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#### Reduce means diminish

Merriam Webster [Encyclopedia Britannica, “Reduce”] [DS]

to diminish in size, amount, extent, or number reduce taxes reduce the likelihood of war

#### IP protections are the patents, trademarks, trade secrets, and copyrights themselves

UpCounsel 6/23/20 [The Modern Way to get Legal Work Done, “Intellectual Property Protection”] [DS]

Four Types of IP Protection for Businesses You'll find four main types of IP protection for your business: 1. Patents A patent grants property rights on an invention, allowing the patent holder to exclude others from making, selling, or using the invention. Inventions allow many businesses to be successful because they develop new or better processes or products that offer competitive advantage on the marketplace. You get a patent by filing a patent application with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO). You'll discover three types of patents: Utility Design Plant A utility patent is the most common type, covering any process, machine, article of manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvements thereof. To qualify for a utility patent, the invention must be novel, nonobvious, and have some usefulness. Novel means new and not known by anyone else, while nonobvious means that it can't be immediately obvious to someone having ordinary skills in the industry. A design patent covers any new, original, and ornamental design for an article of manufacture, while a plant patent covers any new variety of asexually produced plant. A design patent lasts for 14 years, and a utility or plant patent lasts for 20 years. With patent protection, the payent holder can take legal action against anyone who copies the patented invention, design, or discovery. Without this legal protection, anyone can use similar designs, products, and processes without risk. In fact, if you don't file for patent protection on your invention within 12 months of releasing it in a public setting, the opportunity to patent it will be gone. Other companies or individuals can also file for a patent on your idea, taking away your chance to do so first. When reviewing patent applications and violations, the USPTO will usually default to the individual who submitted the application first, since proving who used something first is nearly impossible. Before filing for a patent, you should determine who will own the idea. Some companies file for patents on their protected inventions, but if an employee came up with the idea, the individual may be granted holder of the patent. If your business owns the patent, you must protect the patent with the company by having employees involved in the invention process sign an agreement stating that the idea belongs to the company. The patent application process is complicated, one that could take up to six years and cost thousands of dollars, so the USPTO recommends that you hire a qualified patent attorney or agent to file your patent. To maintain the force of the patent, you must pay fees due at 3 1/2, 7 1/2, and 11 1/2 years after the patent grant. The total amount of maintenance fees for a small entity, such as an independent inventor, is $4,430, while for others the total is $8,860. Visit the USPTO website for more information about patent applications. Certain industries rely on patents more heavily than others. For example, pharmaceuticals go through extensive and costly testing procedures to make sure that products are safe for human use. When spending considerable money on a product, applying for a patent is one of the only ways that pharmaceutical companies can protect their investments. Without a patent, any other company could manufacture an exact replica of the drug. In March 2011, the U.S. Senate passed The America Invents Act, one of the most significant changes to patent law in the last century. The final details of the laws are still under review, but its purpose is to change what makes an idea patentable. This act also increases the protections for the first person or company to file for a patent. Critics of the act believe that the regulation may be biased toward larger companies with more funds available to patent ideas quickly. Those on the opposite side believe that patents and other forms of protection restrict free trade and economic growth. But IP protection laws are still in place and designed to protect inventors, business owners, and creators. 2. Trademarks A trademark is a word, phrase, symbol, or design that distinguishes the source of products (trademarks) or services (service marks) of one business from its competitors. In order to qualify for patent protection, the mark must be distinctive. For example, the Nike "swoosh" design identifies athletic footware made by Nike. Although rights in trademarks are acquired by use, registration with the USPTO allows you to more easily enforce those rights. Before registering your trademark, conduct a search of federal and state databases to make sure a similar trademark doesn't already exist. This trademark search can help you reduce the amount of time and money you could spend on using a mark that is already registered and trademarked. To apply, you must have a clear representation of the mark, as well as an identification of the class of goods or services to which the mark will apply. You can submit an online application, and filing fees vary according to several factors, including the form type and the number of classes of goods or services. Trademarks expire after 10 years, and renewal terms are 10 years. Before receiving approval from the USPTO, companies and people can use the TM symbol to indicate ownership of the mark. Upon approval, you can legally add the registered trademark symbol (®) to your mark. The TM symbol doesn't hold any legal weight, but it can indicate to other businesses or people in your industry that you intend to claim the mark. To register a trademark, you can: File a "use" application after using the mark. File an "intent to use" application before using the mark . If a foreign application exists, a trademark holder might be able to rely on that application for use in the United States. Filing an application is complex, so most applicants hire an attorney who specializes in trademarks. 3. Trade Secrets A trade secret is a formula, process, device, or other business information that companies keep private to give them a business advantage over their competitors. Examples of trade secrets include: Soda formulas Customer lists Survey results Computer algorithms Unlike the other types of intellectual property, you can't obtain protection by registering your trade secret. Instead, protection lasts only as long as you take the necessary steps to control disclosure and use of the information. Businesses use nondisclosure agreements, restricted access to confidential information, post-employment restrictive covenants, and other security practices to maintain trade secrets. When protecting intellectual property, look at competitors and others in the industry as if they are in competition for your ideas. Protecting yourself and your company is the best way to make sure that no one else can use your distinctive inventions, works, marks, or other ideas. Meet often with employees to keep them aware of what must stay out of public discussion and away from competitors. Physical and digital protection of ideas is also necessary, so track who has access and limit who can get into important databases. Looking at the risk and cost-benefit analysis can also help you decide what's worth protecting. Protection of intellectual property often comes at a high cost and takes much time, so make sure your time and money is worth the investment. 4. Copyrights Copyrights protect original works of authorship, such as literary works, music, dramatic works, pantomimes and choreographic works, sculptural, pictorial, and graphic works, sound recordings, artistic works, architectural works, and computer software. With copyright protection, the holder has the exclusive rights to modify, distribute, perform, create, display, and copy the work. In order to qualify under copyright laws, the work must be fixed in a tangible medium of expression, such as words on a piece of paper or music notes written on a sheet. A copyright exists from the moment the work gets created, so registration is voluntary. However, registered works may be eligible for statutory damages and attorneys fees in a copyright infringement suit, so you may want to consider registering your work through the U.S. Copyright Office. You can register your copyright online by completing an application, submitting a nonrefundable fee of $35, and sending in a nonreturnable copy of your work. The average processing time for e-filed copyright applications is 2 1/2 months and a little more than 5 1/2 months for paper filing. Copyright duration depends on several factors, but generally for works created after Jan. 1, 1978, the copyright lasts for the life of the author plus an additional 70 years and is nonrenewable. You can visit the U.S. Copyright Office website for more information.

#### Violation – the aff doesn’t reduce an actual IP protection through changing eligibility criteria or increasing restrictions – instead, it temporarily delays how one is enforced

#### Negate for limits and ground – their interp opens up the floodgates to process affs that change minute processes of implementation and claim perception advantages off of the balance of power between branches of the government – skirt core neg ground like the innovation DA and politics because they still defend patents writ large.

#### Precision matters – only our evidence points to the protections themselves, as opposed to how they are implemented, which matters because it determines predictability and the value of lost ground.

#### Topicality is a voting issue that should be evaluated through competing interpretations – it tells the negative what they do and do not have to prepare for—there’s no way for the negative to know what constitutes a “reasonable interpretation” when we do prep – reasonability is arbitrary and causes a race to the bottom, proliferating abuse

#### No RVIs—it’s your burden to be topical.
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#### Increased cartel competition and fragmentation cause attacks against PEMEX – decks American energy security

Jeremy Martin, Director of the Energy Program at the Institute of the Americas, and Sylvia Longmire, Mexico Security Expert & President, Longmire Consulting, “The Perilous Intersection of Mexico’s Drug War & Pemex,” 15 MARCH ’11, <http://www.ensec.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=283:the-perilous-intersection-of-mexicos-drug-war-aamp-pemex&catid=114:content0211&Itemid=374>

The drug war in Mexico is being fought on two fronts. First, roughly seven major drug trafficking organizations, or DTOs, are fighting against each other for control of lucrative drug smuggling corridors, or plazas, into the United States. Second, they are also fighting a massive military and law enforcement offensive under the direction of Mexican President Felipe Calderón, who decided upon entering office in 2006 that existing levels of drug trafficking and associated violence would not be tolerated. The DTO’s took exception to Calderón’s new mandate, and fought back with a vengeance. Their attacks against each other and against government forces have included beheadings and dismemberments, targeted assassinations, mass murders, grenade attacks, public daylight shootings with high-powered assault rifles, and even the occasional use of car bombs. The result has been the death of more than 34,000 people, including an increasing number of innocent bystanders who have nothing to do with the drug trade. Last year, with over 15,000 deaths associated with the battle, was the deadliest yet. Despite the seemingly unending violence and impenetrability of DTO defenses, their drug trafficking activities—and subsequently their **drug-related profits**—**have been taking a hit** from the combination of Mexican and US law enforcement actions. The escalating violence is partly a result of **increased competition** for more tightly guarded plazas and an increase in drug seizures on both sides of the border. For these reasons, DTO’s have expanded their business to include kidnap-and-ransom operations, extortion, human smuggling, and oil theft. As will be discussed below, this has brought an increasing overlap between DTO activity and Mexico’s oil industry. From politics to finance - oil’s continued hold on Mexico’s national psyche The interconnection of oil and nationalism in Mexico is historic and constitutional. Indeed, the Mexican Constitution sets forth the basic facts that President Lázaro Cárdenas emphasized during the nationalization period of the 1930’s: “The nation is the only owner of the all the hydrocarbons reserves and production”; that “licensing and concessions are prohibited”; and that “Pemex is the nation’s operator and controls the first-hand sales and must not share revenues, production or reserves.” This fundamental political reality continues to affect development of the nation’s huge oil resource potential by restricting private—particularly foreign—investment. It has been said that in Mexico, oil is not merely a chemical compound but rather a fundamental element of sovereignty—a part of the national DNA. The story is well known but worth repeating: Oil is an essential part of the national treasury. Though diminished in relative terms for Mexico’s economy, oil still generates over 15 percent of current export earnings. Moreover, Pemex, due to its onerous fiscal and tax regime, accounts for about 40 percent of the government’s budget. Oil long ago emerged as a significant form of hard currency and provided what amounted to an economic lifeline for a series of Institutional Revolutionary Party, or PRI, governments. In some cases, oil earnings provided a last gasp to stave off financial crisis in the country, such as the 1994 peso crisis. In late 1994, as Mexico neared default, the United States orchestrated an international bailout of roughly $50 billion. Mexican oil sales were used—quite successfully—as collateral for the roughly $20 billion in US loans to Mexico. Leaders for years have depended upon and pointed to the windfall of the nation’s oil patch for its economic well-being and, during the good times, growth. Without broad tax and fiscal reform in the nation, Pemex will remain a financial linchpin, albeit an increasingly tenuous one. From Cardenas to Cantarell’s golden age The Cardenas legacy is celebrated in textbooks and with a national holiday on March 18 to celebrate the expropriation, but it was a fisherman’s discovery that really gave it legs. Aided by a prolific field in the shallow waters of the Bay of Campeche, Mexico entered what might be termed a Golden Age of Oil in the 1970s with the discovery of the supergiant Cantarell field. Cantarell catapulted Mexico and Pemex into position as one of the world’s most important oil exporting nations, particularly in the Western Hemisphere. Nowhere was this more evident than in the oil commerce between Mexico and its northern neighbor, the United States. Thanks to Cantarell, Mexico became, after Canada, the United States’ most trusted supplier of foreign oil. The timing of the relationship’s maturation was perfect as our increasing dependency on oil took inescapable hold in the 1970s. Beyond Cantarell? In hindsight, what seemed like a golden age for oil production and government coffers in Mexico instead foisted upon the nation a more ominous trend toward the first effects of Cantarell disease and easy oil affliction. The myopic policies of the time, coupled with the seemingly infinite spoils of Cantarell, placed Pemex and the nation on a bumpy path toward the unkind decade of 2000-2010 that saw Cantarell’s production crash. True, Cantarell is not the only significant field in Mexico. But the steady production increase of Ku Maloob Zaap (KMZ) has barely offset Pemex’s overall plummeting production. Worse, in 2010 Pemex indicated that KMZ production reached its peak and has about a three year horizon for the current optimum production of roughly 850,000 barrels per day (bpd). And then there’s the Chicontopec field. A geologically challenging play, it has proved a major disappointment for Pemex, which long offered it as the key to offsetting both Cantarell and KMZ decline. Chicontopec has only recently hit 40,000 bpd, far below earlier estimates of hundreds of thousands of barrels per day of production. The facts are unfortunate but fairly plain to see: Mexico’s oil production is in serious decline. In 2004, Pemex oil production peaked just below 3.5 million barrels per day (mbd); in 2009, it dipped to roughly 2.7 mbd. And though some success at stabilization has been made, production in 2010 still ended at just under 2.6 mbd. Figure 2 offers a stark picture of the issue at hand for Mexico, Pemex and the regional energy matrix. Simply put, the recent decade was not kind to Pemex. To further answer the question of what happens in Mexico beyond Cantarell, the current predicament and context must be acknowledged. Indeed, estimates have pointed to oil production average decline rates of about 5 percent per year, beginning in 2010. In the last few years, talk has emerged that Mexico will likely cease to be an oil exporter by the end of the current decade. The Energy Information Administration, however, indicates that may be an optimistic premise: In its International Energy Outlook 2010, it estimated that Mexico could become a net importer by 2015, with imports surpassing 1 mbd by 2035. It is also worth noting that Mexico’s stated plan to deal with the foregoing scenarios and its hope to reverse these ominous trends lie in the deep waters on Mexico’s side of the Gulf. The touted “treasure at the bottom of the sea” bandied about during the 2008 energy reform debate remains the true “X factor” for any legitimate answers to what happens beyond Cantarell, and whether or not the EIA forecast for imports in 25 years holds true. Pemex exposed and impacted As discussed previously, oil theft from Pemex pipelines, money laundering by way of service stations, and, worst of all, provocative kidnappings of the company’s executives and those of service companies working with the state firm, are all on the rise. Unofficial figures place thefts from the Pemex network at roughly **$2 billion** annually. And security experts point to this as an important source of revenue for drug cartels—**especially as the Mexican government continues to crack down on them.** Thefts from the Pemex network are not new, **but the** increase and the strain it is placing on the **already-taxed company** **is important**. And the illegal tapping has grown **significantly** in the areas where the drug war is the **most pervasive**. The spike in fuel thefts and illegal trading, as well as kidnappings, has led some to question whether Pemex is fully in charge of all its facilities across the nation. For some experts following the situation, the answer is a resounding no. Indeed, many analysts indicate that the physical security and monitoring of pipelines belonging to Pemex are severely lacking. According to Mexican daily El Universal, oil looting has occurred in almost every state in Mexico, while the Wall Street Journal, citing Pemex statistics, indicated that between January and November 2010, Pemex discovered 614 illegal siphons—368 in liquid fuels pipelines, 196 in oil pipelines, and 50 in liquefied petroleum gas ducts. Pemex has begun installing systems to detect declines in pressure in some oil product pipelines but the project is expected to take years to complete. Kidnappings send shudders Kidnappings of Pemex executives and subcontractors, including workers from international firms, have taken place across the country but most notably in Tabasco, Tamaulipas and Nuevo Leon, sending shudders throughout the company and Mexico. The kidnappings have terrorized a community where, according to a Los Angeles Times story, jobs on the oil rigs and at the gas wells are handed down, father to son, for generations. “How is it,” asked a relative of a kidnapped worker, “that Pemex, **supposedly the backbone of the nation**, can be made to bow down like this?” One analysis, published by Grupo Reforma highlighted the oil town of Reforma, Chiapas, where at least 30 Pemex employees—ranging from executives to laborers—have been kidnapped over the past year. Mexico Weekly has also reported on other forms of violence that have flared in prime Pemex production zones, such as the Burgos Basin, site of Mexico's biggest natural gas field in Tamaulipas. Last spring, gunmen seized the Gigante Uno gas plant and kidnapped five Pemex workers. Increasingly **unsafe conditions** are **severely hindering** Pemex’s ability to produce natural gas in the Burgos Basin. The Burgos Basin stretches across the northern border state of Tamaulipas, where the Gigante Uno plant is located, and spills into the states of Nuevo León and Coahuila. **All three states are experiencing extremely high levels of drug-related violence**, especially along these states’ border with Texas. The stretch from Nuevo Laredo to Matamoros is in the midst of a bloody conflict between the Gulf cartel and Los Zetas, former paramilitaries and enforcers for the Gulf cartel who are now one of the more vicious DTOs in their own right. Los Zetas are viewed as largely responsible for the kidnapping of Pemex employees in that region. “Once Pemex … comes under regular attack from the cartels, rather than just random, disorganized thugs, then **you have far more serious national security problems** – much worse in the government's eyes than a bunch of homicides in the slums of Ciudad Juárez," said Malcolm Beith, author of The Last Narco, a book about the hunt for Joaquin “El Chapo” Guzmán Loera. Regrettably, Burgos is becoming synonymous with the perilous intersection of Mexico’s raging drug war with Pemex’s efforts to produce the critical energy supplies the nation and region demand. The Murphy Energy case One case of fuel theft from Pemex that’s winding its way through the justice system provides a unique insight into that part of the problem the company is confronting. According to MarketWatch, federal documents released in August 2010 revealed a Texas chemical plant, owned by German chemical company BASF Corp., bought $2 million worth of petroleum products that had been stolen from Pemex and smuggled across the US border. The documents also showed the stolen condensate passed through several companies' hands before arriving on a barge at the BASF facility in Port Arthur, Texas. The actual transport of stolen oil from Mexican pipelines into US corporate hands is complicated at best. Donald Schroeder, former president of Trammo Corp., testified that in January 2009, two companies, Murphy Energy Corp. and Continental Fuels, contacted him. Both wanted to sell him stolen condensate. Apparently he agreed to buy it, and the transfers began. “Unnamed import companies” would sell the condensate to intermediary companies like Continental (which has since shuttered its headquarters in Houston). Those import companies would smuggle the condensate across the border and store it in Continental facilities. No details were available on how those trucks managed to successfully cross the US Mexico border. These piecemeal transfers would continue until there was enough oil in the storage facility to fill a barge and ship to BASF. Jim McAlister, an Assistant US Attorney, said he has no reason to believe that BASF has any involvement in the alleged wrongdoing. The President and founder of Murphy Energy Corp., Matt Murphy, said the company did not know that the condensate was stolen. Josh Crescenzi, the vice president of Continental Fuels, has not been indicted in the case, nor has anyone else from Continental. This particular case has been a success, resulting in the handover of $2.4 million by US customs authorities to the Mexican government. But the extent of corruption in Mexico—within Pemex, in particular—and the ease with which oil can be stolen from pipelines makes the mitigation of oil looting an almost insurmountable challenge. Adding to the problem is the fact that Mexican cartels are involved. According to Reuters, the Mexican government believes the cartels use stolen jet fuel in their aircraft to cover up any evidence of illicit flights. In August 2009, Mexico’s federal police commissioner Rodrigo Esparza said Los Zetas used false import documents to smuggle at least $46 million worth of oil in tankers to unnamed US refineries. President Felipe Calderón has said that DTOs in northern Mexico are responsible for most oil theft. On some levels Pemex is not just a victim of oil-thieving DTOs; sometimes, it’s directly involved. In February 2010, Mexican military units seized more than four tons of marijuana at Pemex installations in Reynosa, Tamaulipas. The discovery was made after Pemex security alerted officials that armed men were removing Pemex employees from a fuel supply station. In response, a Mexican Naval helicopter was dispatched to the scene but retreated after receiving heavy weapons fire from the ground. When military units arrived on the ground, they found the marijuana loaded on trucks abandoned at the site. These alarming facts have led to perhaps the most ominous question of all: Is the company being infiltrated by the perpetrators of the nation’s drug business? In light of the increasing number of incidents President Calderón has acknowledged, there may well be internal operatives at Pemex aiding and abetting the DTOs. For its part, Pemex is soliciting the help of the Mexican people to try to put a stop to oil looting. Last August, the Mexican government posted a Pemex press release, in which exhorts that oil looting is not just an unpatriotic crime against the company and the government, but against the Mexican people. It also offers the number of a hotline where individuals can anonymously report pipeline breaches. Why the perilous intersection matters The relevance of what is happening in Mexico matters on a variety of levels, but in particular, there are three broad reasons that bear discussion. First, and as best portrayed in Figure 2, Pemex has seen its oil production drop precipitously since 2004. The firm has been struggling for the better part of the last decade to deal with a burdensome tax straitjacket, poor planning at its largest field, a lack of new discoveries of oil and production, and an inability to implement serious reform. Moreover, by the nature of being dragged into—and becoming part of—Mexico’s massive drug war, Pemex is clearly suffering from the **additional strain and havoc** wrought by the myriad elements of the conflict on its business. From huge financial losses to the increasing inability to control its network and prevent theft to the more serious kidnapping threats, the evidence is only becoming clearer. The second reason concerns Mexico’s fiscal dependency on oil and Pemex. As assorted struggles impact the company's and the nation’s fiscal well-being, broader and longer term economic growth and employment discussions become ever more complicated for policy makers. These issues are particularly critical as the nation appears far from passage of the necessary and far-reaching national tax and fiscal reforms that could ameliorate some of the burden on Pemex and the nation’s oil dependency. Third, all of the above leads to the real potential for **further erosion** **of Mexico’s** critical role as a secure and constant energy supplier for the United States and the Western Hemisphere. As oil prices steadily rise in early 2011, it is quite rational to revisit the significant energy security aspects of Mexico’s persistent energy woes, which are now clearly exacerbated by the overflow of drug war violence and corruption. On the heels of yet another State of the Union address in the United States that included elegant rhetoric about the country’s energy imbalance and energy security risks, a comprehensive, all of the above **approach and solution remains far from reach.** Conclusion Clearly oil, and energy more broadly, is not a sector of the economy where Mexico needs **any further impediments**. Pemex’s huge hurdles derive largely from its inability to replace declining oil production and navigate a burdensome nationalistic legacy. What is now added to the combustible mix is an increasing drain on the company’s finances and, worse, a sense of trepidation among executives in the field. Threats against its executives and loss of its resources are surely **not** a **useful** element **as the company makes efforts to reform itself.** All of the above analysis is of **extreme relevance to Mexico for its financial and overall well-being**—and especially for Pemex. It is also **critical for North American energy security** as the United States, in the wake of the Deepwater Horizon incident, deals with offshore drilling restrictions and slow downs in the formerly prolific Gulf of Mexico. Moreover, there are thorny issues surrounding increased production from Canada’s oil sands for the US market. This was made abundantly clear during an early February visit by Canadian Prime Minister Stephen Harper to the White House. More than 80 environmental groups used the occasion to send a letter of protest to President Obama. These concerns do not appear to have any immediate or simple resolutions and make the United States' need to count on Mexico **greater than ever before.**

#### Energy insecurity causes nuclear war

Neil King, global economics editor for the WSJ, Peak Oil: A Survey of Security Concerns, Center for a New American Security, ‘8, http://www.cnas.org/files/documents/publications/CNAS\_Working%20Paper\_PeakOil\_King\_Sept2008.pdf

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.
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#### Counterplan: The member nations of the World Trade Organization, excluding Mexico, should delay patent enforcement for cannabis.

#### Solves cartels because Mexican government no longer goes after them

# Case

### NC – Kellner/Barnett

The IP part of the advantage makes no sense –

1. Aff doesn’t ban foreign companies from stealing everything, it just gives domestic companies a window – but they can never catch up to the “sophisticated foreign monopolies”
2. Proven by Thailand which did this and it didn’t matter – that’s their evidence
3. Evergreening alt cause, Barnett says that they all need to go, patent blitzes – aff doesn’t change that
4. Second Barnett card – why does biod cause less profits? What? What? What? This card is in the context of medical marijuana

#### No bioterror – their ev speaks to the ability to gain materials, not construct and plan an attack – that’s never happened in history, and every attempt has failed – materials are too fickle to be reliable, and incredibly expensive – EVEN IF they could attack, it couldn’t be large enough to effect one country, let alone the entire world – finally, countermeasures and damage limitation solves any existential attack – they need to beat every warrant to win the impact – that’s Lentzos, citing an aggregation of studies