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## Plan

The United States federal government should increase its technical and regulatory assistance toward Mexico for hydrocarbon energy resource development.

## Advantage 1 Oil Spills

#### With absent cooperation from the US Mexico is planning the drill in gulf’s deep waters alone – lack of experience dooms its attempts

Johnson, McClatchy Newspapers, Reporter 12

[Tim Johnson, Maria Moors Cabot Prize, Winner & Stanford University, Knight Fellow, citing various oil experts, 3-04-12, McClatchy Newspapers, Mexico City, “Mexican plan for Gulf deepwater wells sparks new worries” <http://www.mcclatchydc.com/2012/04/03/144004/mexican-plan-for-gulf-deepwater.html#.UdA9CvmwWuk>, accessed 6-30-13]

If all goes as planned, Petroleos de Mexico, known as Pemex, will deploy two state-of-the-art drilling platforms in May to an area just south of the maritime boundary with the United States. One rig will sink a well in 9,514 feet of water, while another will drill in 8,316 feet of water, then deeper into the substrata.

Pemex has no experience drilling at such depths. Mexico's oil regulator is sounding alarm bells, saying the huge state oil concern is unprepared for a serious deepwater accident or spill. Critics say the company has sharply cut corners on insurance, remiss over potential sky-high liability.

Mexico's plans come two years after the Deepwater Horizon catastrophe, the worst oil spill in U.S. history. On April 20, 2010, a semi-submersible rig that the British oil firm BP had contracted to drill a well known as Macondo exploded off the Louisiana coast, killing 11 workers and spewing 4.9 million barrels of oil in the nearly three months it took engineers to stop the spill.

BP has said the tab for the spill — including government fines, cleanup costs and compensation — could climb to $42 billion for the company and its contractors.

Pemex's plans to sink even deeper offshore wells underscore Mexico's pressing need to maintain sagging oil production — exports pay for one-third of government operating expenses — along with oil companies' desire to leverage technology and drill at ever more challenging depths.

#### Even if Pemex contracts service, it still lacks management expertise that the U.S. can provide.

Johnson, McClatchy Newspapers, Reporter 12

[Tim Johnson, Maria Moors Cabot Prize, Winner & Stanford University, Knight Fellow, citing various oil experts, 3-04-12, McClatchy Newspapers, Mexico City, “Mexican plan for Gulf deepwater wells sparks new worries” <http://www.mcclatchydc.com/2012/04/03/144004/mexican-plan-for-gulf-deepwater.html#.UdA9CvmwWuk>, accessed 6-30-13]

Mexico's nationalist constitution bars Pemex from operating joint ventures with oil companies that already are experienced at very deep water. It can contract only with global oil service companies, ordering them to perform functions.

"This requires managerial expertise that Pemex lacks," said Miriam Grunstein Dickter, an oil expert at the Center for Research and Teaching of Economics, a Mexico City institute in the social sciences. "When you contract a service company, they perform the work that you command them to perform. Here, Pemex does not know how to command the service company."

#### US and Mexico oil deal results in joint cooperation in respect to the environment

Klapper, Associated Press, 12

(Bradley, A reporter on the State Department for the Associated Press, 2/20/12, The Huffington Post, “U.S, Mexico Agree To Cooperate on Energy,”

U.S., Mexico Agree To Cooperate On Energy,” <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/02/20/us-mexico-agree-to-cooper_n_1288976.html>, Accessed: 6/23/13)

¶ — The United States and Mexico **agreed** Monday to work together when drilling for oil and gas below their maritime border in the Gulf of Mexico.¶ Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton and Mexico's foreign minister signed the deal at a ceremony in the Mexican resort of Los Cabos as Mexican President Felipe Calderon and U.S. Interior Secretary Ken Salazar looked on.¶ The cooperation stems from an understanding that President Barack Obama and Calderon reached in 2010 to share in the profits and work together to avoid spills.¶ **Clinton said** the deal would "ensure safe, efficient, responsible exploration of the oil and gas reservoirs in the Gulf of Mexico."¶ "These reservoirs could hold considerable reserves that would benefit the United States and Mexico alike," she said. But they don't necessarily stop neatly at our maritime boundary," Clinton added. "This could lead to disputes if a company discovers a reservoir that straddles the boundary – disputes, for example, over who should do the extraction and how much they should extract."¶ Clinton said the agreement will prevent such disputes and create new business opportunities.¶ Calderon said the deal creates clear rules and should erase any fear among Mexicans that their oil will be appropriated by Americans.¶ And he stressed that "operations will be done in a safe and responsible manner, with full respect to the environment."¶ Under the agreement, U.S. companies will now be allowed to partner with Mexico's national oil company in drilling. But neither country is constrained by the other.¶ If the two governments can't agree on how to exploit a reservoir, either can take its share unilaterally.¶ The U.S. Interior Department said the agreement makes nearly 1.5 million acres of the U.S. Outer Continental Shelf more accessible for exploration and production activities.¶ The area could contain 172 million barrels of oil and 304 billion cubic feet of natural gas, it said.¶ "This is an area larger than the state of Delaware," Salazar said.

#### US cooperation with Mexico via the THA brings new regulations that prevent oil spills.

PennEnergy, Editorial Staff, 13’

(PennEnergy Editorial Staff, PennEnergy, April 18, 2013, “Bill introduced to approve transboundary hydrocarbon agreement with Mexico”, http://www.pennenergy.com/articles/pennenergy/2013/04/bill-introduced-to-approve-transboundary-hydrocarbon-agreement-w.html, Accessed 6/26/13)

This bill would amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, and provide the legal certainty needed for greater energy exploration and development for resources that extend across our maritime border with Mexico. The Agreement was signed in 2012 by then-Secretary of State Hillary Clinton and Mexican Foreign Minister Castellano at the G-20 summit in Los Cabos. It lifts the current moratorium on drilling along a section of the boundary, and provides a framework for the safe management of transboundary hydrocarbons along the whole maritime border.

“This bill is another step towards embracing an all-of-the-above approach to energy that safely develops our natural resources to help achieve North American energy independence. This bill will help lower energy costs while creating American jobs by safely opening up more areas in the Gulf of Mexico for exploration and production. This is a common sense approach to work with our partners south of the border to make both countries more energy secure, while protecting our sovereignty. We’re choosing to act instead of allowing the Administration to continue dragging its feet on energy development,” said Rep. Jeff Duncan.

#### US and Mexican borders in the Gulf of Mexico key to oil spill prevention

HRC, High-Level Regulatory Cooperation Council 12

(HLRCC, 2/28/12, United States-Mexico High-Level Regulatory Cooperation Council, “UNITED STATES-MEXICO ¶ HIGH-LEVEL REGULATORY ¶ COOPERATION COUNCIL ¶ WORK PLAN,” p. 11-12, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/oira/irc/united-states-mexico-high-level-regulatory-cooperation-council-work-plan.pdf>, Accessed 6/30/13)

Mexico and the United States border the Gulf of Mexico. This means that the ¶ exploration and drilling activities that take place in this body of water present risks for both¶ countries, and both countries would benefit from a common set of drilling standards. While ¶ different institutional models, regulations and laws bind each country, U.S. and Mexican ¶ regulators are open-minded and would like to develop a set of harmonized standards related to ¶ the exploration and production of oil resources and well control and containment standards, ¶ including requirements for sharing worst-case discharge and spill response plans. Although the ¶ harmonization is intended as a long-term goal, there have been short-term successes; the first¶ product of this common philosophy is that Mexico will incorporate standards according to the ¶ American Petroleum Institute Offshore Recommended Practices that apply to operators working ¶ in the United States.

On February 19, the two countries signed the Agreement Between the United Mexican States ¶ and the United States of America Concerning Transboundary Hydrocarbon Reservoirs in the ¶ Gulf of Mexico (“Agreement”) to govern transboundary reservoirs underlying the Outer ¶ Continental Shelf maritime boundary in the Gulf of Mexico. The Agreement includes a ¶ commitment, in Article 19, by both parties to adopt, where appropriate, common health, safety ¶and environmental standards and requirements applicable to activity contemplated under the ¶ Agreement within the transboundary area. In addition, there are discussions between the two ¶ countries happening now, with both countries working to identify elements of a common ¶ approach for the entire Gulf of Mexico.

#### Oil spills kill birds, marine life, coral reefs— throws off food chain.

Mims Albuquerque Academy 11

[Jim, 4/6/11, “The Effectiveness of Chemical Dispersants for Oil Spill Cleanup”, <http://www.supercomputingchallenge.org/archive/10-11/finalreports/6.pdf>, p. 5-6, accessed 6/30/13]

The major effects of oil on life and the environment stems from the toxicity of oil. Many birds¶ and marine life can die from complications caused by the contact of oil in addition to the inherent¶ effects of oil. These complications include hypothermia, asphyxiation, weak immune system,¶ and the inability to sense or escape from predators. As one part of the food chain is disrupted, a¶ balance between predator and prey is broken, and, in extreme cases, can lead to extinction. Oil¶ spills also impact coral reefs. Coral reefs are not motile, and can easily become contaminated. Oil,¶ apart from being toxic to the animal life in coral reefs, can cause obscure the water, preventing the¶ photosynthetic processes of symbiotic algae. This leads to the infamous coral bleaching, causing¶ whole regions of coral to die off.

#### Coral reefs key to biodiversity

Mims Albuquerque Academy 11

[Jim, 4/6/11, “The Effectiveness of Chemical Dispersants for Oil Spill Cleanup”, <http://www.supercomputingchallenge.org/archive/10-11/finalreports/6.pdf>, p. 8, accessed 6/30/13]

Coral is composed of small animals called polyps. These polyps have a mutualistic symbiotic rela-¶ tionship with a group of protozoans, zooxanthellae. The polyps create the familiar coral structure¶ by excreting calcium carbonate, CaCO3, into a skeleton. This protects not only the polyps, but¶ the zooxanthellae as well. In return for the shelter, zooxanthellae use photosynthesis to create food¶ for both symbionts. In a healthy environment, both the polyps and zooxanthellae ¶ ourish, but¶ when the coral is stressed, it will either expel the zooxanthellae or digest it. In doing so, however,¶ because the zooxanthellae provides the coral with food, both polyp and zooxanthellae then die.¶ This event is what is commonly known as coral bleaching," named due to the loss of coral color¶ due to the loss of the pigmented zooxanthellae. These circumstances occur with even slight changes¶ in pH levels, temperature, salinity, nutrient levels, concentration of chemicals, and the clarity of¶ the water. The impacts of coral bleaching are wide-reaching, affecting some of the world's richest¶ ocean ecosystems.¶

Other potential impacts of bleaching is the loss of coral reefs as a source of food, as coral reefs¶ support many coastal economies. Coral reefs also protect the coastlines from hurricanes, tropical¶ storms, and heavy waves. Additionally, corals are being increasingly used as a source for biomedical¶ chemicals.2

#### Collapse of marine biodiversity causes extinction- collapse of biological cycles

Craig, Indiana University Professor of Law 3

[Robin Kundis, Winter 2003, McGeorge Law Review, “Taking Steps Toward Marine Wilderness Protection? Fishing and Coral Reef Marine Reserves in Florida and Hawaii”, accessed via LexisNexis 7/1/13]

Biodiversity and ecosystem function arguments for conserving marine ecosystems also exist, just as they do for terrestrial ecosystems, but these arguments have thus far rarely been raised in political debates. For example, besides significant tourism values - the most economically valuable ecosystem service coral reefs provide, worldwide - coral reefs protect against storms and dampen other environmental fluctuations, services worth more than ten times the reefs' value for food production. n856 Waste treatment is another significant, non-extractive ecosystem function that intact coral reef ecosystems provide. n857 More generally, "ocean ecosystems play a major role in the global geochemical cycling of all the elements that represent the basic building blocks of living organisms, carbon, nitrogen, oxygen, phosphorus, and sulfur, as well as other less abundant but necessary elements." n858 In a very real and direct sense, therefore, human degradation of marine ecosystems impairs the planet's ability to support life.

Maintaining biodiversity is often critical to maintaining the functions of marine ecosystems. Current evidence shows that, in general, an ecosystem's ability to keep functioning in the face of disturbance is strongly dependent on its biodiversity, "indicating that more diverse ecosystems are more stable." n859 Coral reef ecosystems are particularly dependent on their biodiversity.[\*265]

Most ecologists agree that the complexity of interactions and degree of interrelatedness among component species is higher on coral reefs than in any other marine environment. This implies that the ecosystem functioning that produces the most highly valued components is also complex and that many otherwise insignificant species have strong effects on sustaining the rest of the reef system. n860

Thus, maintaining and restoring the biodiversity of marine ecosystems is critical to maintaining and restoring the ecosystem services that they provide. Non-use biodiversity values for marine ecosystems have been calculated in the wake of marine disasters, like the Exxon Valdez oil spill in Alaska. n861 Similar calculations could derive preservation values for marine wilderness.

However, economic value, or economic value equivalents, should not be "the sole or even primary justification for conservation of ocean ecosystems. Ethical arguments also have considerable force and merit." n862 At the forefront of such arguments should be a recognition of how little we know about the sea - and about the actual effect of human activities on marine ecosystems. The United States has traditionally failed to protect marine ecosystems because it was difficult to detect anthropogenic harm to the oceans, but we now know that such harm is occurring - even though we are not completely sure about causation or about how to fix every problem. Ecosystems like the NWHI coral reef ecosystem should inspire lawmakers and policymakers to admit that most of the time we really do not know what we are doing to the sea and hence should be preserving marine wilderness whenever we can - especially when the United States has within its territory relatively pristine marine ecosystems that may be unique in the world.

We may not know much about the sea, but we do know this much: if we kill the ocean we kill ourselves, and we will take most of the biosphere with us. The Black Sea is almost dead, n863 its once-complex and productive ecosystem almost entirely replaced by a monoculture of comb jellies, "starving out fish and dolphins, emptying fishermen's nets, and converting the web of life into brainless, wraith-like blobs of jelly." n864 More importantly, the Black Sea is not necessarily unique**.**

## Relations Advantage

### **Scenario 1 Economy**

**We isolate 2 internal links for a better economy**

**First is domestic development – energy development in the Gulf is key to the economy by creating jobs, lowering energy prices, increasing domestic supply, generating federal revenue, and expanding exploration**

**Hastings,** Chairman on the Natural Resource House Committee, 5/15/**13**

[Doc, 5-15-13, Committee on Natural Resources, “House Committee Approves Legislation to Approve Transboundary Hydrocarbon Agreement with Mexico”, http://naturalresources.house.gov/news/documentsingle.aspx?DocumentID=334042, accessed 6-30-13]

WASHINGTON, D.C., May 15, 2013 - Today, **the House Natural Resources Committee approved H.R. 1613, the “Outer Continental Shelf Transboundary Hydrocarbon Agreements Authorization Act”** with a bipartisan vote of 25-16.  This important legislation would approve and implement the terms of the U.S. - Mexico Transboundary Hydrocarbons Agreement that governs the development of shared oil and natural gas resources along the U.S. – Mexico maritime border in the Gulf of Mexico.

**The bill would lift the current moratorium on drilling along the maritime border and provide new access to an area estimated to contain as much as 172 million barrels of oil and 304 billion cubic feet of natural gas.  This will expand energy development, create new American jobs, lower energy prices, generate new revenue, and make America more energy secure.**

“Today we took another step towards embracing an all-of-the-above approach to energy that safely develops our natural resources to help achieve North American energy independence. This bipartisan bill will help lower energy costs while creating American jobs by safely opening up more than 1.5 million acres in the Gulf of Mexico for exploration and production. This is a common sense approach to work with our partners south of the border to make both countries more energy secure, while protecting our sovereignty.  This legislation works out the vast majority of differences with the Obama Administration, while also ensuring that those seeking to harvest these resources have the certainty they need to move forward. I’m optimistic that this legislation will pass the House of Representatives, and continue on its path towards becoming law,” said Rep. Jeff Duncan (SC-03).

**“Approval of this legislation by the Committee is important to finalizing this agreement and expanding American energy production.  This bill would create jobs, lower energy prices by increasing our domestic supply, generate new federal revenue to help lower the debt and strengthen our economy, and make America more energy secure by opening up new areas in the Gulf of Mexico to exploration and development.  In addition, this important legislation would lay the framework for transboundary agreements with other nations that will allow America to fully utilize its shared natural energy reserves.” said Natural Resources Committee Chairman Doc Hastings (WA-04).**

The House Natural Resources Committee recently held an [oversight hearing](http://naturalresources.house.gov/calendar/eventsingle.aspx?EventID=330029) on H.R. 1613 where the Obama Administration and expert witnesses both voiced their support of the “Outer Continental Shelf Transboundary Hydrocarbon Agreements Authorization Act.”

**Second is trade cooperation – opening up the Gulf to increased development spurs bi-lateral economic cooperation and stimulates their economies**

**Simmons,** economist at the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission in Washington, D.C., 4/30/**13**

[Daniel, 4-30-13, Master Resource, “U.S.-Mexico Transboundary Hydrocarbons Agreement: A Rare Victory for Oil and Gas in the Obama Era”, http://www.masterresource.org/2013/04/u-s-mexico-transboundary-hydrocarbons-agreement/, accessed 6-30-1]

The energy and economic welfare of the United States and Mexico are intertwined by our shared geography, geology, and peoples. **The Transboundary Hydrocarbon Agreement will help to tie our countries together and grow our economies.”**

- Daniel Simmons, [Testimony](http://www.instituteforenergyresearch.org/2013/04/24/testimony-of-daniel-simmons-subcommittee-on-energy-and-mineral-resources/) before House Natural Resources Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, “[**U.S.-Mexico Transboundary Hydrocarbon Agreement and Steps Needed for Implementation**](http://naturalresources.house.gov/calendar/eventsingle.aspx?EventID=330029)**,” April 25, 2013.**

**Mexico is America’s** [**third largest trading partner**](http://www.census.gov/foreign-trade/statistics/highlights/toppartners.html) **and has been** [**one of the largest**](http://www.eia.gov/dnav/pet/pet_move_impcus_a2_nus_ep00_im0_mbblpd_a.htm) **sources of oil exports to the United States. Mexico is the** [**largest recipient**](http://www.eia.gov/dnav/pet/pet_move_expc_a_epm0f_eex_mbbl_a.htm) **of U.S. gasoline exports and the** [**second largest recipient**](http://www.eia.gov/dnav/ng/ng_move_expc_s1_a.htm;%20Energy%20Information%20Administration,%20U.S.%20Natural%20Gas%20Imports%20by%20Country,%20http://www.eia.gov/dnav/ng/ng_move_impc_s1_a.htm)**of our natural gas exports.**

**The energy trade between the United States and Mexico is growing, especially for America’s finished petroleum and natural gas exports.** Mexico’s heavy oil production is falling, but that means more spare refining capacity on the Gulf Coast if Canadian oil sands can be transported to the Gulf Coast.

The Gulf of Mexico is one of the most prolific hydrocarbon-producing areas for both the United States and Mexico. Oil production, especially in deepwater on the U.S. side of the border, has moved closer to the U.S.-Mexico maritime border in recent years. Until last year, however, there was no agreement on how to divide resources between the United States and Mexico for resources that straddle the border.

The Agreement A [Fact Sheet](http://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2012/02/184235.htm) released by the U.S. Department of State on February 20th announced and described the Transboundary Hydrocarbon Agreement.

**The United States and Mexico today signed an agreement concerning the development of oil and gas reservoirs that cross the international maritime boundary between the two countries in the Gulf of Mexico. The Agreement is designed to enhance energy security in North America and support our shared duty to exercise responsible stewardship of the Gulf of Mexico.** It is built on a commitment to the safe, efficient, and equitable exploitation of transboundary reservoirs with the highest degree of safety and environmental standards.

Elements of the Agreement

**US and Mexico’s economies are interdependent**

**WC,** Wilson Center **9** [January 2009 “THE UNITED STATES AND MEXICO: Towards a Strategic Partnership” <http://www.wilsoncenter.org/sites/default/files/The%20U.S.%20and%20Mexico.%20Towards%20a%20Strategic%20Partnership.pdf> p. 3 6/30/13]

**Mexico also remains vital for the U.S. economy,** although the current economic slowdown presents special challenges that will have to be addressed with great care. **Mexico is the second destination for U.S. exports, and the ﬁrst** or second **destination of exports for at least twentytwo U.S. states. Over six million Americans live in cities and counties on the border and over 60 million in border states, whose economies are particularly tied with Mexico’s. This degree of integration creates opportunities for more focused economic cooperation, but also generates risks for spillover eﬀects in times of economic crisis. An economic slowdown in either country will inevitably aﬀect the other and a full-scale crisis could send shockwaves across the border.** Moreover, the persistent wage gap between the two countries presents a long-term challenge that has been insuﬃciently addressed in past eﬀorts at deepening cross-border economic ties. **The United States and Mexico have the opportunity to develop a framework for economic integration that helps to contain the eﬀect of economic shocks, takes advantage of complementarities to increase the competitive position of both countries, and, above all, places an emphasis on improving the well-being of average citizens in both countries.**

**Economic decline impacts extinction- studies prove**

**Royal,** Director Cooperative Threat Reduction DOD, **2010**

(Jedediah, Director Cooperative Threat Reduction DOD, 2010,“Economic Integration, Economic Signaling and the Problem of Economic Crises” in ‘Economics of War and Peace: Economic, Legal and Political Perspectives’ ed. Goldsmith and Brauer, p. 213-215, Accessed: 6/30/13)

**Less intuitive is how periods of economic decline may increase the likelihood of external conflict**. Political science literature has contributed a moderate degree of attention to the impact of economic decline and the security and defence behaviour of interdependent stales. Research in this vein has been considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow. First, on the systemic level. Pollins (20081 advances Modclski and Thompson's (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, finding that **rhythms in the global economy are associated with the rise and fall of a pre-eminent power and the often bloody transition from one pre-eminent leader to the next**. As such, **exogenous shocks such as economic crises could usher in a redistribution of relative power** (see also Gilpin. 19SJ) **that leads to uncertainty about power balances, increasing the risk of miscalculation** (Fcaron. 1995). Alternatively, **even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflict as a rising power may seek to challenge a declining power** (Werner. 1999). Separately. Pollins (1996) also shows that global economic cycles combined with parallel leadership cycles impact the likelihood of conflict among major, medium and small powers, although he suggests that the causes and connections between global economic conditions and security conditions remain unknown. Second, on a dyadic level. Copeland's (1996. 2000) theory of trade expectations suggests that 'future expectation of trade' is a significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behaviour of states. He argues that interdependent states are likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations. However, **if the expectations of future trade decline**, **particularly for difficult to replace items such as energy resources**, **the likelihood for conflict increases**, **as states will be inclined to use force to gain access to those resources**. Crises could potentially be the trigger for decreased trade expectations either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states.4 Third, **others** **have considered the link between economic decline and external armed conflict at a national level**. Mom berg and **Hess** (2002) **find a strong correlation between internal conflict and external conflict**, **particularly during periods of economic downturn**. They write. **The linkage, between internal and external conflict and prosperity are strong and mutually reinforcing**. **Economic conflict tends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn returns the favour**. Moreover, **the presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which international and external conflicts self-reinforce each other** (Hlomhen? & Hess. 2(102. p. X9> Economic decline has also been linked with an increase in the likelihood of terrorism (Blombcrg. Hess. & Wee ra pan a, 2004**). which has the capacity to spill across borders and lead to external tensions**. Furthermore, **crises generally reduce the popularity of a sitting government**. "**Diversionary theory" suggests that, when facing unpopularity arising from economic decline, sitting governments have increased incentives to fabricate external military conflicts to create a 'rally around the flag' effect**. Wang (1996), DcRoucn (1995), and Blombcrg. Hess, and Thacker (2006) find supporting evidence showing that economic decline and use of force arc at least indirecti) correlated. Gelpi (1997). Miller (1999). and Kisangani and Pickering (2009) suggest that the tendency towards diversionary tactics arc greater for democratic states than autocratic states, due to the fact that democratic leaders are generally more susceptible to being removed from office due to lack of domestic support. DeRouen (2000) has provided evidence showing that periods of weak economic performance in the United States, and thus weak Presidential popularity, are statistically linked lo an increase in the use of force. In summary, rcccni **economic scholarship positively correlates economic integration with an increase in the frequency of economic crises**, **whereas political science scholarship links economic decline with external conflict** al systemic, dyadic and national levels.' This implied connection between integration, crises and armed conflict has not featured prominently in the economic-security debate and deserves more attention.

### Scenario 2 Hegemony

#### US/Mexico relations low

Barnes, ’11 (Joe, Bonner Means Baker Fellow at James A. Baker III Institute for Public Policy, “Oil and U.S.-Mexico Bilateral Relations”, <http://www.bakerinstitute.org/publications/EF-pub-BarnesBilateral-04292011.pdf>, p.10-15, YYu)

The U.S.-Mexico relationship has traditionally ranked rather low as a U.S. policy priority. All recent incoming U.S. presidents offer rhetorical tribute to the centrality of U.S.-Mexico ties. All find themselves consumed by other foreign policy issues. President Obama is a case in point. He met Mexican president Felipe Calderón before his inauguration. He visited Mexico in April 2009; Calderón visited the United States the next month. They have continued to meet; they keep in regular contact. But there is little doubt that the Obama administration’s foreign policy focus is elsewhere. The ongoing economic downturn has put cooperation with other major economies at the very top of the Obama administration’s agenda. U.S. combat forces are engaged in Iraq and Afghanistan. The United States is conducting military missions in Yemen and Pakistan. Washington is leading an international effort to halt Iran from developing nuclear weapons. The Obama administration has launched yet another round of Israeli-Palestinian talks. Popular unrest has swept much of the Arab world, toppling dictatorships and creating huge uncertainty in the region and in the United States. And, as this paper goes to print, the United States has intervened in Libya’s nascent civil war on behalf of opponents of the Gaddafi regime. From Washington’s perspective, U.S.-Mexico relations simply lack the urgency of these and many other issues.¶ There are nonetheless two issues that have leapt to the forefront. Both are related to border security. The first, of course, is illegal immigration. This is not the place to discuss in detail the ebb and flow of immigration as a domestic political issue in the United States. Suffice it to say that recent years have seen a sharp rise in anti-immigration sentiment. The restrictive law enacted by the state of Arizona in April 2010 best exemplifies this increase. The legislation expands the power of police to detain individuals suspected of being in the United States illegally. The Arizona law is very popular, particularly among conservatives, and other states are moving to emulate it.15 This upsurge in concern, ironically enough, has occurred just as Mexican illegal immigration into the United States has waned because of poor employment prospects associated with the U.S. recession. The political sensitivity of the issue is extreme. President Obama, for instance, has—despite repeated promises— failed to introduce a plan for comprehensive immigration reform. His Homeland Security Department has significantly stepped up border enforcement, deportations of illegal immigrants, and audits of firms suspected of hiring undocumented aliens.16 Republicans, for their part, are split into anti-immigrant and pro-business factions; President George W. Bush’s own unsuccessful immigration proposal received a barrage of criticism within his own party. In the current environment, the possibility of more liberalized immigration is, to put it very mildly, remote. Indeed, pro-immigration interests in the United States will be hard pressed to avert more severe measures to tighten the border and crack down on illegal aliens currently in the United States.¶ Much of the recent furor over immigration is associated with a second pressing bilateral issue: drug-related violence in Mexico. This violence has not spread across the border to any significant extent; indeed, major U.S. cities along the U.S.-Mexico border are among the least violent of U.S. metropolitan areas.17 But the prospect of significant cross-border violence is of grave concern, particularly in U.S. states adjacent to Mexico; needless to say these worries can be— and, indeed, are—used for partisan purposes.¶ Leaked U.S. State Department cables suggest that the United States is worried about Mexico’s ability to combat drug cartels.18 Certainly, concern about Mexican drug violence has helped drive U.S. support, under Presidents Bush and Obama, for Mexican efforts to suppress drug-related violence. The United States is providing more than a billion dollars worth of equipment to Mexico under the Merida Initiative announced by leaders of the United States, Mexico, and Central American countries in 2007. It is important to put this assistance into perspective. The total funds committed over the initial three-year period of the initiative are less than what the United States spent weekly on the war in Afghanistan in 2010.¶ Fundamentally, the upsurge in Mexican violence is attributable to U.S. inability to a) sufficiently reduce the demand for illegal drugs in the United States by recreational users and addicts alike and b) adequately diminish the availability of illegal drugs through domestic law enforcement, despite decades of crackdowns and high incarceration levels for drug-related offences. In many ways, Mexico, like Colombia before it, is collateral damage in the U.S. war on drugs. Ironically, a significant portion of the weapons used by drug traffickers in Mexico is smuggled from the United States.19 U.S. attitudes toward drug liberalization may be evolving, but there is no sign yet of an end to the “War on Drugs” declared by President Richard Nixon in 1971.¶ One tragic event sums up the drug-guns-death nexus now shaping U.S.-Mexico relations. In early 2010, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement agent Jaime Zapata was murdered in northern Mexico, presumably by individuals associated with drug cartels. The gun used to kill him was bought in Dallas, Texas.20¶ To sum up: U.S.-Mexico relations are positive. NAFTA remains the keystone of the relationship. U.S.-Mexico issues tend to rank low among U.S. foreign policy priorities. To the extent that such issues carry weight in Washington, they are dominated by illegal immigration and drug-related violence in Mexico. Where does petroleum fit in this picture?

**Mexican cooperation is key to US hegemony**

**Valenzuela,** Georgetown Center for Latin American Studies Director, et. al **12** [Arturo, Otto Reich, president of Otto Reich Associates LLC and former U.S. assistant secretary of state for Western Hemisphere Affairs, Donna Hrinak, member of the Inter-American Dialogue's board and president of Boeing Brazil, and John Maisto, member of the Advisor board and director of U.S. Education Finance Group, December 17, 2012 “Is the United States Losing Influence in Latin America?” <http://www.thedialogue.org/page.cfm?pageID=32&pubID=3179> 6/30/13 EYS]

Q: **The trope that the United States is losing influence in the region is not only wrong, but misses the "the actual complexity** (and yes, maturity) **of U.S. diplomacy** in the region today," **former State Department official** William McIlhenny argued in a Nov. 26 article for America's Quarterly. **McIlhenny cited a number of positive developments in Latin America that have been advanced by a U.S. foreign policy** that is "relevant to practical needs widely felt by other peoples-the way it should be." Is it time to rethink what U.S. "success" and "influence" in the region means, as McIlhenny suggests? Or are fears that the United States doesn't pay enough attention to the region and has lost its prominence well-founded? In addition to government, how do private sector and civil society initiatives factor in?

A: Arturo Valenzuela, founding director of the Center for Latin American Studies at Georgetown University and former U.S. assistant secretary of state for Western Hemisphere Affairs: "As the administration prepares for its second term and evaluates how it should proceed in the hemisphere, Bill McIlhenny's piece is of singular importance. A curious cacophony of voices have argued that the United States has lost influence in a region that it once dominated, to the detriment of vital U.S. interests. Behind these arguments is a woeful lack of understanding of the extraordinary changes that have taken place in Latin America over the last quarter century. **A continent once plagued by authoritarianism and coup d'états is gradually consolidating democratic stability. A continent that invented stagflation successfully implemented macro-economic stabilization and structural adjustment policies while adopting innovative policies to reduce extreme poverty, largely insulating the region from the world financial crisis and ushering in an era of export-led growth. The United States, which played a key role in encouraging these trends, is now benefitting from them, both in terms of greater security and increased economic opportunities.** To advance its interests in this new context, **the United States must avoid reverting to the hegemonic presumptions of the past-and seek to consolidate genuine partnerships based on shared interests. This means addressing in a cooperative fashion the challenges such as those posed by assaults on democratic governance or drug-fueled criminal violence while seeking constructive approaches to ensuring sustainable development**. But **it also means encouraging the enormous opportunities that U.S. investors and exporters have in Latin America.** Neither the United States government nor the private sector is neglecting a continent vital to U.S. interests."

A: Otto Reich, president of Otto Reich Associates LLC and former U.S. assistant secretary of state for Western Hemisphere Affairs: "Does the United States have influence in Latin America? It has enormous potential influence, by virtue of being the remaining global superpower and by the geographic, historical and other ties that connect us. Sadly, however, in the past four years the U.S. government has apparently decided that Latin America is not worth the time or effort to use that influence for good purposes. The problem may not be insufficient attention but rather misplaced priorities. How else to explain the counterproductive policies directed at the region's most hostile countries while neglecting the friendliest nations? **The primary purpose of any nation's foreign policy is to advance its national interests; U.S. interests are advanced by having free, democratic, secure, prosperous and friendly neighbors**. In the past four years, the United States has tried to appease the anti-American alliance gathered under the ALBA umbrella, a group of failed or failing states united by anti-Americanism, Marxist economics and authoritarian methods. These are Cuba, Venezuela, Ecuador, Bolivia, Nicaragua and Argentina (Argentina is not yet an ALBA member, but it imitates one). In the same period that the United States exhibited unlimited patience with ALBA countries they have, individually or collectively, for example: expelled U.S. ambassadors and other diplomats; confiscated U.S. properties; cooperated with Iran and terrorist groups; held an American civilian hostage for three years and counting; stamped out individual freedoms; packed or neutered legislatures and judiciaries; voided the separation of powers; and generally made a mockery of democratic institutions, all in the name of '21st Century Socialism.' Meanwhile, it took the administration three years to ratify a free-trade agreement with Colombia and with Panama, two friendly and strategically important countries; it has not begun or promoted any new free-trade negotiations in the region; it has weakly assisted Mexico's war on narcotics and organized crime; Chávez, Castro, Correa, Kirchner, Morales, Ortega and other despots still enjoy the fruits of their authoritarianism. If we really have influence in the region, why not use it?."

A: Donna Hrinak, member of the Inter-American Dialogue's board and president of Boeing Brazil: "Without the need to talk about 'losing' influence, it's clear **the nature of U.S. influence in the region has changed-and that's largely a good thing.** In fact, that change underlies what both Republican and Democratic governments in the United States have been saying we were seeking in the hemisphere beginning at least with the 1994 Summit of the Americas**: a more assertive region that generates and implements its own creative initiatives to advance democracy and development**. An objective look at how the United States exerts influence today also makes clear it's time to stop talking about 'Latin America' without acknowledging that the term is appropriate only as a linguistic convenience. U.S. relations differ so much in both breadth and intensity from one country to another that any general discussion of regional relations requires a series of footnotes specifying exceptions. At the same time, we should be thinking not in terms of relations between the United States on one side and the other countries of the hemisphere on the other, but about relations among various groupings of countries that share interests and want to make progress in specific areas, more an Intra-American Dialogue. And the private sector, academia and civil society can all contribute to the discussion and must all be involved in implementation on issues which, again as the United States has been saying for nearly two decades, 'are too important to be left to governments alone.' The bottom line is that it's not a matter of the U.S. government's losing prominence, but of other actors stepping up to assume their roles, in terms of both rights and responsibilities."

A: John F. Maisto, member of the Advisor board and director of U.S. Education Finance Group: "McIlhenny's observations are on the mark in substance and tone. U.S. interest in the region has been constant since the end of the Cold War, when policies based on U.S. values became paramount. Spanning Republican and Democratic administrations, they have had bipartisan support. U.S. engagement continues through trade agreements; Plan Colombia; investment; Peace Corps; dependable U.S. Southern Command; and hosts of government, NGO and civil society relationships. They are an integral part of today's vibrant but still problematic democratic era in the hemisphere. But the region is not a uniform place. Ties with South America are complex. The linkages with Brazil are 'sui generis' and on the Pacific side trade pacts point toward a Trans-Pacific Partnership with the northern giants. Engaging selectively, **U.S. interest in South America is hardly fading; it is mature and smart. Diplomacy works. The challenge is with Mexico**, Central America and the Caribbean. **This immediate 'neighborhood' needs more policy focus and resources to support major U.S. interests-stable democracies, growth, youth opportunities, cooperation to combat narco-trafficking and criminal terrorism. The Mexico relationship is healthy due to Plan Mérida, but more is needed**. Central America, particularly the northern tier of Guatemala, Honduras and Belize, needs significant policy and resource attention, such as that given to El Salvador. If not, Central America could surprise us negatively. So could the Caribbean. It is re-boot time, particularly with progress in Central America."

**US-Mexico relations increase both countries’ leadership**

**Mares,** USCD political science professor and Cánovas, El Colegio de Mexico international studies professor, **10** [David R., Gustavo Vega, 01-01-2010, “The U.S.-Mexico Relationship: Towards a New Era?”, <http://usmex.ucsd.edu/assets/024/11635.pdf> p. 6-7 6/30/13 EYS]

Globalization is an economic process that seeks to determine the allocation of land, capital and labor on a world-wide basis. This process attempts to mold countries and incorporate them into an exchange process determined by the logic of a global market. All countries resist that process to some degree, depending largely upon their endowments of natural resources, capital and skilled labor. In and of itself, globalization is a process that produces both positive and negative results; how those results are dealt with is influenced, but not determined by the globalization process. The challenge for countries is to develop policies that will mitigate the adjustment costs and facilitate the movement of capital and labor into productive and competitive enterprises. No country, including the U.S., is immune from these challenges. National responses will have their domestic and international components, and making these two interconnected spheres work together can be difficult. **Economic integration is one potential response by countries to the globalization process.** Integration is built upon national policies that facilitate and promote the complementarities of national economies; de facto integration by the pull of market forces can never go far enough on its own to generate the level of integration that is advantageous in competing with extra-regional forces. There are competing paths to sub-global integration, but each have the common goal of dealing with globalization in a manner that promotes and defends the interests of the nations involved in that particular integration scheme. The globalization process has its own dynamic but is ultimately dependent on the major consuming countries and providers of capital adopting policies that keep barriers to the process low. **The U.S. needs to develop a strategy to deal with its continued movement out of manufacturing enterprises, a falling dollar, the economic rise of China, growing demands on energy that result in price increases, and the violent backlash against globalization which targets** the U.S. as its chief promoter. **The U.S.** undoubtedly **still retains sufficient advantages to bungle its way through the short term but an adjustment that will sustain the** country’s standard of living over the medium term **will require important decisions** concerning the relative incentives facing investors and the social infrastructure undergirding the development of human capital. **The US has to rationalize its demand for energy in order to stay on the cutting edge of industrial technology and to divert national income from purchasing** ever increasing quantities of **oil and gas towards investing in the nation’s productivity. In this revised national strategy Mexico** and Canada **will play important roles**. The US must remember that **NAFTA not only helped to prevent negative shocks from spreading to the US border states but also made Mexico an important contributor to US economic well being. A similar response at the present time can assist both countries in surmounting their domestic crises while helping the Mexican government to win its battle against organized crime. With appropriate policies in the US stimulating development in Mexico, the latter**, with its 108 million people, **could also contribute a growing market for US goods and services as well as provide skilled labor. But the U.S. must not only want Mexico to play a more significant role in North America, Mexico itself must want to and adopt the appropriate responses to promote that development.**

**Hegemony prevents extinction**

**Barnett 11** (Thomas P.M., Former Senior Strategic Researcher and Professor in the Warfare Analysis & Research Department, Center for Naval Warfare Studies, U.S. Naval War College American military geostrategist and Chief Analyst at Wikistrat., worked as the Assistant for Strategic Futures in the Office of Force Transformation in the Department of Defense, “The New Rules: Leadership Fatigue Puts U.S., and Globalization, at Crossroads,” March 7 <http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/8099/the-new-rules-leadership-fatigue-puts-u-s-and-globalization-at-crossroads>)

Events in Libya are a further reminder for Americans that we **stand at a crossroads in our continuing evolution as the world's sole full-service superpower**. Unfortunately, we are increasingly seeking change without cost, and shirking from risk because we are tired of the responsibility. We don't know who we are anymore, and our president is a big part of that problem. Instead of leading us, he explains to us. Barack Obama would have us believe that he is practicing strategic patience. But many experts and ordinary citizens alike have concluded that he is actually beset by strategic incoherence -- in effect, a man overmatched by the job. It is worth first examining the larger picture: We live in a time of arguably **the greatest structural change in the global order yet endured**, with this historical moment's most amazing feature being its relative and absolute **lack of mass violence**. That is something to consider when Americans contemplate military intervention in Libya, because if we do take the step to prevent larger-scale killing by engaging in some killing of our own, we will not be adding to some fantastically imagined global death count stemming from the ongoing "megalomania" and "evil" of American "empire." We'll be engaging in the same sort of system-administering activity that has marked our stunningly successful stewardship of global order since World War II. Let me be more blunt: As the **guardian of globalization**, the U.S. military has been the **greatest force for peace the world has ever known**. Had America been removed from the global dynamics that governed the 20th century, the **mass murder never would have ended**. Indeed, it's entirely conceivable **there would now be no identifiable human civilization left, once nuclear weapons entered the killing equation.**  But the world did not keep sliding down that **path of perpetual war**. Instead, America stepped up and changed everything by **ushering in our now-perpetual great-power peace**. We introduced the **international liberal trade order known as globalization** and played loyal Leviathan over its spread. What resulted was the collapse of empires, **an explosion of democracy**, the **persistent spread of human rights**, the liberation of women, **the doubling of life expectancy**, a roughly **10-fold increase in adjusted global GDP** and a **profound and persistent reduction in** battle deaths from **state-based conflicts.** That is what American "hubris" actually delivered. Please remember that the next time some TV pundit sells you the image of "unbridled" American military power as the cause of global disorder instead of its cure. With self-deprecation bordering on self-loathing, we now imagine a post-American world that is anything but. Just watch who scatters and who steps up as the Facebook revolutions erupt across the Arab world. While we might imagine ourselves the status quo power, we remain the world's most vigorously revisionist force. As for the sheer "evil" that is our military-industrial complex, again, let's examine what the world looked like before that establishment reared its ugly head. The last great period of global structural change was the first half of the 20th century, a period that saw a death toll of about 100 million across two world wars. That comes to an average of 2 million deaths a year in a world of approximately 2 billion souls. Today, with far more comprehensive worldwide reporting, researchers report an average of less than 100,000 battle deaths annually in a world fast approaching 7 billion people. Though admittedly crude, these calculations suggest a 90 percent absolute drop and a 99 percent relative drop in deaths due to war. We are clearly headed for a world order characterized by multipolarity, something the American-birthed system was designed to both encourage and accommodate. But given how things turned out the last time we collectively faced such a fluid structure, we would do well to keep U.S. power, in all of its forms, deeply embedded in the geometry to come. To continue the historical survey, after salvaging Western Europe from its half-century of civil war, the U.S. emerged as the progenitor of a new, far more just form of globalization -- one based on actual free trade rather than colonialism. America then successfully replicated globalization further in East Asia over the second half of the 20th century, setting the stage for the Pacific Century now unfolding.