## Advantage Two

Advantage two is Venezuela -

#### US detention policy makes successful pressure of Venezuela through the OAS impossible

Bosworth 13 (James, Former Associate for Communications at The Inter-American Dialogue and Director of Research at The Rendon Group, Consultant at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, “Protecting the IACHR, now make it stronger,” 3-25-13, <http://www.bloggingsbyboz.com/2013/03/protecting-iachr-now-make-it-stronger.html>)

Last Friday, the OAS voted to reform the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (IACHR). Most importantly, the organization managed to push back against a set of cynical and harmful proposals by four countries - Bolivia, Ecuador, Nicaragua and Venezuela - that would have weakened the organization and reduced its funding sources. Those four countries ended up isolated from the other 30 voting members of the OAS who remained committed to strengthening the Inter-American human rights system. Sources: AQ, Pan-American Post, IPS, Ecuador wanted the system to be funded only by countries that have signed the San Jose Pact and wanted all the rapporteurs funded equally. This would have eliminated most of the funding for the IACHR coming from the US, Canada and Europe without guarantees of pledges to replace that money. It also would have weakened the Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Expression, a particularly thorn in the side for Ecuador's censorship-loving president. Of course, the ALBA criticisms aren't actually about funding. The ALBA countries tried to weaken the IACHR because they are annoyed that any independent outside organizations criticizes their abuses of human rights and free speech. So, good on the rest of the Americas including the US, Brazil and Mexico for working to stop those proposals from being implemented. All three of those countries have all recently faced tough criticisms from the IACHR, making it notable that they still defended the commission at this session. From the speech of Deputy Secretary Burns: This is why we actively respond to the Commission even as it raises challenging issues for us – from the death penalty and the human rights of migrants and incarcerated children, to the status of detainees at Guantanamo Bay. And this is why we continue to collaborate with the Commission – including its recent on-site visit to immigrant detention facilities in the United States. We do this not because we always see eye to eye with the Commission. We do it because we are secure in our commitment to democratic principles and in our conviction that we are accountable to our citizens for the protection of their human rights. We do it because we believe that no government should place itself beyond international scrutiny when it comes to the protection of basic human rights and civil liberties. Strong words that I absolutely agree with. However.... On 12 March the US formally answered questions to the IACHR about the detainees held at Guantanamo Bay. At that time, the US lawyer did not provide any timeline for closing the detention center and refused to admit anyone is being held in "indefinite detention," though the fact they are held without trial and without a potential release date seems to be the definition of that term. Though the US defended the conditions of the prison, as far as I can tell, no representative from the IACHR has been allowed to visit. On the issue of immigrant detentions, here is the IACHR in July 2009 based on its visits to detention centers (longer report released in 2011): Finally, the Rapporteurship was distressed at the use of solitary confinement to ostensibly provide personal protection for vulnerable immigrant detainees, including homosexuals, transgender detainees, detainees with mental illnesses, and other minority populations. The use of solitary confinement as a solution to safeguard threatened populations effectively punishes the victims. The Rapporteurship urges the U.S. Government to establish alternatives to protect vulnerable populations in detention and to provide the mentally-ill with appropriate treatment in a proper environment. Here is the NYT yesterday: On any given day, about 300 immigrants are held in solitary confinement at the 50 largest detention facilities that make up the sprawling patchwork of holding centers nationwide overseen by Immigration and Customs Enforcement officials, according to new federal data. Nearly half are isolated for 15 days or more, the point at which psychiatric experts say they are at risk for severe mental harm, with about 35 detainees kept for more than 75 days. Four years after the IACHR visited the immigrant detention facilities and spoke out against the practice of solitary confinement, the article in the NYT from 2013 reads just like the IACHR report from 2009. Nothing has been done to respond to those criticisms. The US gets credit for fighting back against the ALBA countries' push to silence the IACHR. The commission provides a needed voice for the hemisphere's human rights. Over the past month, with the purpose of protecting and strengthening human rights in the hemisphere, I've heard US officials praise Brazil, Mexico and Uruguay for listening and acting on the recommendations of the IACHR. The sad truth is that the US praised those other countries because the US hasn't acted on many of the important criticisms that it has received from the IACHR. It's part of the credibility gap that the US faces in this hemisphere. Last week, the Obama administration played a vital role in protecting human rights in the hemisphere by leading the effort at the OAS to maintain a strong IACHR. We need to remember that nothing the US says diplomatically at the OAS will be as powerful as the US ability to lead by example. If the US really wants stronger human rights protections in this hemisphere, that effort starts at home. The issues raised by Deputy Secretary Burns in his OAS speech - Guantanamo and immigrant detention conditions - would be great places to start.

#### OAS review is critical to Venezuelan judicial stability- now is key

The Economist 13 (“Latin America’s Venezuela problem: Ostrich diplomacy, Venezuela’s neighbours studiously ignore the crisis unfolding next door,” 6-8-13, <http://www.economist.com/news/americas/21579067-venezuelas-neighbours-studiously-ignore-crisis-unfolding-next-door-ostrich-diplomacy/>)

FOR Latin American presidents of all political persuasions, a knock on the door from Henrique Capriles is a far from welcome sound these days. Not that the leader of Venezuela’s opposition is a particularly boring or obnoxious guest, despite the strenuous efforts of President Nicolás Maduro to portray him as a “murderous fascist”. It’s just that having Mr Capriles round for a cup of tea can get you into all sorts of trouble, as Colombia’s Juan Manuel Santos found out to his cost. On May 29th a shirtsleeved Mr Santos held a private meeting of about an hour with Mr Capriles, which provoked a barrage of invective from the Venezuelan government. The Colombian president had “put a bomb under” relations between the two countries, said Diosdado Cabello, the speaker of Venezuela’s National Assembly. Venezuela would have to “review” its support for Colombia’s peace talks with the leftist FARC guerrillas, added Elías Jaua, the foreign minister. To top things off, Mr Maduro said certain Colombian institutions “at the highest level” were plotting with the Venezuelan opposition to inject him with a poison that would lead to a slow death. Mr Santos said this was “crazy”. His foreign minister declined to engage in microphone diplomacy. Colombia and Venezuela, whose governments are poles apart ideologically, have enjoyed a friendship of convenience in recent years after a very rocky decade. The reason for all the huffing and puffing is that Mr Capriles, who came within an ace of winning a snap presidential election on April 14th, has challenged the result in the supreme court and is seeking to persuade the region’s governments of his case. Mr Maduro is the chosen successor of Hugo Chávez, who died of cancer in March, five months after being re-elected. He heads a weak administration beset by political and economic problems and desperate to hang on to the international support that Chávez built up over more than a decade of oil diplomacy. With the Chávez charisma gone, the new president’s legitimacy in doubt and the money running out, bluster is one of the few resources not in short supply. This week was to have been Peru’s turn to receive a visit from Mr Capriles. But such was the panic in Ollanta Humala’s government at having to decide whether to receive him that the trip was postponed. Peru currently chairs the South American Union (Unasur), one of several regional bodies failing to deal with the Venezuelan crisis. Unasur held an emergency meeting on the eve of Mr Maduro’s inauguration to insist on an audit of the election result. But although the opposition says the partial audit now under way is insufficient, Unasur has failed to pursue the case. Peru’s foreign minister stood down—officially for health reasons—shortly after he had the effrontery to say publicly that a fresh Unasur summit on the subject was being mooted. Most Latin American and Caribbean governments are either ideologically close to the chavista regime, dependent on its oil-fuelled largesse, or simply disinclined to incur its wrath. The Organisation of American States (OAS), whose annual assembly began on June 4th in Guatemala, is bound by treaty to monitor its members’ democratic credentials. But the OAS’s Democratic Charter, launched in 2001, has so far been used only to protect presidents (including Chávez) and to bludgeon puny countries such as Honduras and Paraguay. Brazil, which has the muscle to take on a country the size of Venezuela, seems more concerned with protecting its businesses, which are making billions from trade with its northern neighbour. Ahead of the OAS meeting its secretary-general, José Miguel Insulza, said the “atmosphere” was not conducive to a discussion of the Venezuelan crisis—a diplomatic way of saying no one was prepared to pick up the hot potato. Mr Insulza himself has in the past admitted that Venezuela is in breach of the Democratic Charter. Among other things, it requires an independent judiciary and guarantees recourse to the inter-American human-rights system. Venezuela has announced that it will abandon the system later this year. The ostrich approach may not work for ever. For one thing, the Venezuelan opposition’s campaign across the region is putting presidents under pressure from their parliaments and civic groups to support democracy. Second, Venezuela’s political fragility and Mr Maduro’s weakness threaten instability which the region may be unable to ignore. Shutting the door in Mr Capriles’ face could prove a short-sighted policy, as well as a shameful one.

#### **Judicial independence is a prerequisite to stability- signal of internal executive review fails**

Provea 13 (Venezuelan Program of Education and Action on Human Rights, “The political use of the Venezuelan judicial system,” Venezuela: International Bulletin on Human Rights Issue No. 5, August 13, <http://www.derechos.org.ve/pw/wp-content/uploads/boletin_05_eng.pdf>)

“In recent years, the Commission has heard of cases in which members of the judiciary have expressly stated their support for the executive, showing the lack of independence of this institution. The Commission has also observed how certain failures caused by the lack of independence of the judiciary is exacerbated in cases of high political significance, and consequently affects society’s confidence in justice.” Four years later the situation is even more worrying. The judiciary and the Public Prosecutor are political instruments of the executive branch to criminalize social protest and to persecute dissident voices. As it has been indicated by several Venezuelan human rights organizations in a statement of July 26 there is “a deep concern over the progressive weakening of judicial guarantees in Venezuela and prosecution as a method to criminalize those with critical positions and to discard them.” The use of justice, to face social protest, led by the working men and women of the country, is expressed in the opening of lawsuits against student leaders, community, indigenous and unions and even, in some cases, by applying military justice. The most emblematic case is the trial of the unionist Rubén González after the Criminal Chamber of the Supreme Court set aside the judgment against him, which was deliberately biased in favor of the government, (that verdict sentencing him to seven years in prison). The Criminal Chamber overturned the judgement after unions announced the call for a strike in response to the decision. In its judgment the Criminal Chamber said: “[the judgement] injured the constitutional rights of the defense, due process and hence to effective judicial protection as provided in Articles 26 and 49.1 of the Constitution of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, what ultimately denied the exercise of procedural defenses that our legal system provides in a criminal trial” This biased and unconstitutional conduct of a criminal court The political use of the Venezuelan judicial system has been repeated in trials of other social leaders, some of whom have more than six years on probation. But there are two major elements in the manipulation of the justice system. One of them is a priori defense of senior government officials from the high courts to the claims brought by individuals for violations of their rights. It is even exclude senior officials of their constitutional obligations, through sentences being handed down by the Constitutional Court, which imposed same criteria to other courts. Although the Constitution provides that any public official should give timely and adequate response to the requests made by any person, but when the request is made to the President of the Republic, the Constitutional Court stated that: “In this regard, it is noted that the multiple functions assigned to the President and the scale of these, prevents suchpublic officer to be given equal treatment as any other official who did not answer, -within the time periods-to requests that have been made.” A study conducted by PROVEA on the behavior of the Supreme Court of Justice to complaints against senior government officials, determined that only 7.14% of decisions are in favor of the petitioners, but when it came to action against the National Assembly, the General Prosecutor or against the President of the Republic, the petitioners did not receive positive responses in any case. The other outstanding feature is the use of Justice to prosecute political dissidents. An emblematic case is the open trial against General Francisco Vicente Uson Ramirez, who in a television program gave his opinion about alleged human rights violations in a particular fact. The many irregularities in the judicial process, generated his case had to be presented at the Inter-American system for the protection of human rights, which concluded in a judgment handed down by the Inter-American Court of Human Rights on November 20, 2009. Conclusion issued by the IACHR in its Report on Democracy and Human Rights in Venezuela, is fully in effect: “The lack of independence and autonomy of the judiciary from political power is one of the weakest points of democracy in Venezuela, a situation that seriously hinders the free exercise of human rights in Venezuela. According to the Commission, is the lack of independence that has allowed the possibility of using the punitive power of the State to criminalize human rights defenders in Venezuela, prosecute peaceful social protest and prosecute political dissidents.”

#### Venezuelan stability creates a new oil market- ends Arctic development

Weafer 13 (Chris Weafer is chief strategist at Sberbank Investment Research, BBC Monitoring Former Soviet Union – Political, “No business as usual for Russia in Venezuela – paper,” 3-12-13, Supplied by BBC Worldwide Monitoring)

Despite assurances from government officials in Caracas that it will be business as usual after the death of Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez last week, his passing will almost certainly lead to the start of political and social changes in that country. The only question is the time frame. Chavez's death and the emergence of a new presidential administration will surely have a significant impact on the global oil industry and price of oil, although perhaps on an even longer timeline. According to the BP Energy Review, Venezuela sits on the world's largest exploitable reserves of oil. Chavez's policies have led not only to no significant exploitation of those reserves but have actually directly led to a cut in the country's average daily oil output by one-third in the 14 years he served as president. In 1999, the country produced an average of 3.5 million barrels per day, while the current average output has dropped to 2.5 million barrels. With the right investments, the country may easily support average daily oil output of 5 million barrels and probably higher, according to industry estimates. There can be little doubt that as of last week, Venezuela has become the most important target location for foreign oil majors, especially US companies. Russian oil majors still have a small advantage, and senior executives from state-owned Rosneft and Gazprom will be eager to ensure good relations with the next administration. But they must know that there is now a limited window to convert promised cooperation with the Venezuelan state-owned oil company, PDVSA, into actual projects. Oil executives from Houston will soon be descending on Venezuela with lucrative alternatives, and PDVSA, in dire need of capital investment, will surely be listening to their offers. For Russia, that means three risks. First, Gazprom and Rosneft will have more competition for joint-venture deals in that country. Second, Venezuela is an easier alternative to the hostile and unpredictable Russian Arctic for US oil companies, which may make it harder for Moscow to attract joint-venture deals. Finally, the prospect of more oil coming out of Venezuela adds to the growth projections for shale oil as a significant longer-term threat to the price of oil, and therefore, to the Russian economy. None of this will be lost on the Kremlin. It means that there will have to be greater urgency to convert promised deals into real projects in Venezuela. At the same time, the Kremlin will want to conclude more joint ventures to exploit the Arctic. It also means that the clock counting down to lower oil revenues is now ticking, increasing the need for more urgent progress in economic reforms. The Venezuelan constitution mandates that a new election must take place within 30 days. As it stands today, the current vice president, Nicolas Maduro, is expected to be elected to replace Chavez. Maduro said he intends to stick with the economic and political policies and ideologies of his former boss, but since Maduro is no Chavez, this will be virtually impossible to achieve. Chavez was a hugely charismatic, larger-than-life leader who managed to maintain unity of purpose among the many vested interests in the country. At the same time, he stayed popular with the people even as the economy slid further into trouble. With oil averaging over 110 dollars per barrel last year, the Venezuelan state budget ran a deficit of close to 20 per cent of gross domestic product. Now that Chavez is gone, the soon-to-be-elected president Maduro will come under increasing pressure to take actions to start improving the economy. No different from President Vladimir Putin's situation when he took over an ailing economy in Russia in 2000, the only place that the new Venezuelan president can get revenue is from the oil sector. But after Chavez practically destroyed PDVSA when he fired 20,000 skilled engineers and other workers in 2002, PDVSA will need a huge boost to capital spending and joint-venture partnerships. Although politically risky, Maduro may have no other choice than to ask ExxonMobil and Chevron, two of the US majors that had their local projects nationalized by Chavez, to come back. Venezuela is certainly an attractive option for the world's big oil majors. Recoverable reserves are now put at just under 300 billion barrels, compared to about 265 billion in Saudi Arabia and less than 100 billion in Russia. Most of Venezuelan oil is heavy and more expensive to refine, but it lies only a few hundred meters below the Orinoco Belt. That makes it a lot more attractive than, for example, speculatively drilling in the hostile Russian Arctic while dodging icebergs. The Orinoco Belt is an extremely important natural environment, and the inevitable objections from domestic, regional and international environmentalists will slow any development. But as has happened in similar situations elsewhere, the quest for the prize will almost certainly prevail. Venezuela needs the money. Venezuela has also very likely moved to near the top of the US government's list of geopolitical priorities. The US is set on a course to become energy independent, and the International Energy Agency calculates this may take two to three decades based on current trends and with optimistic assumptions for US shale oil production. Such assumptions have always been speculative when it comes to the oil industry. But a more achievable target for the US is to become regionally oil independent -that is, to only source its oil requirements domestically and from Canada, Mexico and now perhaps from Venezuela. That would allow the US to become completely independent of Middle East oil within 10 years or so. A change in Venezuela's political and economic priorities would also weaken the Cuban economy since Chavez supplied Cuba with almost free oil. That would hasten the inevitable regime change there as well, an extra bonus for Washington. But while such an outcome would be very favourable for the US economy, it would accelerate the game change already started in the global oil industry with the rapid growth in shale oil volumes. No matter how you work the assumptions, the world is heading for a lot more oil supply over the balance of this decade. New major oil production will come from North America, Iraq and the Caspian Sea, where Kazakhstan's giant Kashagan field starts to produce from this year, almost certainly from Venezuela if a new administration takes concrete steps to increase foreign investment and production in the oil sector. This may be the real reason Russian officials shed a few tears at Chavez's funeral on Friday.

#### Escalating oil developments causes US-Russia nuclear war

Talmadge 12(Eric – AP, Huffington Post, “Arctic Climate Change Opening Region To New Military Activity’, 4/16, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/04/16/arctic-climate-change-military-activity\_n\_1427565.html)

To the world's military leaders, the debate over climate change is long over. They are preparing for a new kind of Cold War in the Arctic, anticipating that rising temperatures there will open up a treasure trove of resources, long-dreamed-of sea lanes and a slew of potential conflicts. By Arctic standards, the region is already buzzing with military activity, and experts believe that will increase significantly in the years ahead. Last month, Norway wrapped up one of the largest Arctic maneuvers ever — Exercise Cold Response — with 16,300 troops from 14 countries training on the ice for everything from high intensity warfare to terror threats. Attesting to the harsh conditions, five Norwegian troops were killed when their C-130 Hercules aircraft crashed near the summit of Kebnekaise, Sweden's highest mountain. The U.S., Canada and Denmark held major exercises two months ago, and in an unprecedented move, the military chiefs of the eight main Arctic powers — Canada, the U.S., Russia, Iceland, Denmark, Sweden, Norway and Finland — gathered at a Canadian military base last week to specifically discuss regional security issues. None of this means a shooting war is likely at the North Pole any time soon. But as the number of workers and ships increases in the High North to exploit oil and gas reserves, so will the need for policing, border patrols and — if push comes to shove — military muscle to enforce rival claims. The U.S. Geological Survey estimates that 13 percent of the world's undiscovered oil and 30 percent of its untapped natural gas is in the Arctic. Shipping lanes could be regularly open across the Arctic by 2030 as rising temperatures continue to melt the sea ice, according to a National Research Council analysis commissioned by the U.S. Navy last year. What countries should do about climate change remains a heated political debate. But that has not stopped north-looking militaries from moving ahead with strategies that assume current trends will continue. Russia, Canada and the United States have the biggest stakes in the Arctic. With its military budget stretched thin by Iraq, Afghanistan and more pressing issues elsewhere, the United States has been something of a reluctant northern power, though its nuclear-powered submarine fleet, which can navigate for months underwater and below the ice cap, remains second to none. Russia — one-third of which lies within the Arctic Circle — has been the most aggressive in establishing itself as the emerging region's superpower. Rob Huebert, an associate political science professor at the University of Calgary in Canada, said Russia has recovered enough from its economic troubles of the 1990s to significantly rebuild its Arctic military capabilities, which were a key to the overall Cold War strategy of the Soviet Union, and has increased its bomber patrols and submarine activity. He said that has in turn led other Arctic countries — Norway, Denmark and Canada — to resume regional military exercises that they had abandoned or cut back on after the Soviet collapse. Even non-Arctic nations such as France have expressed interest in deploying their militaries to the Arctic. "We have an entire ocean region that had previously been closed to the world now opening up," Huebert said. "There are numerous factors now coming together that are mutually reinforcing themselves, causing a buildup of military capabilities in the region. This is only going to increase as time goes on." Noting that the Arctic is warming twice as fast as the rest of the globe, the U.S. Navy in 2009 announced a beefed-up Arctic Roadmap by its own task force on climate change that called for a three-stage strategy to increase readiness, build cooperative relations with Arctic nations and identify areas of potential conflict. "We want to maintain our edge up there," said Cmdr. Ian Johnson, the captain of the USS Connecticut, which is one of the U.S. Navy's most Arctic-capable nuclear submarines and was deployed to the North Pole last year. "Our interest in the Arctic has never really waned. It remains very important." But the U.S. remains ill-equipped for large-scale Arctic missions, according to a simulation conducted by the U.S. Naval War College. A summary released last month found the Navy is "inadequately prepared to conduct sustained maritime operations in the Arctic" because it lacks ships able to operate in or near Arctic ice, support facilities and adequate communications. "The findings indicate the Navy is entering a new realm in the Arctic," said Walter Berbrick, a War College professor who participated in the simulation. "Instead of other nations relying on the U.S. Navy for capabilities and resources, sustained operations in the Arctic region will require the Navy to rely on other nations for capabilities and resources." He added that although the U.S. nuclear submarine fleet is a major asset, the Navy has severe gaps elsewhere — it doesn't have any icebreakers, for example. The only one in operation belongs to the Coast Guard. The U.S. is currently mulling whether to add more icebreakers.

#### Magnitude of escalation in the Arctic is correlated to how much economic development occurs- try or die for the aff

Wallace and Staples 10(Michael Wallace and Steven Staples. \*Professor Emeritus at the University of British Columbia and President of the Rideau Institute in Ottawa

“Ridding the Arctic of Nuclear Weapons: A Task Long Overdue,”http://www.arcticsecurity.org/docs/arctic-nuclear-report-web.pdf)

The fact is, the Arctic is becoming a zone of increased military competition. Russian President Medvedev has announced the creation of a special military force to defend Arctic claims. Last year Russian General Vladimir Shamanov declared that Russian troops would step up training for Arctic combat, and that Russia’s submarine fleet would increase its “operational radius.” 55 Recently, two Russian attack submarines were spotted off the U.S. east coast for the first time in 15 years. 56 In January 2009, on the eve of Obama’s inauguration, President Bush issued a National Security Presidential Directive on Arctic Regional Policy. It affirmed as a priority the preservation of U.S. military vessel and aircraft mobility and transit throughout the Arctic, including the Northwest Passage, and foresaw greater capabilities to protect U.S. borders in the Arctic. 57 The Bush administration’s disastrous eight years in office, particularly its decision to withdraw from the ABM treaty and deploy missile defence interceptors and a radar station in Eastern Europe, have greatly contributed to the instability we are seeing today, even though the Obama administration has scaled back the planned deployments. The Arctic has figured in this renewed interest in Cold War weapons systems, particularly the upgrading of the Thule Ballistic Missile Early Warning System radar in Northern Greenland for ballistic missile defence. The Canadian government, as well, has put forward new military capabilities to protect Canadian sovereignty claims in the Arctic, including proposed ice-capable ships, a northern military training base and a deep-water port. Earlier this year Denmark released an all-party defence position paper that suggests the country should create a dedicated Arctic military contingent that draws on army, navy and air force assets with shipbased helicopters able to drop troops anywhere. 58 Danish fighter planes would be tasked to patrol Greenlandic airspace. Last year Norway chose to buy 48 Lockheed Martin F-35 fighter jets, partly because of their suitability for Arctic patrols. In March, that country held a major Arctic military practice involving 7,000 soldiers from 13 countries in which a fictional country called Northland seized offshore oil rigs. 59 The manoeuvres prompted a protest from Russia – which objected again in June after Sweden held its largest northern military exercise since the end of the Second World War. About 12,000 troops, 50 aircraft and several warships were involved. 609 Ridding the Arctic of Nuclear Weapons: A Task Long Overdue Jayantha Dhanapala, President of Pugwash and former UN under-secretary for disarmament affairs, summarized the situation bluntly: “From those in the international peace and security sector, deep concerns are being expressed over the fact that two nuclear weapon states – the United States and the Russian Federation, which together own 95 per cent of the nuclear weapons in the world – converge on the Arctic and have competing claims. These claims, together with those of other allied NATO countries – Canada, Denmark, Iceland, and Norway – could, if unresolved, lead to conflict escalating into the threat or use of nuclear weapons.” 61 Many will no doubt argue that this is excessively alarmist, but no circumstance in which nuclear powers find themselves in military confrontation can be taken lightly. The current geo-political threat level is nebulous and low – for now, according to Rob Huebert of the University of Calgary, “[the] issue is the uncertainty as Arctic states and non-Arctic states begin to recognize the geo-political/economic significance of the Arctic because of climate change.” 62

#### Prefer the terminal impact- only existential scenario

Bostrom 02 - Professor of Philosophy and Global Studies at Yale (Nick, "Existential Risks: Analyzing Human Extinction Scenarios and Related Hazards," 38, www.transhumanist.com/volume9/risks.html)

A much greater existential risk emerged with the build-up of nuclear arsenals in the US and the USSR. An all-out nuclear war was a possibility with both a substantial probability and with consequences that might have been persistent enough to qualify as global and terminal. There was a real worry among those best acquainted with the information available at the time that a nuclear Armageddon would occur and that it might annihilate our species or permanently destroy human civilization. Russia and the US retain large nuclear arsenals that could be used in a future confrontation, either accidentally or deliberately. There is also a risk that other states may one day build up large nuclear arsenals. Note however that a smaller nuclear exchange, between India and Pakistan for instance, is not an existential risk, since it would not destroy or thwart humankind’s potential permanently.