## Oil DA

### 1NC Oil DA

#### Environmental protections cause oil shocks---even if they don’t actually ban oil extraction

Verledger 2011 [(Phillip, Professor of Management at the University of Calgary’s Haskayne School of Business) “Rising Crude Oil Prices: The Link to Environmental Regulations” Business Economics Vol. 46, No. 4] DD

In this paper, I have sought to demonstrate that oil price movements cannot be explained solely by movements in aggregate supply or demand. To the contrary, the mix of crude production and the actions taken by environmental regulators and policymakers in oil-exporting countries have a greater impact on oil price determination than the basic forces that determine demand and supply. A key ﬁnding is that environmental rules that have boosted demand for clean products such as ULSD can cause very large changes in crude oil prices. This linkage has been ignored in the past by environmental regulators, who have focused solely on the increased cost of manufacturing individual products. Going forward, I hope regulators will consider the market impact of their actions and improve their coordination with reﬁners and oil- exporting countries. Absent such cooperation, expect tighter environmental rules to cause signiﬁcant crude price increases and, possibly, economic dislocations.

#### Oil shocks cause extinction

Lendman 7 [(Steven, Research Associate of the Centre for Research on Globalization. “Resource Wars - Can We Survive Them?,” Rense.com, 6-6-7, pg. http://www.rense.com/general76/resrouce.htm]

With the world's energy supplies finite, the US heavily dependent on imports, and "peak oil" near or approaching, "security" for America means assuring a sustainable supply of what we can't do without. It includes waging wars to get it, protect it, and defend the maritime trade routes over which it travels. That means energy's partnered with predatory New World Order globalization, militarism, wars, ecological recklessness, and now an extremist US administration willing to risk Armageddon for world dominance. Central to its plan is first controlling essential resources everywhere, at any cost, starting with oil and where most of it is located in the Middle East and Central Asia. The New "Great Game" and Perils From It The new "Great Game's" begun, but this time the stakes are greater than ever as explained above. The old one lasted nearly 100 years pitting the British empire against Tsarist Russia when the issue wasn't oil. This time, it's the US with help from Israel, Britain, the West, and satellite states like Japan, South Korea and Taiwan challenging Russia and China with today's weapons and technology on both sides making earlier ones look like toys. At stake is more than oil. It's planet earth with survival of all life on it twice over. Resources and wars for them means militarism is increasing, peace declining, and the planet's ability to sustain life front and center, if anyone's paying attention. They'd better be because beyond the point of no return, there's no second chance the way Einstein explained after the atom was split. His famous quote on future wars was : "I know not with what weapons World War III will be fought, but World War IV will be fought with sticks and stones." Under a worst case scenario, it's more dire than that. There may be nothing left but resilient beetles and bacteria in the wake of a nuclear holocaust meaning even a new stone age is way in the future, if at all. The threat is real and once nearly happened during the Cuban Missile Crisis in October, 1962. We later learned a miracle saved us at the 40th anniversary October, 2002 summit meeting in Havana attended by the US and Russia along with host country Cuba. For the first time, we were told how close we came to nuclear Armageddon. Devastation was avoided only because Soviet submarine captain Vasily Arkhipov countermanded his order to fire nuclear-tipped torpedos when Russian submarines were attacked by US destroyers near Kennedy's "quarantine" line. Had he done it, only our imagination can speculate what might have followed and whether planet earth, or at least a big part of it, would have survived.

### Link---Arctic

#### Arctic regulations are a link

Reisman 2000 [(George, professor of Economics at Pepperdine University’s Graziadio School of Business and Management and is the author of Capitalism: A Treatise on Economics) “Why the Price of Oil Is Surging” The Orange County Register, Sunday, April 2, 2000] AT

The U.S. government, acting largely under the influence of the ecology movement, has restricted the supply of oil in the following ways: (1) It has prevented exploration for and development of oil reserves in vast areas of territory arbitrarily set aside as “wildlife preserves” or “wilderness areas.” It has even consistently sought to prevent the development of the vital North Slope Alaskan oil fields, on the grounds of alleged concerns over harmful “environmental” effects, such as disturbance of the feeding habits of caribou herds and deterioration in the appearance of frozen waste lands. (2) It has joined in an international agreement to close Antarctica and its potentially vast oil deposits to all mining operations for the next fifty years. (3) It has prevented the development of offshore oil wells on the continental shelf. (4) It has prevented the construction of oil and gas pipelines, of new refineries, oil storage facilities, and facilities for handling supertankers. (5) Over the years, the U.S. government has imposed price controls on oil and has acted further to restrict oil company profits, and thus oil industry investment, by punitively increasing their rate of taxation through first reducing and then totally abolishing the old depletion allowance on crude oil. In addition, the U.S. government has been responsible for an enormous artificial increase in the demand for oil, over and above the increase caused by its policy of inflation. It has caused this artificial increase in demand mainly by holding down the supply of substitutes for oil, such as atomic power and coal. In these ways, it forced, and continues to force, the demand for fuel to rely more heavily than necessary on oil supplies. Like reductions in the supply of oil, these measures also increase the scarcity of oil. In sum, the government and the ecology movement have done everything in their power to raise the demand for and restrict the supply of oil. It should be realized that it was only these actions of the U.S. government that has made possible the dramatic rise in the price of oil—in the 1970s and again today.

### Link---Regulations

#### Even restrictions that don’t stop oil production cause shocks

Loris 9 [(Nicholas, Policy Analyst at The Heritage Foundation's Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies) “The Economic Effects of Environmental Regulations” The Foundry Jan 30] AT

Politicians and consumers learned valuable lessons this summer when national gasoline prices peaked at over four dollars per gallon. Simply put, energy supply must be expanded in the United States. Last October Congress took the right first steps by allowing the restrictions on energy leasing in 85 percent of America’s territorial waters to lapse. An estimated 30 years of imports from Saudi Arabia and enough natural gas to power American homes for 17 years could be found in these waters. With a new president and a new Congress, we could be facing new regulations when it comes to energy production. There’s the possibility of a massive cap and trade regulation to drastically reduce carbon dioxide that would be devastating to the economy, but that’s just the beginning. In a somewhat clandestinely released report prepared for The Department of Energy, Advanced Resources International measures the economic effects of the regulations recommended by environmental groups. (Clandestine insofar as it’s extremely difficult to find on DOE’s page.) The regulations include: • Requiring oil and gas exploration and production (E&P) operations to report to the Toxic Release Inventory (TRI). • Subjecting hydraulic fracturing of oil and gas wells by the E&P industry to Underground Injection Control (UIC) program requirements, despite language excluding this in the Energy Policy Act of 2005. • Requiring that all wastes associated with oil and gas exploration and production be addressed under Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) cradle-to-grave hazardous waste provisions. This includes requiring that the underground injection of produced water and other materials associated with enhancing oil and gas production meet the standards of Class I injection. • Requiring storm water permits for all oil and gas E&P operations, rescinding Section 323 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005. • Requiring aggregation of the emissions of oil and gas E&P activities under the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP) program, and requiring the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to review and update clean air regulations related to oil and gas E&P. • The implementation of new Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure (SPCC) requirements issued by EPA to “provide increased clarity,” as well as to better “tailor” requirements to oil and gas industry operations. And the effects of these regulations? • 183,000 barrels per day lost, or 7 percent of U.S. lower-48 onshore oil production in the first year alone. • 245 billion cubic feet of natural gas shut in the first year. • 57 percent of producing onshore oil wells in the United States could be shut in, as could 35% of producing onshore gas wells. • Overall well drilling for unconventional gas could be reduced by half. • Compliance costs: $10 billion first year, up to $75 billion over 25 years. The full 59-page report is available here. Also worth noting is the amount of forgone royalties and tax revenues that would result from these regulations. Page thirteen of the report has these numbers broken down by state. Texas, Pennsylvania, Oklahoma, Louisiana, New Mexico, Kansas and West Virginia are some of the biggest losers. Many restrictions and regulations are a relic of the past. Drilling for oil has strict safeguards and state-of-the-art technology with a proven track record for limiting the risk of spills. After all, oil companies have every incentive not to be careless because doing so could severely cripple their industry and subject the industry to more stringent regulations.

#### Russian oil is key to its economic stability

Pifer 12 [(Steven, Senior Fellow at the Brookings Institution's Center on the United States and Europe as well as the Director of Brookings' Arms Control Initiative) “The Future Course of the U.S.-Russia Relationship” Brookings Institute March 21] AT

Third, Mr. Putin faces tough issues at home, both economically and politically. The Russian economy and government revenues remain overly dependent on exports of oil and natural gas. The Russian state budget remains pegged to the price of oil. While Mr. Medvedev called for economic modernization and diversification, there are few signs of progress or of a realistic plan to achieve those aims. Corruption remains rampant. The lack of confidence in the economy is reflected in the fact that Russia experienced capital outflow of $84 billion last year. And Mr. Putin made a striking number of electoral promises, including higher salaries, rising pensions and greater defense spending, that will need to be funded. While sustained high oil prices could allow him to avoid tough calls, economic questions could face him with a major challenge.

#### Russian economic instability causes war over Ukraine

Petrov 3/6 [(Nikolay, professor of political science at the Higher School of Economics in Moscow) “Ukraine Crimea: Russia's economic fears” BBC 2014] AT

From that perspective, Russia's actions do not look very rational and foreign commentators have explained them in terms of President Vladimir Putin's anger and feelings of humiliation after the overthrow of Ukrainian President Viktor Yanukovych. But I would focus on domestic political considerations as a driving force. The famous Bill Clinton presidential campaign slogan, "It's the economy, stupid", comes to mind. The Russian government's expectations of economic recovery by the end of 2013 went wrong. According to different experts, Russia's economy is already in de facto recession with a drop in investment, a rapid decline in consumer demand and a real-terms decrease in incomes. The economy has already shrunk for two consecutive quarters. The rouble is weakening, causing expectations of growth in inflation. Russia's ministry for economic development has revised downwards its short-term forecasts on an almost monthly basis. According to the most recent forecast by the independent Gaidar Institute for Economic Policy last month, the Russian economy will not grow faster than 2% per year until 2016, even with a best-case scenario of growing quasi-state investment, an improving investment climate and small business growth. Now with all the events developing in Crimea, even this scenario looks too optimistic. On 3 March, dubbed Black Monday, Russia's RTS stock market index plummeted 12% and the rouble fell 1.9% against the dollar in spite of massive intervention by Russia's Central Bank. The stock market has since recovered its losses. The Crimean parliament's decision to join Russia has only added to the economic instability. The rouble had already fallen by 10% in two months, which due to the high dependence of the Russian economy on imported goods and commodities almost automatically translates into a fall in real incomes. A lengthy economic stagnation, perhaps even a recession, caused by domestic problems rather than by the world market might not be so devastating if the government was not already facing accusations of a decline in legitimacy since the 2011-2012 political protests. It should be taken very seriously because it means that the political-economic base of Vladimir Putin's 2004-2013 administration is coming to an end. Turning the screw The regime had to do something about these: either by improving the economy at the expense of weakening its control over it, or by focusing on the image of an external enemy and consolidating the nation around the leader. Russia appears to have made its choice, passing a very important fork in the road, by choosing to tighten the screw and switching to a different model of relations between state and society rather than liberalising the economy and improving the investment climate. This is by no means an immediate reaction. The events that culminated in the past week in Crimea had been developing for a while. Looking back, several developments over recent months fit this scenario. There was the merger of Russia's two top courts - the merger of the Supreme Arbitration Court with the Supreme Court - along with tougher controls on the judiciary and the increasingly powerful role of Mr Putin's inner circle at the Kremlin, known as the Siloviki. The final stage can be traced back to the start of last autumn, first with the Kremlin's appointment of Mr Putin's former deputy chief of staff Vladislav Surkov as his personal aide; then the very serious reshuffle at Russia's Ria Novosti news agency; and finally the intense pressure placed on two largely independent media outlets, Dozhd TV and Echo Moskvy Radio. Facing the prospect of recession, Mr Putin now appears to be returning to the days of 1999-2000, when "a small victorious war" in Chechnya led to a major rise in his tremendous approval ratings. Paradox of sanctions Attacking Ukraine may promote mobilisation and the consolidation of the society around the leader, at least in the short term, with a tightening of the screws on his opponents and any potentially disloyal members of the elite. The paradox is that sanctions placed on the elite could serve Mr Putin's goal of closing Russia and creating a siege mentality. Serious economic sanctions, especially from Europe, seem unlikely for now. But Russia has already paid a high price for its aggression in terms of a fall in the stock market and a further decline in investment due to both the increased cost of borrowing and the further alienation of investors. However, it doesn't look like this changes his calculations of costs and benefits. It became evident last year that Russia's leadership was not put off by the high cost of keeping Ukraine on side - with an eagerness to pay almost $15bn (£9bn) a year in discounts on gas sales. However, if more serious European sanctions were to be imposed such as an embargo on Russia's gas supply, by replacing it as some experts suggest with Norwegian gas and liquefied natural gas, then Russia would stand to lose some $100bn a year and face economic collapse.

#### Ukraine war causes extinction

International News 3/17 [(News agency, cites Secretary of State John Kerry; Rebecca E. Johnson, executive director of the Acronym Institute for Disarmament and Diplomacy; Ira Helfand, co-president of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War; Tilman A. Ruff, co-chair, International Steering Group and Australian Board member of the International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons) “US-Russia standoff over Ukraine may trigger nuclear attack” March 17, 2014] AT

Secretary of State John Kerry told US legislators early this week that if the dispute results in punitive sanctions against Russia, things could “get ugly fast” and go “in multiple directions. ”Perhaps one such direction could lead to a nuclear impasse between the two big powers. According to a state agency news report from Moscow, Russia has threatened to stop honouring its arms treaty commitments, and more importantly, to block U.S. military inspections of nuclear weapons, if Washington decides to suspend military cooperation with Moscow. These mostly bilateral treaties between the United States and Russia include the 1994 Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START), the 2010 new START, the 1987 Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) treaty and the 1970 international Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). A nuclear tug-of-war between the two big powers is tinged in irony because post-Soviet Ukraine undertook one of the world’s most successful nuclear disarmament programmes when it agreed to destroy all its weapons of mass destruction (WMDs). Dr. Rebecca E. Johnson, executive director of the Acronym Institute for Disarmament and Diplomacy, told IPS, “Clearly the situation between Ukraine and Russia is deeply worrying. “Without going into the politics of the situation on the ground, as I don’t have the kind of regional expertise for that, this is not a place for issuing nuclear threats or scoring nuclear points,” she said. “I’ve been disgusted to see some British and French representatives try to use Ukraine’s crisis to justify retaining nuclear weapons in perpetuity.” Russia is not directly threatening to attack Ukraine with nuclear weapons, and no one believes it would be useful for the United States and countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) to threaten Russia with a nuclear attack, no matter what they do, said Johnson. Ukraine, which was once armed with the third largest nuclear arsenal after the United States and Russia, and possessed more nukes than France, Britain and China, dismantled and shipped its weapons to Russia for destruction beginning in 1994. Dr. Ira Helfand, co-president of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW), said Ukraine is commendable in being one of the few states to have given up its nuclear weapons peacefully, and the people of Ukraine should not have to fear nuclear weapons ravaging their country. “Any war involves a terrible and lasting human toll, risks spreading and harming people’s health in the region and beyond,” he warned. In a statement released last week, IPPNW said it underscores the absolute imperative to avoid the possibility of use of nuclear weapons. “This danger exists with any armed conflict involving nuclear armed states or alliances, which could escalate in uncontrollable, unintended and unforeseeable ways,” it warned. Dr Tilman A. Ruff, co-chair, International Steering Group and Australian Board member of the International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons, told IPS the current agreements (e.g. START, New START and INF) are probably most important in that they demonstrate that verified reductions and elimination of whole classes of nuclear weapons are feasible, and hopefully reduce the risk of nuclear war between Russia and the United States. However, continuing massive nuclear arsenals on both sides; the retention of almost 1,800 nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert missiles, ready to be launched within minutes; the aggressive eastward expansion of NATO, contrary to what Russian leaders were promised; and the rapid escalation of tension over recent events in Ukraine demonstrate the Cold War has not been firmly laid to rest. “Any confrontation between nuclear-armed states runs the risk of escalating to the use of nuclear weapons, whether by inadvertence, accident, or bad decision-making,” said Dr Ruff, who is also an associate professor at the Nossal Institute for Global Health, School of Population and Global Health, University of Melbourne. He said currently all the nuclear-armed states are massively investing in keeping and modernising their nuclear arsenals, and show no serious commitment to disarm, as they are legally bound to do. As long as nuclear weapons exist and are deployed, and policies countenance their possible use, the danger they will be used is real and present. “The dangerous and unstable situation in Ukraine highlights this starkly, and should dispel any notion that nuclear danger ended 20 years ago with apparent end of the Cold War,” he said. Dr Johnson told IPS Russian and US nuclear weapons in the region are demonstrably not contributing to deterrence. “If anything, their presence complicates the current dangers, with the attendant risks of crisis instability and potential military or nuclear escalation or miscalculations, though I’d hope no one would be mad enough to actually use them,” she said.

### Short Russia Econ Impact

#### Russian economic decline spills over and sparks nuclear conflict

David 99 [Steven, Professor of Political Science at Johns Hopkins University, “Internal War: Causes and Cures”, July, https://muse.jhu.edu/journals/world\_politics/related/v049/49.4er\_brown.html]

If internal war does strike Russia, economic deterioration will be a prime cause. From 1989 to the present, the GDP has fallen by 50 percent. In a society where, ten years ago, unemployment scarcely existed, it reached 9.5 percent in 1997 with many economists declaring the true figure to be much higher. Twenty-two percent of Russians live below the official poverty line (earning less than $ 70 a month). Modern Russia can neither collect taxes (it gathers only half the revenue it is due) nor significantly cut spending. Reformers tout privatization as the country's cure-all, but in a land without well-defined property rights or contract law and where subsidies remain a way of life, the prospects for transition to an American-style capitalist economy look remote at best. As the massive devaluation of the ruble and the current political crisis show, Russia's condition is even worse than most analysts feared. If conditions get worse, even the stoic Russian people will soon run out of patience. A future conflict would quickly draw in Russia's military. In the Soviet days civilian rule kept the powerful armed forces in check. But with the Communist Party out of office, what little civilian control remains relies on an exceedingly fragile foundation -- personal friendships between government leaders and military commanders. Meanwhile, the morale of Russian soldiers has fallen to a dangerous low. Drastic cuts in spending mean inadequate pay, housing, and medical care. A new emphasis on domestic missions has created an ideological split between the old and new guard in the military leadership, increasing the risk that disgruntled generals may enter the political fray and feeding the resentment of soldiers who dislike being used as a national police force. Newly enhanced ties between military units and local authorities pose another danger. Soldiers grow ever more dependent on local governments for housing, food, and wages. Draftees serve closer to home, and new laws have increased local control over the armed forces. Were a conflict to emerge between a regional power and Moscow, it is not at all clear which side the military would support. Divining the military's allegiance is crucial, however, since the structure of the Russian Federation makes it virtually certain that regional conflicts will continue to erupt. Russia's 89 republics, krais, and oblasts grow ever more independent in a system that does little to keep them together. As the central government finds itself unable to force its will beyond Moscow (if even that far), power devolves to the periphery. With the economy collapsing, republics feel less and less incentive to pay taxes to Moscow when they receive so little in return. Three-quarters of them already have their own constitutions, nearly all of which make some claim to sovereignty. Strong ethnic bonds promoted by shortsighted Soviet policies may motivate non-Russians to secede from the Federation. Chechnya's successful revolt against Russian control inspired similar movements for autonomy and independence throughout the country. If these rebellions spread and Moscow responds with force, civil war is likely. Should Russia succumb to internal war, the consequences for the United States and Europe will be severe. A major power like Russia -- even though in decline -- does not suffer civil war quietly or alone. An embattled Russian Federation might provoke opportunistic attacks from enemies such as China. Massive flows of refugees would pour into central and western Europe. Armed struggles in Russia could easily spill into its neighbors. Damage from the fighting, particularly attacks on nuclear plants, would poison the environment of much of Europe and Asia. Within Russia, the consequences would be even worse. Just as the sheer brutality of the last Russian civil war laid the basis for the privations of Soviet communism, a second civil war might produce another horrific regime. Most alarming is the real possibility that the violent disintegration of Russia could lead to loss of control over its nuclear arsenal. Nonuclear state has ever fallen victim to civil war, but even without a clear precedent the grim consequences can be foreseen. Russia retains some 20,000 nuclear weapons and the raw material for tens of thousands more, in scores of sites scattered throughout the country. So far, the government has managed to prevent the loss of any weapons or much material. If war erupts, however, Moscow's already weak grip on nuclear sites will slacken, making weapons and supplies available to a wide range of anti-American groups and states. Such dispersal of nuclear weapons represents the greatest physical threat America now faces. And it is hard to think of anything that would increase this threat more than the chaos that would follow a Russian civil war.

### Russia Oil---Accidents DA

#### Russia’s deteriorating infrastructure risks accidental war – oil profits are key to modernize nuclear infrastructure

Hacket 1 [(James, contributing writer to The Washington Times) “Accident Launch Wake-Up Call” WASHINGTON TIMES 6-20-2001] AT

Twice in the past month accidents involving Russian missiles and missile warning systems have served to remind us that the possibility of a nuclear accident still exists. In the most recent incident a surface-to-air missile complex in the Moscow region's Ramenskoye district exploded on June 8, destroying three S-300 missile launchers and 12 missiles. Eyewitnesses said they saw what appeared to be a missile launch following the explosion and Moscow television reported two missiles were launched. But a Russian Air Force spokesman said there were no launches. Whether a missile was launched or not, one or more might have been. A short-circuit in a missile engine is believed to have caused the explosion and resulting fire. Windows were broken in a nearby town, where witnesses said they counted six loud explosions and saw a mushroom cloud rising over the forest. But it was not a nuclear explosion - these missiles normally are not nuclear-armed. The S-300 is Russia's counterpart to America's Patriot, a solid-fuel missile designed to intercept aircraft, cruise missiles, and short-range ballistic missiles. It is in widespread service in Russia, and Moscow is eagerly trying to sell it abroad. Less than a month earlier, on May 10, a major fire broke out at a mission control center of Russia's military space forces near Kurilovo, some 60 miles southwest of Moscow, causing a loss of contact with four military satellites. The fire, reportedly caused by a short-circuit in a power cable, broke out at 2:30 in the morning and was so severe that the three-story command center was still burning at noon. The function of the military satellites that were out of service was not reported. Whether missile early warning satellites or military communications satellites, they could play an important role in Russia's ability to maintain control of its nuclear missiles. Remember 1995, when a sounding rocket launched from Norway caused Russian nuclear missile forces to go on alert and President Boris Yeltsin's nuclear briefcase was activated, ready to launch a missile attack on the U.S? Even a brief, unexpected interruption in the functioning of Moscow's early warning satellites could be dangerous. These two recent incidents are only the latest in a string of accidents that reflect Russia's declining infrastructure, diminishing military effectiveness, and lack of funds. Last August, the explosion and sinking of the Kursk nuclear submarine was followed by a major fire in the Ostankino TV tower that knocked out Moscow television. With infrastructure that has not been modernized for 20 to 30 years, more disasters are waiting to happen. The Russian economy has been buoyed this year by the high price of oil on the world market, but the next downturn in price could produce an acceleration of Russia's infrastructure decline. Last year an article in the paper Komsomolskaya Pravda claimed that the unnatural Soviet economy had forced technological expansion beyond the country's means. Now, with few resources to modernize the aging infrastructure the chance of a nuclear disaster or crisis involving Russia's huge stockpile of nuclear weapons will increase. All of Russia's intercontinental and sea-launched ballistic missiles, except for the 26 new SS-27s produced over the past three years, will be obsolete by 2010 and should be retired. Since Russia is not an enemy, there has been a tendency to forget its nuclear-armed missiles. The main reason for a national missile defense is to prevent missile-armed countries from using their weapons to blackmail or intimidate, and to stop any missile that a rogue state may launch. But another important reason is to stop an accidental or unauthorized launch from any country. The main concern in this regard has to be the 736 intercontinental ballistic missiles and hundreds of submarine-launched missiles still operational in Russia and carrying some 6,000 aging nuclear warheads. The decline of Russia's command and control network, with equipment that tends to have "short-circuits," is\_ sending us a warning.

#### Accidental launch causes nuclear war

Wickersham 9 [“Confronting Nuclear War: The Role of Education, Religion, and the Community”. Professor of Peace Studies at Michigan State University, Wickersham is part of the eight-member Missouri University Nuclear Disarmament Education Team, which he helped found in 2009. Their mission is to enlighten Missouri and the rest of the world about the need to abolish nuclear war weapons from the planet through discussions and presentations to interested groups.] AT

Currently, there are over 23,000 nuclear weapons in the world—a total of over 100,000 Hiroshima bombs or 7000 megatons of TNT. At its peak in 1964, the U.S. alone had the equivalent of 17,000 megatons. For perspective, all of the bombs dropped during WWII totaled only 3 megatons, which is about ten average-sized strategic nuclear weapons. Combined, the U.S. and Russia possess over 97 percent of these weapons. Of which, about 3,500 remain on high alert status and are ready to be launched in minutes. In a time of crisis or perceived attack, the Russian and U.S. presidents have three and eight minutes, respectively, to make a decision to order an attack against each other. Thus, a single miscalculation or computer error could lead to nuclear war (see table in appendix). Political leaders have taken elaborate steps to comfort these fears. However, the mere existence of these weapons maintains the possibility of an unpredicted sequence of events leading to its use.

## A2 Peak oil

### Energy Independence

#### Energy independence is coming now but isn’t here yet – this means peak oil won’t trigger collapse since the US will be independent by then, but the disad scenario still occurs since the US isn’t independent now

#### 1. US energy independence fast arriving – prefer *recent* projections

WE 4/15 [Washington Examiner. “Examiner Editorial: American energy independence in sight despite Obama.” 4/15/14. <http://washingtonexaminer.com/american-energy-independence-in-sight-despite-obama/article/2547258>] AJ

Booming oil and natural gas production made possible by technological advances in hydraulic fracturing and horizontal drilling has been the lone bright spot in the U.S. economy throughout President Obama's tenure in the Oval Office. The U.S. Energy Information Administration released data last week that effectively illustrates the boom, saying "total U.S. net imports of energy, measured in terms of energy content, declined in 2013 to their lowest level in more than two decades. Growth in the production of oil and natural gas displaced imports and supported increased petroleum product exports, driving most of the decline. A large drop in energy imports together with a smaller increase in energy exports led to a 19% decrease in net energy imports from 2012 to 2013.”

#### 2. US fracking boom solves energy independence by 2020

Hudson ’13 Alexandra Hudson – Correspondent with Reuters Berlin – Reuters – Feb 3, 2013 – http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/02/03/us-europe-shale-idUSBRE91204Z20130203

The United States is enjoying an energy bonanza thanks to shale gas, making it a magnet for industry, reducing import dependence and challenging Europe as it battles to dig itself out of recession, energy officials say.¶ Panelists at a weekend security conference in Munich warned Europe must develop a strategy on how to tap its own resources in order to keep energy costs competitive, or risk seeing power-intensive industries locate elsewhere.¶ "The shale gas and oil boom is already underway. As Europe continues to debate it, North America is reaping the advantages," said Jorma Ollila, Chairman of Royal Dutch Shell (RDSa.L).¶ Just a week ago Shell signed a $10 billion shale gas deal with Ukraine - the biggest contract yet in Europe - which could help Ukraine ease its reliance on Russian gas imports.¶ Ukraine is said to have Europe's third-largest shale gas reserves at 42 trillion cubic feet (1.2 trillion cubic meters), according to the U.S. Energy Information Administration.¶ Its reserves are dwarfed by those of France however, estimated to be Europe's largest at 180 trillion cubic feet.¶ France has banned the procedure, known as fracking which is used to extract shale gas and which involves pumping vast quantities of water and chemicals at high pressure through drill holes to prop open shale rocks.¶ Environmentalists fear it could increase seismic risks and pollute drinking water. U.S. officials question this and say that thanks to the higher proportion of gas use the United States has had its lowest carbon dioxide emissions in 20 years.¶ "Observing this from across the Atlantic it is really quite remarkable that there should be a ban or a go-slow on this development in Europe, really without any facts," said Daniel Yergin, Vice-Chairman of IHS Cambridge Energy Research.¶ Fracking is used to produce a third of U.S. natural gas he said, showing the environmental impact can be managed.¶ SHALE SCRAMBLE¶ World energy market flows already reflect North America's scramble to exploit shale oil and gas and highlight the potential prize Europe is ignoring.¶ "The U.S. internal energy revolution and the radical increases in production of oil and gas have boosted gas production by 25 percent and seen oil import dependence drop from 60 percent to 40 percent, and expected to decline further to 30 percent," said Carlos Pascual, the U.S. special envoy for energy affairs.¶ While Europe retains deep environmental concerns it also acknowledges that with the price of gas in the United States just a third of that in Germany, its industry is already suffering the effects.¶ German Economy Minister Philipp Roesler said: "Many German firms have opted for (relocation to) the United States, saying energy prices were the decisive factor...We are already seeing that we are suffering with our higher energy prices…it affects our own competiveness."¶ Addressing the panel in Munich European Union Commissioner Guenther Oettinger said Europe should be in a position to produce enough shale gas to replace its depleting conventional gas reserves, so as not to become more dependent on imports.¶ RUSSIA UNAFRAID¶ A greater abundance of gas could threaten the dominance of Russia's gas exports and pressure prices. The United States seized Russia's spot as the world's largest gas producer in 2012, and is due to produce significantly more from 2015.¶ "I believe that the shale revolution is something positive, a chance for all of us to launch technologies, intensify competitiveness, make our countries more energy secure, and reduce costs," said Russian Energy Minister Alexander Novak.¶ Russia is focusing on boosting exports to energy-hungry Asia and developing infrastructure to transport gas eastwards.¶ A recent confidential study by the German intelligence agency (BND) suggested the United States could turn from being the world's greatest energy importer into an oil and gas exporter by 2020, reducing its dependence on the Middle East and thereby giving it much more freedom in policy making.

## Yes Oil Wars

THESE IMPACT CARDS ARE ALL GENERIC AND NOT CUT BY US

### US Intervention

#### Oil volatility sparks great power war – forces U.S. intervention and goes nuclear

King 08 (Neil, Peak Oil: A Survey of Security Concerns, Center for a New American Security, p. 14-17)

Many commentators in the United States and abroad have begun to wrestle with the question of whether soaring oil prices and market volatility could spark an outright oil war between major powers—possibly ignited not by China or Russia, but by the United States. In a particularly pointed speech on the topic in May, James Russell of the Naval Postgraduate School in California addressed what he called the increasing militarization of international energy security. “Energy security is now deemed so central to ‘national security’ that threats to the former are liable to be reflexively interpreted as threats to the latter,” he told a gathering at the James A. Baker Institute for Public Policy at Houston’s Rice University.6 The possibility that a large-scale war could break out over access to dwindling energy resources, he wrote, “is one of the most alarming prospects facing the current world system.”7 Mr. Russell figures among a growing pool of analysts who worry in particular about the psychological readiness of the United States to deal rationally with a sustained oil shock. Particularly troubling is the increasing perception within Congress that the financial side of the oil markets no longer functions rationally. It has either been taken over by speculators or is being manipulated, on the supply side, by producers who are holding back on pumping more oil in order to drive up the price. A breakdown in trust for the oil markets, these analysts fear, could spur calls for government action—even military intervention. “The perceptive chasm in the United States between new [oil] market realities and their impact on the global distribution of power will one day close,” Mr. Russell said. “And when it does, look out.”8 The World at Peak: Taking the Dim View For years, skeptics scoffed at predictions that the United States would hit its own domestic oil production peak by sometime in the late 1960s. With its oil fields pumping full out, the U.S. in 1969 was providing an astonishing 25 percent of the world’s oil supply—a role no other country has ever come close to matching. U.S. production then peaked in December 1970, and has fallen steadily ever since, a shift that has dramatically altered America’s own sense of vulnerability and reordered its military priorities. During World War II, when its allies found their own oil supplies cut off by the war, the United States stepped in and made up the difference. Today it is able to meet less than a third of its own needs. A similar peak in worldwide production would have far more sweeping consequences. It would, for one, spell the end of the world’s unparalleled economic boom over the last century. It would also dramatically reorder the wobbly balance of power between nations as energy-challenged industrialized countries turn their sights on the oil-rich nations of the Middle East and Africa. In a peak oil future, the small, flattened, globalized world that has awed recent commentators would become decidedly round and very vast again. Oceans will reemerge as a hindrance to trade, instead of the conduit they have been for so long. An energy-born jolt to the world economy would leave no corner of the globe untouched. Unable to pay their own fuel bills, the tiny Marshall Islands this summer faced the possibility of going entirely without power. That is a reality that could sweep across many of the smallest and poorest countries in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, reversing many of the tentative gains in those regions and stirring deep social unrest. Large patches of the world rely almost entirely on diesel-powered generators for what skimpy electricity they now have. Those generators are the first to run empty as prices soar. A British parliamentary report released in June on “The Impact of Peak Oil on International Development” concluded that “the deepening energy crisis has the potential to make poverty a permanent state for a growing number of people, undoing the development efforts of a generation.”9 We are seeing some of the consequences already in Pakistan – a country of huge strategic importance, with its own stash of nuclear weapons – that is now in the grips of a severe energy crisis. By crippling the country’s economy, battering the stock market, and spurring mass protests, Pakistan’s power shortages could end up giving the country’s Islamic parties the leverage they have long needed to take power. It’s not hard to imagine similar scenarios playing out in dozens of other developing countries. Deepening economic unrest will put an enormous strain on the United Nations and other international aid agencies. Anyone who has ever visited a major UN relief hub knows that their fleets of Land Rovers, jumbo jets and prop planes have a military size thirst for fuel. Aid agency budgets will come under unprecedented pressure just as the need for international aid skyrockets and donor countries themselves feel pressed for cash. A peaking of oil supplies could also hasten the impact of global climate change by dramatically driving up the use of coal for power generation in much of the world. A weakened world economy would also put in jeopardy the massively expensive projects, such as carbon capture and storage, that many experts look to for a reduction in industrial emissions. So on top of the strains caused by scarce fossil fuels, the world may also have to grapple with the destabilizing effects of more rapid desertification, dwindling fisheries, and strained food supplies. An oil-constricted world will also stir perilous frictions between haves and have-nots. The vast majority of all the world’s known oil reserves is now in the hands of national oil companies, largely in countries with corrupt and autocratic governments. Many of these governments—Iran and Venezuela top the list—are now seen as antagonists of the United States. Tightened oil supplies will substantially boost these countries’ political leverage, but that enhanced power will carry its own peril. Playing the oil card when nations are scrambling for every barrel will be a far more serious matter that at any time in the past. The European continent could also undergo a profound shift as its needs—and sources of energy—diverge all the more from those of the United States. A conservation-oriented Europe (oil demand is on the decline in almost every EU country) will look all the more askance at what it sees as the gluttonous habits of the United States. At the same time, Europe’s governments may have little choice but to shy from any political confrontations with its principal energy supplier, Russia. An energy-restricted future will greatly enhance Russia’s clout within settings like the UN Security Council but also in its dealings with both Europe and China. Abundant oil and gas have fueled Russia’s return to power over the last decade, giving it renewed standing within the UN and increasing sway over European capitals. The peak oil threat is already sending shivers through the big developing countries of China and India, whose propulsive growth (and own internal stability) requires massive doses of energy. For Beijing, running low on fuel spells economic chaos and internal strife, which in turn spawns images of insurrection and a breaking up of the continent sized country. Slumping oil supplies will automatically pit the two largest energy consumers—the United States and China—against one another in competition over supplies in South America, West Africa, the Middle East, and Central Asia. China is already taking this competition very seriously. It doesn’t require much of a leap to imagine a Cold War-style scramble between Washington and Beijing—not for like-minded allies this time but simply for reliable and tested suppliers of oil. One region that offers promise and peril in almost equal measure is the Artic, which many in the oil industry consider the last big basin of untapped hydrocarbon riches. But the Artic remains an ungoverned ocean whose legal status couldn’t be less clear, especially so long as the United States continues to remain outside the international Law of the Sea Treaty. As the ices there recede, the risk increases that a scramble for assets in the Artic could turn nasty.

#### The shock alone causes war

Roberts 04 (Paul, Regular Contributor to Harpers and NYT Magazine, “The End of Oil: On The Edge of a Perilous New World”, p. 93-94)

The obsessive focus on oil is hardly surprising, given the stakes. In the fast-moving world of oil politics, oil is not simply a source of world power, but a medium for that power as well, a substance whose huge importance enmeshes companies, communities, and entire nations in a taut global web that is sensitive to the smallest of vibrations. A single oil "event" — a pipeline explosion in Iraq, political unrest in Venezuela, a bellicose exchange between the Russian and Saudi oil ministers — sends shockwaves through the world energy order, pushes prices up or down, and sets off tectonic shifts in global wealth and power. Each day that the Saudi-Russian spat kept oil supplies high and prices low, the big oil exporters were losing hundreds of millions of dollars and, perhaps, moving closer to financial and political disaster — while the big consuming nations enjoyed what amounted to a massive tax break. Yet in the volatile world of oil, the tide could quickly turn. A few months later, as anxieties over a second Iraq war drove prices up to forty dollars, the oil tide abruptly changed directions, transferring tens of billions of dollars from the economies of the United States, Japan, and Europe to the national banks in Riyadh, Caracas, Kuwait City, and Baghdad, and threatening to strangle whatever was left of the global economic recovery. So embedded has oil become in today's political and economic spheres that the big industrial governments now watch the oil markets as closely as they once watched the spread of communism — and with good reason: six of the last seven global recessions have been preceded by spikes in the price of oil, and fear is growing among economists and policymakers that, in today's growth-dependent, energy-intensive global economy, oil price volatility itself may eventually pose more risk to prosperity and stability and simple survival than terrorism or even war.

### Regional Wars

#### The shock causes regional conflicts that escalate to global nuclear war

Qasem 7 [Islam Yasin Qasem, a doctoral candidate in the Department of Politics and Social Sciences at the University of Pompeu Fabra (UPF) in Barcelona, MA in International Affairs from Columbia, July 9, 2007, “The Coming Warfare of Oil Shortage,” online: http://www.opednews.com/articles/opedne\_islam\_ya\_070709\_the\_coming\_warfare\_o.htm]

Recognizing the strategic value of oil for their national interests, superpowers will not hesitate to unleash their economic and military power to ensure secure access to oil resources, triggering worldwide tension, if not armed conflict. And while superpowers like the United States maintain superior conventional military power, in addition to their nuclear power, some weaker states are already nuclearly armed, others are seeking nuclear weapons. In an anarchic world with many nuclear-weapon states feeling insecure, and a global economy in downward spiral, the chances of using nuclear weapons in pursues of national interests are high.

### Yes Escalation

#### US would escalate any oil conflict

Klare 9 (Michael, professor of peace and world security studies at Hampshire college and the author of resource wars and blood and oil. “Repudiate the Carter Doctrine” http://www.fpif.org/articles/repudiate\_the\_carter\_doctrine. January 22, 2009)

Twenty-nine years ago, president jimmy Carter adopted the radical and dangerous policy of using military force to ensure U.S. Access to Middle Eastern oil. "let our position be absolutely he clear," he said in his state of the union address on january 23, 1980. "an attempt by any outside force to gain control of the Persian Gulf region [and thereby endanger the flow of oil] will be regarded as an assault on the vital interests of the United States of America, and such an assault will be repelled by any means necessary, including military force." this principle — known ever since as the carter doctrine — led to U.S. Involvement in three major wars and now risks further military entanglement in the greater gulf area. It's time to repudiate this doctrine and satisfy U.S. Energy needs without reliance on military intervention.

### China War

#### US oil dependence makes US-Sino war inevitable

Nur ‘11 – Amos Nur, Professor of Earth Sciences and Professor of Geophysics at Stanford (Lecture at Technion, 3/28/11, http://www1.technion.ac.il/\_local/includes/blocks/news-items/110331-nur/news-item-en.htm)

There is a risk for conflict between the U.S. and China due to oil shortages: So warns Professor Amos Nur of Stanford University’s Department of Geophysics, who gave a lecture at the Technion as part of the Nancy and Stephen Grand Technion Energy Program: “China and the U.S. compete in developing Middle East oil resources.” This issue has sparked eight wars in the last twenty years, from the Gulf War up to Libya, and according to Nur, the situation will worsen. There is a high risk of conflict between two of the biggest economic powers in the world the U.S. and China as a result of the struggle for control of oil sources, if the leaders of these two countries do not manage the crisis sensibly. So warns Professor Amos Nur of the Department of Geophysics at Stanford University and a world renowned expert in the field of oil. In a lecture he gave in the framework of the Nancy and Stephen Grand Technion Energy Program, Prof. Nur said that many wars have been sparked because of oil shortages, and just in the last twenty years there have been eight such wars. According to him, the objective of the First Gulf War had been to change the regime in Iraq the country with the second largest oil reserves in the world (Saudi Arabia is the largest), and privatize its oil sector. The September 11 attacks stemmed from Bin Laden’s disgust with the American support of the Saudi royal family, which controls the oil resources, and his demand for a more equal division of the Saudi royal family’s money. The Egyptian crisis, which has led to a change in government, is also connected to oil. The population increase, on the one hand, and the dwindling of oil wells, on the other, changed Egypt in the last few years from an oil exporter into an oil importer, which means not enough revenue from oil sales for food subsidies. As a result, the prices of food doubled and gas prices went up tens of percent, fueling the masses’ anger with Mubarak. The fact that Libya is an oil exporter to the West has also been a reason for intervening in the present crisis. The West hopes to ensure that a democracy replaces Qaddafi, so that one madman does not control all of Libya’s oil reserves. Energy in general and oil in particular are the largest economic sector in the world generating about 10 trillion dollars. Notwithstanding, oil resources are limited and the tendency is, with their discovery, to consume them rapidly. As a result, many countries are already producing as much as they can and the amounts being produced are decreasing. The U.S. reached its peak in 1971, and after its rising population curve and declining oil production curve met, the U.S. became an oil importing nation. Today the U.S. imports about two-thirds of its oil needs and in another decade this will reach 80%. China, too, became an oil importer following the huge rise in its living standard. If in the beginning, China looked for and developed oil resources in relatively remote areas such as Darfur in Sudan, today it is competing with the U.S. in everything related to influence on oil resources especially in the Middle East. Hence, for example, China opposes sanctions on Iran in order to ensure itself oil. “In the end, if the crisis is not handled prudently, it is likely to lead to a conflict between the two superpowers,” warms Prof. Nur. “Whoever thinks that this is unrealistic should remember that the U.S. and Japan were not enemies prior to World War II, but the Japanese decided to destroy the entire U.S. navy stationed in the Pacific Ocean in the Pearl Harbor attack and risk war just to guarantee itself access to Sumatra’s oil wells. Rommel also did not just race to destroy the Jews in Eretz Yisrael but to get control of the Middle East oil wells, especially those in Iraq that had already been discovered in the 1920s.”