement of continents; transformation of plains into mountain ranges and of seas into plains; fluctuations of ocean currents and the jet stream; 300-foot vacillations in sea levels; shortening and lengthening of the seasons caused by shifts in the planetary axis; collisions of asteroids and comets bearing far more force than man's nuclear arsenals; and the years without summer that followed these impacts. Yet hearts beat on, and petals unfold still. Were the environment fragile it would have expired many eons before the advent of the industrial affronts of the dreaming ape. Human assaults on the environment, though mischievous, are pinpricks compared to forces of the magnitude nature is accustomed to resisting.

No extinction

Easterbrook 3 (Gregg, Distinguished Fellow – Fullbright Foundation, “We’re All Gonna Die!”, Wired Magazine, July, http://www.wired.com/wired/archive/11.07/doomsday.html?pg=1&topic=&topic\_set=)

If we're talking about doomsday - the end of human civilization - many scenarios simply don't measure up. A single nuclear bomb ignited by terrorists, for example, would be awful beyond words, but life would go on. People and machines might converge in ways that you and I would find ghastly, but from the standpoint of the future, they would probably represent an adaptation. Environmental collapse might make parts of the globe unpleasant, but considering that the biosphere has survived ice ages, it wouldn't be the final curtain. Depression, which has become 10 times more prevalent in Western nations in the postwar era, might grow so widespread that vast numbers of people would refuse to get out of bed, a possibility that Petranek suggested in a doomsday talk at the Technology Entertainment Design conference in 2002. But Marcel Proust, as miserable as he was, wrote Remembrance of Things Past while lying in bed.

The entire adv is non-unique – just had a spill

Skaggs 7-9-13 (Christina, “US Coast Guard confirms natural gas leak in Gulf of Mexico”, July 9th, 2013, http://www.wlox.com/story/22797968/us-coast-guard-confirms-natural-gas-leak-in-gulf-of-mexico)

The U.S. Coast Guard confirmed a natural gas leak in the Gulf of Mexico has forced the evacuation of a gas production platform 74 miles southwest of Port Fourchon, LA. According to the Coast Guard, the leak began Sunday at Ship Shoal Block 225 platform B, which is a natural gas and crude oil platform owned by Energy Resources Technology (ERT). The Coast Guard and Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement (BSEE) are responding to what the Coast Guard calls "the loss of well control". Once ERT learned of the leak, the company began work to temporarily plug the well and contacted the Coast Guard and BSEE, according to Coast Guard officials. The Coast Guard and BSEE inspectors conducted overflights early Tuesday. Coast Guard officials said rainbow sheen runs more than four miles wide by three quarters of a mile long. Coast Guard and BSEE will conduct an investigation of the incident to determine the cause of the loss of well control.

## Relations Advantage

### 1NC Relations

No chance of war from economic decline---best and most recent data

Daniel W. Drezner 12, Professor, The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University, October 2012, “The Irony of Global Economic Governance: The System Worked,” <http://www.globaleconomicgovernance.org/wp-content/uploads/IR-Colloquium-MT12-Week-5_The-Irony-of-Global-Economic-Governance.pdf>

The final outcome addresses a dog that hasn’t barked: the effect of the Great Recession on cross-border conflict and violence. During the initial stages of the crisis, multiple analysts asserted that the financial crisis would lead states to increase their use of force as a tool for staying in power.37 Whether through greater internal repression, diversionary wars, arms races, or a ratcheting up of great power conflict, there were genuine concerns that the global economic downturn would lead to an increase in conflict. Violence in the Middle East, border disputes in the South China Sea, and even the disruptions of the Occupy movement fuel impressions of surge in global public disorder. The aggregate data suggests otherwise, however. The Institute for Economics and Peace has constructed a “Global Peace Index” annually since 2007. A key conclusion they draw from the 2012 report is that “The average level of peacefulness in 2012 is approximately the same as it was in 2007.”38 Interstate violence in particular has declined since the start of the financial crisis – as have military expenditures in most sampled countries. Other studies confirm that the Great Recession has not triggered any increase in violent conflict; the secular decline in violence that started with the end of the Cold War has not been reversed.39 Rogers Brubaker concludes, “the crisis has not to date generated the surge in protectionist nationalism or ethnic exclusion that might have been expected.”40 None of these data suggest that the global economy is operating swimmingly. Growth remains unbalanced and fragile, and has clearly slowed in 2012. Transnational capital flows remain depressed compared to pre-crisis levels, primarily due to a drying up of cross-border interbank lending in Europe. Currency volatility remains an ongoing concern. Compared to the aftermath of other postwar recessions, growth in output, investment, and employment in the developed world have all lagged behind. But the Great Recession is not like other postwar recessions in either scope or kind; expecting a standard “V”-shaped recovery was unreasonable. One financial analyst characterized the post-2008 global economy as in a state of “contained depression.”41 The key word is “contained,” however. Given the severity, reach and depth of the 2008 financial crisis, the proper comparison is with Great Depression. And by that standard, the outcome variables look impressive. As Carmen Reinhart and Kenneth Rogoff concluded in This Time is Different: “that its macroeconomic outcome has been only the most severe global recession since World War II – and not even worse – must be regarded as fortunate.”42

#### 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).

Plan kills Nieto’s Credibility

Starr 12 - Director, U.S.-Mexico Network Associate Professor (NTT) University Fellow, Center on Public Diplomacy University of Southern California (Pamela, “U.S.-Mexico Relations and Mexican Domestic Politics”, October 6 of 2012, <https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=3&cad=rja&ved=0CD4QFjAC&url=http%3A%2F%2Fcollege.usc.edu%2Fusmexnet%2Fwp-content%2Fuploads%2F2010%2F10%2FCamp-Oxford-paper-final.doc&ei=mTLYUZTDMbOLyQGT14GwCQ&usg=AFQjCNH_cqiYTQRo7SFmpfWugH9ABshhCg&sig2=_M2KmLNnt3e8v4vVshc_fQ>)

The final implication of Mexican nationalism for U.S.-Mexico relations is the nearly insurmountable obstacle it erected to political alliances between Mexican actors and their U.S. counterparts, which has broken down only gradually and incompletely since the mid-1990s. For decades, the fear of being tarred as a traitor to the nation prevented Mexican leaders from seeking allies to their cause in the United States and thereby deprived U.S. actors of an easy point of entry into Mexican politics. Mexicans who ignored this taboo paid the price even in the final years of the twentieth century. In the 1980s, the then opposition National Action Party openly elicited U.S. backing for its charges of electoral fraud and associated actions of civil disobedience, producing a nationalist backlash in Mexico that sharply undercut the legitimacy of its claims. In the early 1990s, Mexican opponents of the North American Free Trade Agreement formed an alliance with their U.S. and Canadian counterparts, leading to accusations of having organized traitorous “campaigns against Mexico in the United States.” ¶ Carlos Salinas’ 1990 decision to summon U.S. assistance to lock in his domestic economic reform agenda through a bilateral trade treaty and his active lobbying to gain U.S. congressional approval of the treaty dealt a blow to this long-standing taboo. As a result, cross-border alliances are now increasingly common and accepted, but they are heavily concentrated among civil society actors. Mexico’s continuing anxiety about U.S. political domination, however, means that tolerance for cross-border political alliances is much less developed. While Mexican policy makers and analysts of the bilateral relationship have significantly more freedom of action to work with their U.S. counterparts in the early twenty-first century than did their predecessors, they still must watch their step or risk having their reputation sullied for being excessively “pro-gringo.” Mexicans remain uneasy living next door to a superpower; they continue to worry that the United States might get the notion to translate its power into domination of Mexico, its politics, policy, and culture, and they thus still approach their neighbor with trepidation. As a result, Mexican politicians and policy makers still must take care to avoid the appearance of being too willing to accept support and guidance from north of the border.

Turns the advantage

Brown 13 (Vanda Felbab-Brown, a senior fellow with the Center for 21st Century Security and Intelligence in the Foreign Policy program at Brookings, “Peña Nieto’s Piñata: The Promise and Pitfalls of Mexico’s New Security Policy against Organized Crime,” February 2013, <http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/papers/2013/02/mexico%20new%20security%20pol> icy%20felbabbrown/mexico%20new%20security%20policy%20felbabbrown.pdf//MRG)

Peña Nieto’s New Strategy Mexico’s new president Enrique Peña Nieto has accepted that prioritization. But he has been rather vague about how he actually plans to reduce violence, particularly homicides, kidnappings, and extortion. Throughout the presidential campaign, Peña Nieto clearly and repeatedly disavowed any inclination to engage in negotiations with the cartels. He also promised to move away from Calderón’s frequent use of military forces in law enforcement tasks. After assuming office he announced that he intended to establish a new 10,000 member National Gendarmerie (Gendarmería Nacional); boost security spending and expand the federal police by at least 35,000 officers; reorganize Mexico’s national security and law enforcement agencies and improve coordination among them; and divide Mexico into five distinct regions according to cartel presence and criminal activity type.10 His 34-point security plan Pacto por Mexico, which Mexico’s major political parties signed, also includes establishing a unified police command system at the state-level and emphasizing crime prevention.11 Like his predecessor, he has been asking the United States to do more to combat the southward flow of weapons and money to Mexican drug trafficking groups and to reduce the demand in the United States for illicit narcotics. Negotiating with the DTOs? — Apparently Not in the Plan and Certainly Unwise There has been concern in the United States policy community that the returning Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI) which Enrique Peña Nieto leads and which had an authoritarian grip on Mexico for 71 years may be tempted to go back to some revived negotiated deals with at least some of the DTOs or to let the DTOs off the hook and allow them to have a freer run in exchange for violence being reduced. The negotiated truce between the two large gangs in El Salvador—the Mara Salvatrucha (MS-13) and Calle 18 gangs—endorsed and facilitated by the El Salvadorian government did reduce violence there during 2012 and was pointed to by some community leaders and analysts in Mexico as a possible model for how to deal with Mexico’s crime problems.12 But even Peña Nieto’s commitments aside, a negotiate-with-the-criminals strategy cannot easily be instituted in today’s Mexico: The end of the PRI rule in 2000 brought the end of the so-called imperial presidency that concentrated great power in the PRI leadership and the office of the president. Political power in Mexico is now far more fractured and devolved to various layers of the government. Equally, the DTOs are too splintered and unstable to be able to commit to a grand bargain and struggle even to uphold any negotiated deals among themselves. Yet under pressure to bring violence down quickly—difficult to do—the new government may be tempted to lessen federal law-enforcement pressure and let local authorities resolve their crime problems on their own. In many areas, municipal and even state authorities will be unable to generate sufficient resources to resist the coercion of organized crime. As has historically been the case in many rural municipalities in Mexico, including, for example, in the showcase of anti-crime efforts, Michoacán, many local authorities would yield to the coercion, cooptation, and corruption pressures and temptations from the criminal groups and strike localized deals with them. Local legal businesses would be forced to pay a cut to organized crime groups or launder their proceeds—be they avocado farmers or logging firms in Michoacán, mining companies in Coahuila, or even the national oil company Pemex.13 Authority would thus be (continually) located in the criminal groups instead of elected officials, and the public’s allegiance may even rest with the criminals as well.14

#### Alt causes to trade internal link

A) Corruption and nationalization

**Camarena 10** (Rodrigo, is an analyst and consultant on Latin American business, politics and public policy, “Mexico's Energy Reform and the Future of Pemex” October 2010, http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/6759/mexicos-energy-reform-and-the-future-of-pemex)

Mexico's Energy Reform and the Future of Pemex The ebullient celebration in Brazil over Petrobas' historic $70 billion share-issue last month was bitterly received in Mexico City, where the state-owned oil company Pemex is mired in debt, inefficiency and ongoing political wrangling. With little having changed since Mexican President Felipe Calderón sought to reform the country's energy sector two years ago, the contrast between Petrobras' successes and Pemex's failures has reignited discussion of Pemex's future and renewed the public's interest in the beleaguered Mexican oil giant. Once Latin America's largest company, Pemex has persistently lost profits and market share to other state-led oil companies, including PetroChina, Russia's Lukoil, and Petrobras. Pemex's inability to expand production and compete internationally stems from decades of mismanagement, corruption and a politically sensitive constitutional provision barring the company from receiving private investment, as most of its state-led competitors already do. Pemex's status as a fully state-owned enterprise has left the company vulnerable to limited financing, a dysfunctional corporate bureaucracy and corrupt public officials. Due to a lack of competitive investment and technology as well as a failure to develop new reserves, Pemex's output has declined by nearly one-third since 2004. If current trends hold, Mexico is on track to becoming a net oil importer by 2020, with some estimates projecting this taking place as early as 2016. Making matters worse, Mexico's federal government relies on taxes from Pemex's falling profits for roughly 40 percent of the total national budget, from which it funds not only Pemex itself but also the country's development and its expensive war against organized crime. In 2008, seeking to reverse the country's fortunes, Calderón's government passed one of the country's most significant energy-sector reforms since Mexico nationalized its oil industry in 1938. The reforms aimed to give Pemex greater budgetary authority, update its statist corporate structure, and allow the company to contract foreign firms to improve production and exploit untapped resources in the depths of the Gulf of Mexico -- where most of the country's hydrocarbon deposits lie. To Calderón's displeasure, implementation of the 2008 law has been slow and largely unsuccessful. The law's stipulation that industry experts be added to the company's boards -- formerly made up entirely of political appointees -- has led to friction in the chain of command and to delayed decision-making. The provision allowing Pemex to contract foreign firms is currently undergoing a lengthy Supreme Court review following complaints from opposition legislators.

B) Constitution

Otillar 5-1

Steven Otillar, has been representing clients in the development, finance, acquisition and divestiture of domestic and international energy projects for over 15 years, with a particular emphasis on upstream projects in emerging markets, May 1, 2013, “Outlook for Mexico's Oil Industry -- Opportunities and Obstacles”, <http://cdn.akingump.com/images/content/2/3/v2/23206/Akin-Otillar.pdf>.

To be successful, the reforms will need to loosen some of the restrictions on Pemex, address Article 6 of the Pemex law and head off constitutional challenges that will likely come as a result of Article 27. Article 27 and Proposed Reforms As mentioned, Article 27 of Mexico’s constitution provides that all natural resources are the property of the state and that private exploitation of natural resources must be done through concessions.
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## Turtles CP

### Say Yes

#### Mexico says yes – Economic engagement can be used as leverage to encourage Mexican sea turtle protection.

Adam Yogel, 5-02-2013, writer for and member of Pace Baja, the production and research journal for Pace University’s award winning documentary travel course, “Conservation Groups Press U.S. to Sanction Mexico Over Sea Turtle Deaths,” http://pacebaja.wordpress.com/2013/05/02/conservation-groups-press-u-s-to-sanction-mexico-over-sea-turtle-deaths/

The Center For Biological Diversity and Sea Turtle Restoration Project have petitioned the United States government to impose trade sanctions on Mexico for failing to abide by international sea turtle conservation agreements. Their core concern is described this way: “Over the past decade, scientists estimate that Mexican gillnet and longline fisheries have killed over 2,000 endangered North Pacific Ocean loggerheads a year. Bycatch reached a record high last July, when a mass mortality event left 483 loggerheads stranded on just one stretch of beach – a 600 percent increase over previous years’ averages. This extraordinarily high level of bycatch cannot be sustained and may ultimately drive this endangered sea turtle population to extinction.” [news release] The groups say the United States has leverage through the Inter-American Convention for the Protection and Conservation of Sea Turtles. The decade-old agreement is designed to protect both dwindling sea turtle populations and the habitat they rely on for feeding and breeding. The “bycatch” of loggerhead sea turtles in gillnets is centered in ocean waters off Magdalena Bay, Mexico, the focal point of our documentary, which will be released next week. In an interview earlier this week, Sarah Uhlemann, a senior attorney for the Center for Biological Diversity, said the surge in deaths of loggerheads is enough to invoke the “Pelly Amendment,” which allows the U.S. to sanction any country that violates the treaty. In the next several years, a ban on imports of certain Mexican seafood products could be instituted by the U.S Commerce Department if government agencies find that the loggerhead bycatch has not been addressed.

### Loggerhead Key

#### Loggerhead turtles are keystone species – key to global marine ecosystems.

Coastal Breeze, 8-23-2012, locally owned and operated bi-weekly community newspaper, “Sea Turtle Tidbits,” http://www.coastalbreezenews.com/2012/08/23/sea-turtle-tidbits-6/

There are five species of sea turtles that nest on Florida’s beaches. The most common is the loggerhead. The green turtle and leatherback are also found frequenting beaches throughout the state. The Kemp’s ridley and hawksbill sea turtles nest in Florida but not very often. All five species are listed as either threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act. Sea turtles are considered to be a keystone species within their ecosystems. The extinction of any one of the many sea turtle species would affect many other organisms within both beach systems and marine systems. Loggerhead sea turtles are considered a keystone species because their eggs actually nourish grass dunes along beaches. They are often referred to as floating reefs because their shells act as a home to as many as 100 different species such as barnacles, small fish, algae and shrimp. The green sea turtle is essential to the health of sea grass beds. Those that are grazed by the green sea turtle are much healthier and balanced than beds that are not. Hawksbill turtles are known for eating sponges which prevents them from overtaking slower growing corals in reef systems. Sea turtles also eat jellyfish, helping to stabilize their population. The necessity of the sea turtle is recognized by The Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission’s Fish and Wildlife Research Institute. It coordinates two different sea turtle monitoring programs: the Statewide Nesting Beach Survey and the Index Nesting Beach Survey. Both programs track nesting data in hopes of understanding and promoting the overall health of the sea turtle.

## Russian Oil DA

### 2NC Brink

#### There’s a clear brink---oil prices will be above $100/barrel this year---that’s FT---anything below that triggers the link

Hulbert 12 – Matthew Hulbert is an analyst at the Netherlands Institute for International Relations "The political perils of low oil prices" July 9 2012 www.europeanenergyreview.eu/site/pagina.php?id=3796&id\_mailing=295&toegang=49182f81e6a13cf5eaa496d51fea6406

Oil prices have rapidly dropped in recent months, and some analysts predict a further (steep) decline. This might seem like good news to consumer states, but there is a catch. Whereas producer states could balance their budgets at $30 a barrel less than ten years ago, they now need $100 a barrel to make ends meet. If oil prices continue to correct, expect instability to hit producer states across the board. That might (ironically) help to set a price floor and push prices up again, but it's not a development that consumer countries should be happy about. Keeping oil prices at $100/b remains a better plan than seeing producer states collapse.

### 2NC Turns Econ

#### Russia key to global economic recovery

Hamilton 3(LEE HAMILTON, Director of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for¶ Scholars and former Chairman, House Committee on¶ International Relations, “Dealing With The Russians”, the international economy policy magazine, Summer 2003, http://www.international-economy.com/TIE\_Su03\_RussiaAdviceSymp.pdf)

While it has proven premature to speak of a positive¶ transformation in U.S.-Russian relations, the¶ breadth of our common interests suggests that¶ partnership is preferable to confrontation.¶ The United States and Russia each have an interest in¶ strengthening Russia’s economy. The United States should¶ forgive some Soviet-era Russian debt, repeal the outdated Jackson-Vanik amendment, and support Russian accession into the World Trade Organization, in return for¶ greater transparency and market reform within Russia. A¶ Russian economy tied more to the West would strengthen the global economic recovery, reduce Russia’s interest in dealing in nuclear technology with countries like¶ Iran, and enable the full development of Russia’s oil and¶ gas reserves.¶ The United States and Russia also have overlapping¶ security concerns. While we should speak out vigorously against Russian human rights violations in Chechnya,¶ the United States must continue working with Russia in¶ the war on terror and the stabilization of Central Asia.¶ We should also bring Russia closer to NATO, as cooperation reduces the likelihood of a return to Russian expansionism.

### 2NC Oil Key

#### High oil prices maintain and cushion the Russian economy – only collapse causes damage

Kramer 12 – Andrew E., NYT, "Putin Needs Higher Oil Prices to Pay for Campaign Promises" March 16 www.nytimes.com/2012/03/17/business/global/vladimir-putins-big-promises-need-fueling-by-high-oil-prices.html?\_r=1&pagewanted=print

 “The current high price of oil cushions Russia’s public finances,” Fitch said. “But in the absence of fiscal tightening that significantly cuts the non-oil and gas fiscal deficit, a severe and sustained drop in the oil price would have a damaging impact on the Russian economy and public finances and would likely lead to a downgrade” of the nation’s credit rating. As Mr. Putin’s spending promises started to be introduced in January, Fitch altered Russia’s outlook to stable, from positive.
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## Advantage CP

### 2NC CIR Plank

#### CIR’s key to Latin American relations

Shifter 12 Michael is the President of Inter-American Dialogue. “Remaking the Relationship: The United States and Latin America,” April, IAD Policy Report, http://www.thedialogue.org/PublicationFiles/IAD2012PolicyReportFINAL.pdf

Some enduring problems stand squarely in the way of partnership and effective cooperation. The inability of Washington to reform its broken immigration system is a constant source of friction between the United States and nearly every other country in the Americas. Yet US officials rarely refer to immigration as a foreign policy issue. Domestic policy debates on this issue disregard the United States’ hemispheric agenda as well as the interests of other nations.

#### Flawed immigration breeds resentment---destroys relations with key nations

Shifter 12 Michael is the President of Inter-American Dialogue. “Remaking the Relationship: The United States and Latin America,” April, IAD Policy Report, http://www.thedialogue.org/PublicationFiles/IAD2012PolicyReportFINAL.pdf

Washington’s failure to repair the United States’ broken immigration system is breeding resentment across the region, nowhere more so than in the principal points of origin and transit: Mexico, Central America, and the Caribbean. Latin Americans find the idea of building a wall on the US-Mexico border particularly offensive.

## Relations Advantage

### Econ Defense

#### 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).

### Nieto Cred – External Impact

#### Drug trade destroys the Mexican economy --- consensus of experts

**Gray, 10** (Colin, “The Hidden Cost of the War on Drugs,” Stanford Progressive, May 2010, http://www.stanford.edu/group/progressive/cgi-bin/?p=521, Tashma)

As a net effect, **most experts** would **agree that** the **illicit drug trade adversely affects the Mexican economy.** Cartels undermine the rule of law. Instability alienates current investors and deters potential investors or business-owners. Government revenues fall, as taxable commodities are replaced in the economy by illegal goods that are not taxed by the government. Tourism, one of Mexico’s most important exports, suffers: the U.S. military has officially discouraged travelers from vacationing in many parts of Mexico. Drug cartels often intervene in economies directly, further discouraging investment. According to the L.A. Times, the Zetas (the military arm of the Gulf Cartel) “have proved to be ruthless overlords. They have kidnapped businessmen, demanded protection money from merchants, taken over sales of pirated CDs and DVDs and muscled into the liquor trade by forcing restaurant and bar owners to buy from them.” Viridiana Rios of the Harvard Department of Government estimates that “**the cost of violence** is equivalent to 1.07 billion dollars, investment losses accounts for other 1.3 billion, drug abuse generates a loss of 0.68 billion dollars, and other costs **may have an impact as high as 1.5 billion dollars.**”

#### Drug trade fuels a Mexican civil conflict and the worst forms of dehumanization

**Chalk, 11** (Peter, Senior Political Scientist at RAND Corporation, Ph.D. in political science, University of British Columbia, M.A. in political studies and international relations, University of Aberdeen, “The Latin American Drug Trade Scope, Dimensions, Impact, and Response,” RAND Project Air Force, http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2011/RAND\_MG1076.pdf, Tashma)

It is in Mexico, however, that the pernicious societal impact of the Latin American cocaine and heroin trade has been greatest, **contributing** to what amounts **to the wholesale breakdown of basic civility across the country**—something that has been particularly evident in the northern border states.8 According to Guillermo Valdés Castellanos, director of the National Security and Intelligence Center (Centro de Investigación y Seguridad Nacional, or CISEN), more than 28,000 drug-related murders have occurred since Felipe Calderón launched an all-out offensive on the country’s cartels in 2006.9 To put these figures in perspective, note that fewer than 4,300 U.S. soldiers lost their lives in Iraq between 2003 and 2008. The enormous human toll has triggered the formation of various self-defense forces across the border provinces. In January 2009, for instance, a group calling itself the Juárez Citizens Command announced that it was preparing to take the law into its own hands and would execute a criminal every 24 hours to bring order to the city.10¶ Most killings are the work of syndicate-controlled paramilitary cells, some with professional training. Notable groups include Los Negros, Los Gueritos, Los Pelones, Los Números, Los Chachos, Los Lobos, Los Sinaloa, and Los Nuevos Zetas.11 Ensuing fatalities have been linked to intersyndicate warfare, the silencing of suspected informers, the assassination of high-ranking officials, and the systematic targeting of law enforcement personnel. The latter has become increasingly evident in line with Calderón’s antidrug push since 2006. In many cases, police either quit (certain towns have seen entire forces abandon the job) or cooperate with syndicates out of straight fear. Although it is lower- and mid-ranking officers who have been mostly affected, traffickers have been prepared to direct their intimidation to the highest levels. In 2009, for instance, the police chief of Cuidad Juárez, Roberto Orduña Cruz, fled the city after his deputy, operations director Sacramento Pérez Serrano, was shot. The assassination was in keeping with a cartel ultimatum that a senior official would be killed every 48 hours until he resigned.12¶ The specific character of drug-related murders has also become progressively more barbaric. **It is not unusual for victims to be dismembered, beheaded, boiled in giant pots** filled with lye (a process known as pozole after the Mexican word for stew), **or** even **skinned.**13 As one official in Tijuana candidly remarked,¶ Criminals earn respect and credibility with creative killing methods. Your status is based on your capacity to commit the most sadistic acts. Burning corpses, using acid, beheading victims. . . . This generation is setting a new standard for savagery.14¶ The extent of cartel violence has begun to take on a disturbing new dimension with the deliberate targeting of ordinary civilians. A particularly bloody attack took place in September 2008, when two fragmentation grenades were hurled into a crowd celebrating Mexico’s Independence Day at the Plaza Melchor Ocampo in Morelia, Michoacán state. The atrocity, which was originally blamed on La Familia but ultimately tied to Los Zetas, resulted in eight deaths and more than 100 injuries.15 Commenting on the incident and what it might herald, Jane’s Homeland Security Review remarks,¶ [The Morelia bombing] indicated that there is a disturbing evolution towards indiscriminate attacks on a large-scale using a methodology . . . which seems to be inspired more by terrorist techniques than by traditional cartel activity. . . . A new chapter in Mexico’s drugs war has now opened and future attacks on this scale must now be considered a reality of security risk.16 ¶ This assessment was borne out in February 2010, when drug traffickers stormed a party packed with teenagers in Cuidad Juárez and indiscriminately killed 14 people, eight of whom were under 20. According to the daily El Diario, one of the victims had been a witness to a multiple homicide and was due to have testified in an upcoming trial.17¶ Apart from fostering extreme violence, the narcotics trade has decisively undermined political stability in Mexico by feeding pervasive corruption throughout the police and administrative bureaucracy.18 Although the overall extent of the problem is unknown, its seriousness can be gauged by the following statistics:¶ One-fifth of Mexico’s entire federal police force was under investigation for corruption as of 2005.19¶ • Between 2006 and 2008, 11,500 public servants were fined or suspended from their jobs for corruption.20¶ • In April 2007, the Monterrey state government arrested an unprecedented 141 police officers for collaborating with the Gulf cartel and accepting kickbacks in exchange for intelligence or ignoring trafficking activities taking place in their respective jurisdictions.21¶ • In 2008, more than 35 high-ranking security officials were detained, notably including Noe Ramírez, a former head of the anti–organized crime unit in the attorney general’s office, and Ricardo Gutiérrez Vargas, director for International Police Affairs at the Federal Investigative Agency (FIA).22¶ • In 2010, nearly one-tenth of the officers in the federal police force were dismissed for failing to pass anticorruption tests.23¶ Evidence suggests that corruption among police and immigration officials who are stationed in the northern border provinces is especially acute where many are offered cash payments to cooperate with drug syndicates and threatened with physical harm if bribes are not accepted.24 This method, known as plata o plomo (“silver or lead”), has been used repeatedly to avail cocaine and heroin (as well as marijuana)25 shipments into the United States, casting considerable doubt on the overall veracity and credibility of the counterdrug offensive that was initiated in 2006.26¶

#### Leads to narco terrorism

**Yager, 9** (Jordy, “Border lawmakers fear drug-terrorism link,” The Hill, 3/7/09, http://thehill.com/homenews/news/18629-border-lawmakers-fear-drug-terrorism-link)

Members of Congress are raising the alarm that war-like conditions on the Mexican border could lead to Mexican drug cartels helping terrorists attack the U.S. “When you have…gangs and they have loose ties with al Qaeda and then you have Iran not too far away from building a nuclear capability, nuclear terrorism may not be far off,” said Rep. Trent Franks (R- Ariz.), a member of the House Armed Services committee. The Mexican drug cartels’ violence accounted for more than 6,000 deaths last year, and in recent months it has begun spilling over into the districts of lawmakers from the southwest region, even as far north as Phoenix, Ariz. -- which has become, Franks noted, the “kidnap capital of the U.S.” Rep. Henry Cuellar (D-Texas), whose district borders Mexico, said that while the situation is bad, it could easily get worse. “The goal of the cartels is to make money,” said Cuellar, who sits on the House Homeland Security committee. “If they can smuggle in drugs and human cargo, then certainly they can smuggle other things in, other devices to cause us harm.” “We have not heard of any associations, but is there the possibility? I’ll be the first to say, yeah. They have the routes, they can very easily smuggle in other things. If I was a bad guy in another country, I would go into Central America because the U.S. is not paying the proper attention.” Violence reached new levels last week when the mayor of Juarez, a Mexican city with 1.6 million people that serves as a major transit point for drug smugglers, moved his family to El Paso, Texas, after receiving threats against his and their lives. The move corresponded with the resignation of the city’s police chief after a drug cartel promised to kill a police officer every 48 hours if he did not step down. The city’s police director of operations, a police officer and a prison guard were killed by the cartels in days prior. “That was a mistake in my judgment,” Franks said of the chief’s resignation. “The federal government should have come in and said listen, we’re going to put a Marine division there to help you out if that’s what’s necessary, but narco-terrorists are not going to tell America who to elect and who resigns.”

#### That results in WMD terrorist attacks

**Anderson, 8** (10/8/2008, Curt, AP, “US officials fear terrorist links with drug lords,” <http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/nation/2008-10-08-805146709_x.htm>)

MIAMI — There is real danger that Islamic extremist groups such as al-Qaida and Hezbollah could form alliances with wealthy and powerful Latin American drug lords to launch new terrorist attacks, U.S. officials said Wednesday.

Extremist group operatives have already been identified in several Latin American countries, mostly involved in fundraising and finding logistical support. But Charles Allen, chief of intelligence analysis at the Homeland Security Department, said they could use well-established smuggling routes and drug profits to bring people or even weapons of mass destruction to the U.S.

"The presence of these people in the region leaves open the possibility that they will attempt to attack the United States," said Allen, a veteran CIA analyst. "The threats in this hemisphere are real. We cannot ignore them."

Added U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration operations chief Michael Braun: "It is not in our interest to let that potpourri of scum to come together."

#### Nuclear war

Ayson 10 (Robert, Professor of Strategic Studies and Director of the Centre for Strategic Studies: New Zealand at the Victoria University of Wellington,“After a Terrorist Nuclear Attack: Envisaging Catalytic Effects,” Studies in Conflict & Terrorism, Volume 33, Issue 7, July, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via InformaWorld)

A terrorist nuclear attack, and even the use of nuclear weapons in response by the country attacked in the first place, would not necessarily represent the worst of the nuclear worlds imaginable. Indeed, there are reasons to wonder whether nuclear terrorism should ever be regarded as belonging in the category of truly existential threats. A contrast can be drawn here with the global catastrophe that would come from a massive nuclear exchange between two or more of the sovereign states that possess these weapons in significant numbers. Even the worst terrorism that the twenty-first century might bring would fade into insignificance alongside considerations of what a general nuclear war would have wrought in the Cold War period. And it must be admitted that as long as the major nuclear weapons states have hundreds and even thousands of nuclear weapons at their disposal, there is always the possibility of a truly awful nuclear exchange taking place precipitated entirely by state possessors themselves. But these two nuclear worlds—a non-state actor nuclear attack and a catastrophic interstate nuclear exchange—are not necessarily separable. It is just possible that some sort of terrorist attack, and especially an act of nuclear terrorism, could precipitate a chain of events leading to a massive exchange of nuclear weaponsbetween two or more of the states that possess them. In this context, today’s and tomorrow’s terrorist groups might assume the place allotted during the early Cold War years to new state possessors of small nuclear arsenals who were seen as raising the risks of a catalytic nuclear war between the superpowers started by third parties. These risks were considered in the late 1950s and early 1960s as concerns grew about nuclear proliferation, the so-called n+1 problem. It may require a considerable amount of imagination to depict an especially plausible situation where an act of nuclear terrorism could lead to such a massive inter-state nuclear war. For example, in the event of a terrorist nuclear attack on the United States, it might well be wondered just how Russia and/or China could plausibly be brought into the picture, not least because they seem unlikely to be fingered as the most obvious state sponsors or encouragers of terrorist groups. They would seem far too responsible to be involved in supporting that sort of terrorist behavior that could just as easily threaten them as well. Some possibilities, however remote, do suggest themselves. For example, how might the United States react if it was thoughtordiscovered that the fissile material used in the actof nuclear terrorismhad come from Russian stocks,40 and if for some reason Moscow denied any responsibility for nuclear laxity? The correct attribution of that nuclear material to a particular country might not be a case of science fiction given the observation by Michael May et al. that while the debris resulting from a nuclear explosion would be “spread over a wide area in tiny fragments, its radioactivity makes it detectable, identifiable and collectable, and a wealth of information can be obtained from its analysis: the efficiency of the explosion, the materials used and, most important … some indication of where the nuclear material came from.”41 Alternatively, if the act of nuclear terrorism came as a complete surprise, and American officials refused to believe that a terrorist group was fully responsible (or responsible at all) suspicion would shift immediately to state possessors. Ruling out Western ally countries like the United Kingdom and France, and probably Israel and India as well, authorities in Washington would be left with a very short list consisting of North Korea, perhaps Iran if its program continues, and possibly Pakistan. But at what stage would Russia and China be definitely ruled out in this high stakes game of nuclear Cluedo? In particular, if the act of nuclear terrorism occurred against a backdrop of existing tension in Washington’s relations with Russia and/or China, and at a time when threats had already been traded between these major powers, would officials and political leaders not be tempted to assume the worst? Of course, the chances of this occurring would only seem to increase if the United States was already involved in some sort of limited armed conflict with Russia and/or China, or if they were confronting each other from a distance in a proxy war, as unlikely as these developments may seem at the present time. The reverse might well apply too: should a nuclear terrorist attack occur in Russia or China during a period of heightened tension or even limited conflict with the United States, could Moscow and Beijing resist the pressures that might rise domestically to consider the United States as a possible perpetrator or encourager of the attack? Washington’s early response to a terrorist nuclear attack on its own soil might also raise the possibility of an unwanted (and nuclear aided) confrontation with Russia and/or China. For example, in the noise and confusion during the immediate aftermath of the terrorist nuclear attack, the U.S. president might be expected to place the country’s armed forces, including its nuclear arsenal, on a higher stage of alert. In such a tense environment, when careful planning runs up against the friction of reality, it is just possible that Moscow and/or China might mistakenly read this as a sign of U.S. intentions to use force (and possibly nuclear force) against them. In that situation, the temptations to preempt such actions might grow, although it must be admitted that any preemption would probably still meet with a devastating response. As part of its initial response to the act of nuclear terrorism (as discussed earlier) Washington might decide to order a significant conventional (or nuclear) retaliatory or disarming attack against the leadership of the terrorist group and/or states seen to support that group. Depending on the identity and especially the location of these targets, Russia and/or China might interpret such action as being far too close for their comfort, and potentially as an infringement on their spheres of influence and even on their sovereignty. One far-fetched but perhaps not impossible scenario might stem from a judgment in Washington that some of the main aiders and abetters of the terrorist action resided somewhere such as Chechnya, perhaps in connection with what Allison claims is the “Chechen insurgents’ … long-standing interest in all things nuclear.”42 American pressure on that part of the world would almost certainly raise alarms in Moscow that might require a degree of advanced consultation from Washington that the latter found itself unable or unwilling to provide. There is also the question of how other nuclear-armed states respond to the act of nuclear terrorism on another member of that special club. It could reasonably be expected that following a nuclear terrorist attack on the United States, both Russia and China would extend immediate sympathy and support to Washington and would work alongside the United States in the Security Council. But there is just a chance, albeit a slim one, where the support of Russia and/or China is less automatic in some cases than in others. For example, what would happen if the United States wished to discuss its right to retaliate against groups based in their territory? If, for some reason, Washington found the responses of Russia and China deeply underwhelming, (neither “for us or against us”) might it also suspect that they secretly were in cahoots with the group, increasing (again perhaps ever so slightly) the chances of a major exchange. If the terrorist group had some connections to groups in Russia and China, or existed in areas of the world over which Russia and China held sway, and if Washington felt that Moscow or Beijing were placing a curiously modest level of pressure on them, what conclusions might it then draw about their culpability? If Washington decided to use, or decided to threaten the use of, nuclear weapons, the responses of Russia and China would be crucial to the chances of avoiding a more serious nuclear exchange. They might surmise, for example, that while the act of nuclear terrorism was especially heinous and demanded a strong response, the response simply had to remain below the nuclear threshold. It would be one thing for a non-state actor to have broken the nuclear use taboo, but an entirely different thing for a state actor, and indeed the leading state in the international system, to do so. If Russia and China felt sufficiently strongly about that prospect, there is then the question of what options would lie open to them to dissuade the United States from such action: and as has been seen over the last several decades, the central dissuader of the use of nuclear weapons by states has been the threat of nuclear retaliation. If some readers find this simply too fanciful, and perhaps even offensive to contemplate, it may be informative to reverse the tables. Russia, which possesses an arsenal of thousands of nuclear warheads and that has been one of the two most important trustees of the non-use taboo, is subjected to an attack of nuclear terrorism. In response, Moscow places its nuclear forces very visibly on a higher state of alert and declares that it is considering the use of nuclear retaliation against the group and any of its state supporters. How would Washington view such a possibility? Would it really be keen to support Russia’s use of nuclear weapons, including outside Russia’s traditional sphere of influence? And if not, which seems quite plausible, what options would Washington have to communicate that displeasure? If China had been the victim of the nuclear terrorism and seemed likely to retaliate in kind, would the United States and Russia be happy to sit back and let this occur? In the charged atmosphere immediately after a nuclear terrorist attack,how would the attacked country respond to pressure from other major nuclear powers not to respond in kind? The phrase “how dare they tell us what to do” immediately springs to mind. Some might even go so far as to interpret this concern as a tacit form of sympathy or support for the terrorists. This might not help the chances of nuclear restraint.