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## 1NC – Disad

#### Russian econ on brink – effect of oil prices magnified

World Bank 10/1 – The World Bank, (“Russia Economic Update - September 2013”, <http://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2013/10/01/russia-economic-update>, AW)

The Russian Federation’s growth outlook for 2013 is positive, but remains below the strong growth outturn of 2012, after having lost steam through this year. Following a 3.4-percent GDP growth in 2012, the World Bank revised its 2013 growth projection for the country down to 1.8 percent. The World Bank’s projection for Russia’s growth in 2014 remains moderately positive at 3.1 percent, but with downside risks. In Russia, economic growth slowed significantly during the first half of 2013: The slowdown was a result of weaker demand – a result of a combination of external and domestic factors, some of which are cyclical and others structural. A large part of the cyclical component is related to Russia’s high dependence on oil and gas exports and with it, its exposure to commodity-price volatility. Structural challenges to the Russian economy and its growth, such as non-competitive sectors and markets, are another important factor. These factors recently moved to the forefront of policy discussions as the economy seems to operate close to its current capacity limit. Weakness in domestic demand was reflected in subdued investment and consumption activities. Consumption, the main growth driver in the past, expanded at a much slower pace than a year ago. Investment activities fell sharply as large infrastructure projects for the Winter Olympic Games in Sochi and the Northern Stream pipeline neared completion. Business sentiments remained skeptical, which affected investment demand. External demand remained sluggish. Trade in global markets did not provide the expected relief, while oil prices retreated, stabilizing below $ 100/bbl in the second quarter of 2013. Weak export performance was an important factor for lower growth in the first quarter of 2013. Recent consumer and business confidence indices point to deteriorating sentiments and lingering uncertainty on how the global economy, and specifically the Russian economy, will play out. While investors have been in a wait-and-see mode for a while, consumers now appear to have joined them and the players in the Russian economy are sitting on the fence. The economy is close to its current growth potential. Despite the observed broad-based slowdown in the economy, most recent estimates show that the level of capacity utilization remained close to 80 percent in the first half of 2013. That is comparable with rates observed in 2006 and 2007, when the economy was expanding at 8 percent annually. Given the still-tight labor market and the depressed investment activities of the last four quarters, it appears that the economy could be running very close to its maximum capacity. Weaker growth potential is also reflected in the sector composition of growth. In the first half 2013, growth in key non-tradable sectors, such as construction, financial services, transport and communication slowed dramatically and is not compensating anymore for the gradually deteriorating industrial performance, and the manufacturing of tradables, in particular. Considering these observations, overcoming structural challenges to the Russian economy and its growth would need to constitute an important aspect of growth-stimulating policies. For Russia, this would constitute a shift from the growth model followed in the past, which focused at stimulating domestic demand. As structural challenges become binding, constraints such as non-competitive sectors and markets would need to be addressed to lift Russia’s growth potential. Despite the slowdown this year, the Russian economy is projected to accelerate to a 3.1percent growth in 2014. Global recovery could result in an increase in Russian exports starting in the fourth quarter of 2013, while the World Bank projects oil prices to remain stable at about $105/bbl. Next year’s growth prospects will largely depend on the recovery in Russia's most important economic partner, the Euro Area, and the increased investment activities associated with the recently announced large state investment projects to be financed off-budget. However, this moderately positive outlook is subject to downside risks. Russian exports could remain depressed if the recovery in global demand is further delayed. The tapering of quantitative easing policies, notably in the United States , could temporarily negatively impact Russia's economy through lower oil prices, restricted access to international capital markets, and higher capital outflows. The Bank also notes vulnerability to increasing risks in regard to the quality of the credit portfolio given continuously high credit growth.

#### 2. Plan solves stability - this bolsters the oil industry – in the short term

**Lugar, 12 –** (Richard Lugar, Senator from Indiana. December 21, 2012. “OIL, MEXICO, AND THE TRANSBOUNDARY AGREEMENT,” http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/)//SDL

Congressional attention to the Mexican energy situation is critical¶ for understanding bilateral issues between our countries and¶ for consideration of U.S. energy security. The United States has a¶ profound interest in economic prosperity and political stability in¶ Mexico, and energy is foundational to both interests. Oil is vital for¶ the Mexican federal budget, underwriting both social programs and¶ law and order, and the oil industry is an important aspect of broader¶ economic activity. Stability and growth, or lack thereof, in Mexico’s¶ oil and gas sector can directly impact issues of bilateral concern.

#### Oil prices key to Russia’s economy – over half of government revenue

**Schuman, 12 –** (Michael Schuman, Associated Press Staff Writer for Times. July 5, 2012. “Why Vladimir Putin Needs Higher Oil Prices,” http://business.time.com/2012/07/05/why-vladimir-putin-needs-higher-oil-prices/)//SDL

But Vladimir Putin is not one of them. The economy that the Russian President has built not only runs on oil, but runs on oil priced extremely high. Falling oil prices means rising problems for Russia – both for the strength of its economic performance, and possibly, the strength of Putin himself.¶ Despite the fact that Russia has been labeled one of the world’s most promising emerging markets, often mentioned in the same breath as China and India, the Russian economy is actually quite different from the others. While India gains growth benefits from an expanding population, Russia, like much of Europe, is aging; while economists fret over China’s excessive dependence on investment, Russia badly needs more of it. Most of all, Russia is little more than an oil state in disguise. The country is the largest producer of oil in the world (yes, bigger even than Saudi Arabia), and Russia’s dependence on crude has been increasing. About a decade ago, oil and gas accounted for less than half of Russia’s exports; in recent years, that share has risen to two-thirds. Most of all, oil provides more than half of the federal government’s revenues.¶ What’s more, the economic model Putin has designed in Russia relies heavily not just on oil, but high oil prices. Oil lubricates the Russian economy by making possible the increases in government largesse that have fueled Russian consumption. Budget spending reached 23.6% of GDP in the first quarter of 2012, up from 15.2% four years earlier. What that means is Putin requires a higher oil price to meet his spending requirements today than he did just a few years ago.¶ Research firm Capital Economics figures that the government budget balanced at an oil price of $55 a barrel in 2008, but that now it balances at close to $120. Oil prices today have fallen far below that, with Brent near $100 and U.S. crude less than $90. The farther oil prices fall, the more pressure is placed on Putin’s budget, and the harder it is for him to keep spreading oil wealth to the greater population through the government. With a large swath of the populace angered by his re-election to the nation’s presidency in March, and protests erupting on the streets of Moscow, Putin can ill-afford a significant blow to the economy, or his ability to use government resources to firm up his popularity.

**Russian economic decline causes nuclear war**

**Filger 9** (Sheldon, Author – Huffington Post, “Russian Economy Faces Disastrous Free Fall Contraction”, <http://www.globaleconomiccrisis.com/blog/archives/356>)

**In Russia**, historically, **economic** health **and** political **stability are intertwined** to a degree that is rarely encountered in other major industrialized economies. It was the economic stagnation of the former Soviet Union that led to its political downfall. Similarly, Medvedev and Putin, both intimately acquainted with their nation's history, are unquestionably alarmed at the prospect that Russia's economic crisis will endanger the nation's political stability, achieved at great cost after years of chaos following the demise of the Soviet Union. Already, strikes and protests are occurring among rank and file workers facing unemployment or non-payment of their salaries. Recent polling demonstrates that the once supreme popularity ratings of Putin and Medvedev are eroding rapidly. Beyond the political elites are the financial oligarchs, who have been forced to deleverage, even unloading their yachts and executive jets in a desperate attempt to raise cash. Should the Russian economy deteriorate to the point where economic collapse is not out of the question, the impact will go far beyond the obvious accelerant such an outcome would be for the Global Economic Crisis. There is a geopolitical dimension that is even more relevant then the economic context. Despite its economic vulnerabilities and perceived decline from superpower status, Russia remains one of only two nations on earth with a nuclear arsenal of sufficient scope and capability to destroy the world as we know it. For that reason, it is not only President Medvedev and Prime Minister Putin who will be lying awake at nights over the prospect that a national economic crisis can transform itself into a virulent and destabilizing social and political upheaval. It just may be possible that U.S. President Barack Obama's national security team has already briefed him about the consequences of a major economic meltdown in Russia for the peace of the world. After all, the most recent national intelligence estimates put out by the U.S. intelligence community have already concluded that the Global Economic Crisis represents the greatest national security threat to the United States, due to its facilitating political instability in the world. During the years Boris Yeltsin ruled Russia, security forces responsible for guarding the nation's nuclear arsenal went without pay for months at a time, leading to fears that **desperate personnel would** illicitly **sell nuclear weapons to terrorist organizations**. If the current economic crisis in Russia were to deteriorate much further, how secure would the Russian nuclear arsenal remain? It may be that the financial impact of the Global Economic Crisis is its least dangerous consequence.

## 1NC – Kritik

The 1AC’s Orthodox IR’s atomistic approach to global problems makes extinction inevitable

Ahmed 12 Dr. Nafeez Mosaddeq Ahmed is Executive Director of the Institute for Policy Research and Development (IPRD), an independent think tank focused on the study of violent conflict, he has taught at the Department of International Relations, University of Sussex "The international relations of crisis and the crisis of international relations: from the securitisation of scarcity to the militarisation of society" Global Change, Peace & Security Volume 23, Issue 3, 2011 Taylor Francis 3. From securitisation to militarisation 3.1 Complicity

This analysis thus calls for a broader approach to environmental security based on retrieving the manner in which political actors construct discourses of 'scarcity' in response to ecological, energy and economic crises (critical security studies) in the context of the historically-specific socio-political and geopolitical relations of domination by which their power is constituted, and which are often implicated in the acceleration of these very crises (historical sociology and historical materialism). Instead, both realist and liberal orthodox IR approaches focus on different aspects of interstate behaviour, conflictual and cooperative respectively, but each lacks the capacity to grasp that the unsustainable trajectory of state and inter-state behaviour is only explicable in the context of a wider global system concurrently over-exploiting the biophysical environment in which it is embedded. They are, in other words, unable to address the relationship of the inter-state system itself to the biophysical environment as a key analytical category for understanding the acceleration of global crises. They simultaneously therefore cannot recognise the embeddedness of the economy in society and the concomitant politically-constituted nature of economics. Hence, they neglect the profound irrationality of collective state behaviour, which systematically erodes this relationship, globalising insecurity on a massive scale - in the very process of seeking security.85 In Cox's words, because positivist IR theory 'does not question the present order [it instead] has the effect of legitimising and reifying it'.86 Orthodox IR sanitises globally-destructive collective inter-state behaviour as a normal function of instrumental reason -thus rationalising what are clearly deeply irrational collective human actions that threaten to permanently erode state power and security by destroying the very conditions of human existence. Indeed, the prevalence of orthodox IR as a body of disciplinary beliefs, norms and prescriptions organically conjoined with actual policy-making in the international system highlights the extent to which both realism and liberalism are ideologically implicated in the acceleration of global systemic crises. By the same token, the incapacity to recognise and critically interrogate how prevailing social, political and economic structures are driving global crisis acceleration has led to the proliferation of symptom-led solutions focused on the expansion of state/regime military-political power rather than any attempt to transform root structural causes.88 It is in this context that, as the prospects for meaningful reform through inter-state cooperation appear increasingly nullified under the pressure of actors with a vested interest in sustaining prevailing geopolitical and economic structures, states have resorted progressively more to militarised responses designed to protect the concurrent structure of the international system from dangerous new threats. In effect, the failure of orthodox approaches to accurately diagnose global crises, directly accentuates a tendency to 'securitise' them - and this, ironically, fuels the proliferation of violent conflict and militarisation responsible for magnified global insecurity. 'Securitisation' refers to a 'speech act' - an act of labelling - whereby political authorities identify particular issues or incidents as an existential threat which, because of their extreme nature, justify going beyond the normal security measures that are within the rule of law. It thus legitimises resort to special extra-legal powers. By labelling issues a matter of 'security', therefore, states are able to move them outside the remit of democratic decision-making and into the realm of emergency powers, all in the name of survival itself. Far from representing a mere aberration from democratic state practice, this discloses a deeper 'dual' structure of the state in its institutionalisation of the capacity to mobilise extraordinary extra-legal military-police measures in purported response to an existential danger. The problem in the context of global ecological, economic and energy crises is that such levels of emergency mobilisation and militarisation have no positive impact on the very global crises generating 'new security challenges', and are thus entirely disproportionate.90 All that remains to examine is on the 'surface' of the international system (geopolitical competition, the balance of power, international regimes, globalisation and so on), phenomena which are dislocated from their structural causes by way of being unable to recognise the biophysically-embedded and politically-constituted social relations of which they are comprised. The consequence is that orthodox IR has no means of responding to global systemic crises other than to reduce them to their symptoms. Indeed, orthodox IR theory has largely responded to global systemic crises not with new theory, but with the expanded application of existing theory to 'new security challenges' such as 'low-intensity' intra-state conflicts; inequality and poverty; environmental degradation; international criminal activities including drugs and arms trafficking; proliferation of weapons of mass destruction; and international terrorism.91 Although the majority of such 'new security challenges' are non-military in origin - whether their referents are states or individuals - the inadequacy of systemic theoretical frameworks to diagnose them means they are primarily examined through the lenses of military-political power.92 In other words, the escalation of global ecological, energy and economic crises is recognised not as evidence that the current organisation of the global political economy is fundamentally unsustainable, requiring urgent transformation, but as vindicating the necessity for states to radicalise the exertion of their military-political capacities to maintain existing power structures, to keep the lid on.93 Global crises are thus viewed as amplifying factors that could mobilise the popular will in ways that challenge existing political and economic structures, which it is presumed (given that state power itself is constituted by these structures) deserve protection. This justifies the state's adoption of extra-legal measures outside the normal sphere of democratic politics. In the context of global crisis impacts, this counter-democratic trend-line can result in a growing propensity to problematise potentially recalcitrant populations - rationalising violence toward them as a control mechanism. Consequently, for the most part, the policy implications of orthodox IR approaches involve a redundant conceptualisation of global systemic crises purely as potential 'threat-multipliers' of traditional security issues such as 'political instability around the world, the collapse of governments and the creation of terrorist safe havens'. Climate change will serve to amplify the threat of international terrorism, particularly in regions with large populations and scarce resources. The US Army, for instance, depicts climate change as a 'stress-multiplier' that will 'exacerbate tensions' and 'complicate American foreign policy'; while the EU perceives it as a 'threat-multiplier which exacerbates existing trends, tensions and instability'.95 In practice, this generates an excessive preoccupation not with the causes of global crisis acceleration and how to ameliorate them through structural transformation, but with their purportedly inevitable impacts, and how to prepare for them by controlling problematic populations. Paradoxically, this 'securitisation' of global crises does not render us safer. Instead, by necessitating more violence, while inhibiting preventive action, it guarantees greater insecurity. Thus, a recent US Department of Defense report explores the future of international conflict up to 2050. It warns of 'resource competition induced by growing populations and expanding economies', particularly due to a projected 'youth bulge' in the South, which 'will consume ever increasing amounts of food, water and energy'. This will prompt a 'return to traditional security threats posed by emerging near-peers as we compete globally for depleting natural resources and overseas markets'. Finally, climate change will 'compound' these stressors by generating humanitarian crises, population migrations and other complex emergencies.96 A similar study by the US Joint Forces Command draws attention to the danger of global energy depletion through to 2030. Warning of ‘the dangerous vulnerabilities the growing energy crisis presents’, the report concludes that ‘The implications for future conflict are ominous.’97 Once again, the subject turns to demographics: ‘In total, the world will add approximately 60 million people each year and reach a total of 8 billion by the 2030s’, 95 per cent accruing to developing countries, while populations in developed countries slow or decline. ‘Regions such as the Middle East and Sub-Saharan Africa, where the youth bulge will reach over 50% of the population, will possess fewer inhibitions about engaging in conflict.’98 The assumption is that regions which happen to be both energy-rich and Muslim-majority will also be sites of violent conflict due to their rapidly growing populations. A British Ministry of Defence report concurs with this assessment, highlighting an inevitable ‘youth bulge’ by 2035, with some 87 per cent of all people under the age of 25 inhabiting developing countries. In particular, the Middle East population will increase by 132 per cent and sub-Saharan Africa by 81 per cent. Growing resentment due to ‘endemic unemployment’ will be channelled through ‘political militancy, including radical political Islam whose concept of Umma, the global Islamic community, and resistance to capitalism may lie uneasily in an international system based on nation-states and global market forces’. More strangely, predicting an intensifying global divide between a super-rich elite, the middle classes and an urban under-class, the report warns: ‘The world’s middle classes might unite, using access to knowledge, resources and skills to shape transnational processes in their own class interest.’99 Thus, the securitisation of global crisis leads not only to the problematisation of particular religious and ethnic groups in foreign regions of geopolitical interest, but potentially extends this problematisation to any social group which might challenge prevailing global political economic structures across racial, national and class lines. The previous examples illustrate how secur-itisation paradoxically generates insecurity by reifying a process of militarization against social groups that are constructed as external to the prevailing geopolitical and economic order. In other words, the internal reductionism, fragmentation and compartmentalisation that plagues orthodox theory and policy reproduces precisely these characteristics by externalising global crises from one another, externalising states from one another, externalising the inter-state system from its biophysical environment, and externalising new social groups as dangerous 'outsiders\*. Hence, a simple discursive analysis of state militarisation and the construction of new "outsider\* identities is insufficient to understand the causal dynamics driving the process of 'Otherisation'. As Doug Stokes points out, the Western state preoccupation with the ongoing military struggle against international terrorism reveals an underlying 'discursive complex", where representations about terrorism and non-Western populations are premised on 'the construction of stark boundaries\* that 'operate to exclude and include\*. Yet these exclusionary discourses are 'intimately bound up with political and economic processes', such as strategic interests in proliferating military bases in the Middle East, economic interests in control of oil, and the wider political goal of 'maintaining American hegemony\* by dominating a resource-rich region critical for global capitalism.100 But even this does not go far enough, for arguably the construction of certain hegemonic discourses is mutually constituted by these geopolitical, strategic and economic interests — exclusionary discourses are politically constituted. New conceptual developments in genocide studies throw further light on this in terms of the concrete socio-political dynamics of securitisation processes. It is now widely recognised, for instance, that the distinguishing criterion of genocide is not the pre-existence of primordial groups, one of which destroys the other on the basis of a preeminence in bureaucratic military-political power. Rather, genocide is the intentional attempt to destroy a particular social group that has been socially constructed as different. As Hinton observes, genocides precisely constitute a process of 'othering\* in which an imagined community becomes reshaped so that previously 'included\* groups become 'ideologically recast' and dehumanised as threatening and dangerous outsiders, be it along ethnic, religious, political or economic lines — eventually legitimising their annihilation.102 In other words, genocidal violence is inherently rooted in a prior and ongoing ideological process, whereby exclusionary group categories are innovated, constructed and 'Otherised' in accordance with a specific socio-political programme. The very process of identifying and classifying particular groups as outside the boundaries of an imagined community of 'inclusion\*, justifying exculpatory violence toward them, is itself a political act without which genocide would be impossible.1 3 This recalls Lemkin's recognition that the intention to destroy a group is integrally connected with a wider socio-political project - or colonial project — designed to perpetuate the political, economic, cultural and ideological relations of the perpetrators in the place of that of the victims, by interrupting or eradicating their means of social reproduction. Only by interrogating the dynamic and origins of this programme to uncover the social relations from which that programme derives can the emergence of genocidal intent become explicable. Building on this insight, Semelin demonstrates that the process of exclusionary social group construction invariably derives from political processes emerging from deep-seated sociopolitical crises that undermine the prevailing framework of civil order and social norms; and which can, for one social group, be seemingly resolved by projecting anxieties onto a new 'outsider' group deemed to be somehow responsible for crisis conditions. It is in this context that various forms of mass violence, which may or may not eventually culminate in actual genocide, can become legitimised as contributing to the resolution of crises.105

#### The alternative is to reject the 1AC – it adopts a critical approach to IR

Bilgin 5—Pinar Bilgin, Associate Professor of International Relations at Bilkent University (Turkey) [“Conclusion,” Regional Security in the Middle East: A Critical Perspective, Published by Routledge, ISBN 0415325498, p. 205-207]

Emphasising the mutually interactive relationship between intellectuals and social movements should not be taken to suggest that the only way for intellectuals to make a change is to get directly involved in political action. They can also intervene by providing a critique of the existing situation, calling attention to what future outcomes may result if necessary action is not taken at present, and by pointing to potential for change immanent in regional politics. Students of security could help create the political space for alternative agents of security to take action by presenting appropriate critiques. It should be emphasised however that such thinking should be anchored in the potential immanent in world politics. The hope is that non-state actors (who may or may not be aware of their potential to make a change) may constitute themselves as agents of security when presented with an alternative reading of their situation. Thinking about the future becomes even more crucial once theory is [end page 205] conceptualised as constitutive of the ‘reality’ it seeks to respond to. In other words, our ideas about the future—our conjectures and prognoses—have a self-constitutive potential. What the students of Cold War Security Studies consider as a more ‘realistic’ picture of the future becomes ‘real’ through practice, albeit under circumstances inherited from the past. Thinking about what a ‘desired’ future would look like is significant for the very same reason; that is, in order to be able to turn it into a ‘reality’ through adopting emancipatory practices. For, having a vision of a ‘desired’ future empowers people(s) in the present. Presenting pictures of what a ‘desired’ future might look like, and pointing to the security community approach as the start of a path that could take us from an insecure past to a more secure future is not to suggest that the creation of a security community is the most likely outcome. On the contrary, the dynamics pointed to throughout the book indicate that there exists a potential for descent into chaos if no action is taken to prevent militarisation and fragmentation of societies, and the marginalisation of peoples as well as economies in an increasingly globalising world. However, these dynamics exist as ‘threats to the future’ to use Beck’s terminology; and only by thinking and writing about them that can one mobilise preventive action to be taken in the present. Viewed as such, critical approaches present not an ‘optimistic’, but a more ‘realistic’ picture of the future. Considering how the ‘realism’ of Cold War Security Studies failed not only when judged by its own standards, by failing to provide an adequate explanation of the world ‘out there’, but also when judged by the standards of critical approaches, as it was argued, it could be concluded that there is a need for more ‘realistic’ approaches to regional security in theory and practice. The foregoing suggests three broad conclusions. First, Cold War Security Studies did not present the ‘realistic’ picture it purported to provide. On the contrary, the pro-status quo leanings of the Cold War security discourse failed to allow for (let alone foresee) changes such as the end of the Cold War, dissolution of some states and integration of some others. Second, notwithstanding the important inroads critical approaches to security made in the post-Cold War era, much traditionalist thinking remains and maintains its grip over the security practices of many actors. Third, critical approaches offer a fuller or more adequate picture of security in different parts of the world (including the Middle East). Cold War Security Studies is limited not only because of its narrow (military-focused), pro-status quo and state-centric (if not statist) approach to security in theory and practice, but also because of its objectivist conception of theory and the theory/practice relationship that obscured the mutually constitutive relationship between them. Students of critical approaches have sought to challenge Cold War Security Studies, its claim to knowledge and its hold over security practices by pointing to the mutually constitutive relationship between theory and practice and revealing [end page 206] how the Cold War security discourse has been complicit in constituting (in)security in different parts of the world. The ways in which the Cold War security discourse helped constitute the ‘Middle East’ by way of representing it as a region, and contributed to regional insecurity in the Middle East by shaping security practices, is exemplary of the argument that ‘theories do not leave the world untouched’. The implication of these conclusions for practice is that becoming aware of the ‘politics behind the geographical specification of politics’ and exploring the relationship between (inventing) regions and (conceptions and practices of) security helps reveal the role human agency has played in the past and could play in the future. An alternative approach to security, that of critical approaches to security, could inform alternative (emancipatory) practices thereby helping constitute a new region in the form of a security community. It should be noted, however, that to argue that ‘everything is socially constructed’ or that ‘all approaches have normative concerns embedded in them’ is a significant first step that does not by itself help one adopt emancipatory practices. As long as people rely on traditional practices shaped by the Cold War security discourse - which remains prevalent in the post-Cold War era - they help constitute a ‘reality’ in line with the tenets of ‘realist’ Cold War Security Studies. This is why seeking to address evolving crises through traditional practices whilst leaving a critical security perspective to be adopted for the long-term will not work. For, traditionalist thinking and practices, by helping shape the ‘reality’ ‘out there’, foreclose the political space necessary for emancipatory practices to be adopted by multiple actors at numerous levels. Hence the need for the adoption of a critical perspective that emphasises the roles human agency has played in the past and could play in the future in shaping what human beings choose to call ‘reality’. Generating such an awareness of the potentialities of human agency could enable one to begin thinking differently about regional security in different parts of the world whilst remaining sensitive to regional actors’ multiple and contending conceptions of security, what they view as referent(s) and how they think security should be sought in different parts of the world. After decades of statist, military-focused and zero-sum thinking and practices that privileged the security of some whilst marginalising the security of others, the time has come for all those interested in security in the Middle East to decide whether they want to be agents of a world view that produces more of the same, thereby contributing towards a ‘threat to the future’, or of alternative futures that try to address the multiple dimensions of regional insecurity. The choice is not one between presenting a more ‘optimistic’ or ‘pessimistic’ vision of the future, but between stumbling into the future expecting more of the same, or stepping into a future equipped with a perspective that not only has a conception of a ‘desired’ future but is also cognisant of ‘threats to the future’.

## 1NC – Disad

#### **China-Mexico bilat increasing – we assume your collapse warrants**

The Economist 6/6 – The Economist Magazine, (“Why has China snubbed Cuba and Venezuela?”, Article Written for The Economist, 6/6/13, <http://www.economist.com/blogs/economist-explains/2013/06/economist-explains-3>, AW)

In terms of funding, Kevin Gallagher of Boston University says China has provided more loans to Latin America since 2005 than the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank combined. The visits to Mexico and Costa Rica may also represent a pivot of sorts in terms of the type of economic relationship China has with Latin America. Up until now, China has hoovered up the region’s commodities, importing soya, copper, iron, oil and other raw materials, particularly from Brazil, Chile and Venezuela, while flooding the region with its manufactured goods. But its relations with Mexico, a rival in low-cost manufacturing, have been frosty: China accounts for only about 0.05% of Mexican foreign direct investment, and it exports ten times as much to Mexico as it imports. But as wages in China have increased and high energy prices have raised the cost of shipping goods from China to America, Beijing may be looking for bases such as Mexico and Costa Rica where it can relocate Chinese factories and benefit from free-trade agreements with the United States. This idea thrills the Mexican government, but does it pose an immediate threat to Venezuela and Cuba? Probably not: China will continue to need their staunch ideological support over issues like Taiwan, for one thing. But it does suggest that China’s economic interest in the region is broadening, especially along the Pacific coast.

#### Economic integration with Mexico hurts China

Mares and Canovas 10 – [David R. Mares & Gustavo Vega Cánovas, the Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies (San Diego), the Mexico Institute of the Woodrow Wilson Center (Washington DC), El Colegio de la Frontera Norte (Tijuana), and El Colegio de México (Mexico City).The U.S.-Mexico Relationship: Towards a New Era?, 2010, <http://usmex.ucsd.edu/assets/024/11635.pdf>]

This chapter begins by briefly characterizing the most recent period of US-Mexico relations, the NAFTA era since 1994. We trace the origins, purposes, and the impact of NAFTA in the two economies and societies. A second section lays out the parameters of a new era in the bilateral relationship, paying particular attention to the challenges to both countries raised by the processes of globalization and democratization. Globalization’s impact on the relationship is best captured in the rise of China and consequent displacement of Mexico in trade relations with the US. Democratization complicates policy responses but improves the likelihood that policy will have some consistency over time. The inadequate manner in which the two countries have responded up to now to these challenges is highlighted. A third section discusses the essence of any appropriate response to these challenges: economic integration. The failure of integration at a regional level is discussed, but we note that Mexico’s long border with the US means that the options open to Brazil, Argentina and Chile in diversifying their economic relations simply are not viable for Mexico. A fourth section evaluates the current relationship and offers suggestions to improve the two countries’ abilities to respond effectively to today’s challenges. Whether Mexico or the US like it or not, they are destined to walk together if they want to be successful in this globalized economy. The conclusion speculates on whether the countries will move towards a more collaborative or distant relationship, thus helping to set the context for the in-depth discussions in subsequent chapters

#### Lack of US economic engagement spurs China’s growth.

Erikson & Chen ‘7 – (Daniel is a Senior Associate of US Policy at the Inter-American Dialogue. Janice is a degree candidate at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy. “China, Taiwan, and the Battle for Latin America,” Fletcher Forum of World Affairs, Vol. 31:2, Summer 2007, pg. 71)

China’s economic engagement with Latin America responds to the requirements of a booming Chinese economy that has been growing at nearly 10 percent per year for the past quarter century. The economic figures are impressive: in the past six years, Chinese imports from Latin America have grown more than six-fold, at a pace of some 60 percent a year, to an estimated $60 billion in 2006. China has become a major consumer of food, mineral, and other primary products from Latin America, benefiting principally the commodity-producing countries of South America-par- ticularly Argentina, Brazil, Peru, and Chile. Chinese investment in Latin America remains relatively small at some $6.5 billion through 2004, but that amount represents half of China's foreign investment overseas.9 China's Xinhua News agency reported that Chinese trade with the Caribbean ex- ceeded $2 billion in 2004, a 40 percent increase from the previous year.10 China has promised to increase its investments in Latin America to $100 billion by 2014, although government officials have since backed away from that pledge and several proposed investments are already showing signs of falling short in Brazil, Argentina, and elsewhere. For their part, Latin Americans are intrigued by the idea of China as a potential partner for trade and investment. As a rising superpower with- out a colonial or "imperialist" history in the Western Hemisphere, China is in many ways more politically attractive than either the United States or the European Union, especially for politicians confronted with constituen- cies that are increasingly anti-American and skeptical of Western inten- tions. 12 Nevertheless, most analysts recognize that Latin America's embrace of China-to the extent that this has actually occurred-is intimately linked to its perception of neglect and disinterest from the United States. Nervousness about Chinas rise runs deeper among the smaller economies such as those of Central America, which do not enjoy Brazil's or Argentina's abundance in export commodities and are inclined to view the competi- tion posed by the endless supply of cheap Chinese labor as a menace to their nascent manufacturing sectors. But even as China seeks to reassure the United States that its interests in South America are purely economic, Beijing has begun enlisting regional powers like Mexico to aid its effort to woo Central American diplomats. Pressure is also being placed on Paraguay by Argentina, Brazil, and Chile, its partners in the South American Common Market (Mercosur), which places certain constraints on member states' bilateral foreign policy prerogatives. Despite its avowals to Washington, China appears to be using its economic might as a means to achieve the patently political objective of stripping Taiwan of its democratic allies in the Western Hemisphere.

#### CCP Collapse causes nuclear and biological warfare

Renxing 5 (San, Epic Times Staff Member, The CCP’s Last-ditch Gamble: Biological and Nuclear War, 8/5/5, The Epoch Times,<http://english.epochtimes.com/news/5-8-5/30975.html>)

As *The Epoch Times*’ *Nine Commentaries on the Communist Party* spreads ever wider in China, the truth it speaks is awakening Chinese people to the true nature of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) and inspiring them to cancel their Party memberships. With the number of people quitting the Party growing rapidly by the day, the Communist Party sees that the end is near. In a show of strength to save itself from demise, the CCP has brought out a sinister plan that it has been preparing for years, a last-ditch gamble to extend its life. This plan is laid out in two speeches written by Chi Haotian, Minster of Defense and vice-chairman of China’s Central Military Commission, and posted on the Internet. The background surrounding the speeches is still shrouded in mystery. The titles of the two speeches are “[War Is Approaching Us](http://english.epochtimes.com/news/5-8-4/30974.html%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank)” [[1]](http://english.epochtimes.com/news/5-8-5/30975.html#1) and “[War Is Not Far from Us and Is the Midwife of the Chinese Century](http://english.epochtimes.com/news/5-8-4/30974.html%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank).” The two, judging from their similar contexts and consistent theme, are indeed sister articles. These speeches describe in a comprehensive, systematic, and detailed way the CCP’s nearly 20 years of fear and helplessness over its doomed fate, and its desperate fight to extend its life. In particular, the speeches lay uncharacteristically bare what is really on the CCP’s mind and hide nothing from the public—a rare confession from the CCP that can help people understand its evil nature. If one truly understands what is said in this confession, one will immediately catch on to the CCP’s way of thinking. In short, the speeches are worth reading, and I would like to comment on them. I. A Gangster Gambles with the World as His Stake, and the Lives of People in this Global Village Become Worthless What, then, is the gist of this wild, last-ditch gamble? To put it in a few words: A cornered beast is fighting desperately to survive in a battle with humanity. If you don’t believe me, read some passages directly from the speeches. 1) “We must prepare ourselves for two scenarios. If our biological weapons succeed in the surprise attack [on the US], the Chinese people will be able to keep their losses at a minimum in the fight against the U.S. If, however, the attack fails and triggers a nuclear retaliation from the U.S., China would perhaps suffer a catastrophe in which more than half of its population would perish. That is why we need to be ready with air defense systems for our big and medium-sized cities. Whatever the case may be, we can only move forward fearlessly for the sake of our Party and state and our nation’s future, regardless of the hardships we have to face and the sacrifices we have to make. The population, even if more than half dies, can be reproduced. But if the Party falls, everything is gone, and forever gone!” 2) “In any event, we, the CCP, will never step down from the stage of history! We’d rather have the whole world, or even the entire globe, share life and death with us than step down from the stage of history!!! Isn’t there a ‘nuclear bondage’ theory? It means that since the nuclear weapons have bound the security of the entire world, all will die together if death is inevitable. In my view, there is another kind of bondage, and that is, the fate our Party is tied up with that of the whole world. If we, the CCP, are finished, China will be finished, and the world will be finished.” 3) “It is indeed brutal to kill one or two hundred million Americans. But that is the only path that will secure a Chinese century, a century in which the CCP leads the world. We, as revolutionary humanitarians, do not want deaths. But if history confronts us with a choice between deaths of Chinese and those of Americans, we’d have to pick the latter, as, for us, it is more important to safeguard the lives of the Chinese people and the life of our Party. That is because, after all, we are Chinese and members of the CCP. Since the day we joined the CCP, the Party’s life has always been above all else!” Since the Party’s life is “above all else,” it would not be surprising if the CCP resorts to the use of biological, chemical, and nuclear weapons in its attempt to extend its life. The CCP, which disregards human life, would not hesitate to kill two hundred million Americans, along with seven or eight hundred million Chinese, to achieve its ends. These speeches let the public see the CCP for what it really is. With evil filling its every cell the CCP intends to wage a war against humankind in its desperate attempt to cling to life. *That* is the main theme of the speeches. This theme is murderous and utterly evil. In China we have seen beggars who coerced people to give them money by threatening to stab themselves with knives or pierce their throats with long nails. But we have never, until now, seen such a gangster who would use biological, chemical, and nuclear weapons to threaten the world, that they will die together with him. This bloody confession has confirmed the CCP’s nature: That of a monstrous murderer who has killed 80 million Chinese people and who now plans to hold one billion people hostage and gamble with their lives.

## 1NC – Counterplan

#### Text – The United States federal government will substantially increase its non-wind based renewable energy integration with Mexico.

#### Increasing wind production crowds out all other uses of rare earth metals – overuses clean tech resources – turns case

Professor Chris Rhodes is a writer and researcher. He studied chemistry at Sussex University, earning both a B.Sc and a Doctoral degree; rising to become the youngest professor of physical chemistry in the U.K. at the age of 34, 7/30/12 [“Peak Minerals: Shortage of Rare Earth Metals Threatens Renewable Energy,” July 30, Oilprice, http://oilprice.com/Alternative-Energy/Renewable-Energy/Peak-Minerals-Shortage-of-Rare-Earth-Metals-Threatens-Renewable-Energy.html

Not only are supplies of oil and natural gas under imminent threat of failing to meet demand for them, but so is a whole range of precious metals, along with indium, gallium and germanium and other vital elements such as phosphorus and helium, as is discussed throughout this Commentary. A report from the Science and Technology Committee, advised by the Royal Society of Chemistry, warns that if the U.K. does not secure supplies of strategic metals, its economic growth will be severely jeopardized. Of particular concern are indium, used in touch screens and liquid crystal displays, and rare earth elements (REEs) particularly neodymium and dysprosium, used to fabricate highly efficient magnets for electric cars and wind turbines. Platinum group metals are an issue too, used in catalytic converters and fuel cells. As is true of oil and gas, and indeed world population, such resources are not evenly distributed around the globe, and for example 80% of available new platinum is extracted from just two mines in South Africa. 92% of the niobium used in the world (for superconducting magnets and highly heat-resisting superalloys e.g. in jet-engines and rocket subassemblies) is exported from Brazil, and 97% of REEs are presently supplied from China. In developing a low-carbon transport infrastructure, it is proposed that biofuels should be used principally for aviation where there is no practical alternative to liquid fuels. Thus, it is ventured, electric cars will become increasingly important in providing personalised transport while avoiding the use of petroleum or natural-gas based fuels. The knock-on effect is that new sources of lithium must be found along with the means to mine and process the metal, plus the inauguration of recycling technology for lithium. One can immediately take issue with the practicalities of both arms of this scheme, however. Roughly one fifth of all fuel in the UK is used for aircraft, or around 13 million tonnes. At a yield of 952 L/ha and a density of 0.88 g/cm3, to produce this much biodiesel would take 15.5 million hectares of arable land, of which the UK has only 6.5 million hectares. Thus if we were to stop growing food crops entirely and just rapeseed, we could still only fuel 42% of our aviation fleet. It is obvious that just a few percent at best of our current number of planes can be kept in the air by means of biofuels. Clearly, the days of cheap air-travel are numbered and this may be one reason why the coalition government has scrapped plans to build the controversial and vexed third runway at Heathrow Airport. Given the 30 million cars on the roads here currently fuelled by oil, the case for a wide-scale implementation of electric-cars might appear compelling. However, the lead-in time to make a dent in that number of vehicles and the 60 million tonnes of crude oil used for fuel would be decades at best, even if the necessary supplies of REEs, lithium and overall manufacturing capacity for them could be achieved. The most practical use for electricity is to power mass transportation, e.g. tramways and railway networks rather than individual vehicles.¶ Endangered Elements: Threat to Green Energy.¶ Underpinning the above political agenda, a list of "endangered elements" has been published in a new report, including the rare earth elements (REEs), in particular neodymium, production of which, it is reckoned, will have to increase five-times to build enough magnets for the number of wind-turbines deemed necessary for a fully renewable future. Nonetheless, my rough calculations indicate that this would still take 50 - 100 years to implement, depending on exactly what proportion of the renewable electricity budget would be met from wind-power, and if the manufacturing capacity and other resources of materials and energy needed for this Herculean task will prevail.¶ Neodymium is a rare earth metal used extensively to produce permanent magnets found in everything from computer hard disks and cell phones to wind turbines and cars. Neodymium magnets are the strongest permanent magnets known, and a neodymium magnet of a few grams can lift a thousand times its own weight. The magnets that drive a Toyota Prius hybrid’s electric motor use around 1 kilogram of neodymium, while 10 - 15 kg of lanthanum is used in its battery. Interestingly, neodymium magnets were invented in the 1980s to overcome the global cobalt supply shock that occurred as the result of internal warfare in Zaire (now Congo). Around one tonne of REE-based permanent magnets is needed to provide each MW of wind-turbine power.¶ Of the other REEs, demands for dysprosium and terbium, which are harder elements to extract than their lighter relatives, are such that supply will be outpaced within a decade. The latter have been described as "miracle" ingredients for green energy production since small quantities of dysprosium can result in magnets with only one tenth the weight of conventional permanent magnets of similar strength, while terbium can be used to furnish lights that use as little as 20% of the power consumed by normal illumination. By alloying neodymium with dysprosium and terbium, magnets are created that more readily maintain their magnetism at the high temperatures of hybrid car engines.¶ However, far more dysprosium relative to neodymium is required than occurs naturally in the REE ores, meaning that another source of dysprosium must be found if hybrid cars are to be manufactured at a seriously advancing rate. As noted, almost all REEs come from China whom it appears will run out of dysprosium and terbium within 15 years, or sooner if demand continues to soar, notwithstanding that Chinese hegemony for its own future energy projects may mean that the current amount of REEs being released onto the world markets will be severely curbed. Almost certainly, new sources of REEs will be sought, given their vital importance to providing future renewable energy, and Japanese geologists have reported that there may be 100 billion tonnes of REEs in the mud of the floor of the Pacific Ocean. Since the minerals were found at depths of 3,500 to 6,000 metres (11,500-20,000 ft) below the ocean surface, the undertaking required to recover them will not be trivial, however, and the practicalities of the enterprise remain to be seen.¶ Peak Oil - Peak Minerals.¶ According to the Hubbert theory, all resources are finite and will ultimately be extracted only to the limit where it is feasible to do so, whereupon either financial costs or those of energy dictate that to proceed further only yields diminishing returns. The Hubbert theory was originally applied to oil, in which the production curve "peaks" at the point of maximum output (when half the original resource has been used), beyond which it falls remorselessly. Similar fits can also be made to gas and coal production data and a recent analysis was reported using the approach to a study of 57 different minerals by Ugo Burdi and Marco Pagini. These authors have fitted both logistic and Gaussian functions to mineral production data from the United States Geological Survey (USGS), and it is interesting that for mercury, lead, cadmium and selenium, there is good accord found between the "ultimate recoverable resources" URR determined from the curve-fitting to the data and those reported as remaining in the USGS tables (plus the amount of each already extracted). For tellurium, phosphorus, thallium, zirconium and rhenium, the agreement is quite close but tends to smaller values than are indicated from the figures for cumulative production plus the USGS reserves. For gallium, the figure obtained from the fitting analysis is significantly lower than the USGS estimate (by about a factor of seven).¶ Evidence of peaking is found for a number of minerals, e.g. mercury around 1962; lead in 1986; zirconium in 1990; selenium in 1994; gallium in 2000. The results for gallium are significant, both in that the peak occurred seven years ago and in the size of its total reserve, which when compared with the amount used worldwide by the electronics industry, implies that we may run short of gallium any time soon. Tellurium and selenium are two other minerals that underpin the semiconductor industry and it appears that their fall in production may also impact negatively on future technologies that are entirely reliant upon them, since there are no obvious substitute materials with precisely equivalent properties.¶ For vanadium, although a production peak is indicated in 2005, the data in the "mineral commodities handbook" show a later and sudden surge in production, which is not fully explained but thought may potentially relate to uncertainties in reporting from countries like China. So, there may be a real and ongoing upsurge in production from particularly the Chinese economy which is quoted as being "out of sync" with the rest of the world, such is its massive expansion, or it might be a red herring.¶ Hafnium, another metal whose days are numbered, is an essential component of computer-chips and is also employed as a thermal-neutron absorber in nuclear control-rods, is thought may literally run-out within 10 years. Peak oil we all know about, but peak gas, peak uranium and peak coal will follow. There is in fact a peak in the production of all materials that were laid down in the distant past, and we are using them up at an expanding rate.¶ Interestingly, copper, zinc, tin, nickel and platinum show an almost exponential increase in production; however, the stocks of some metals may be insufficient to supply the technological demands of the modern developed world into the far (or even near) future. There is also the issue of how quickly a rare and difficultly extractable metal such as platinum might be produced in comparison with an overall demand for it. Copper production can be fitted with an exponential function up to 2006, while a logistic function provides about the same quality of fit, yet indicates a peak in about 2040. The latter agrees reasonably well with the USGS estimated copper reserves of 0.5 - 1.0 Gigatons, while the fit gives 2 Gigatons. Notably, the world price of copper has skyrocketed during the past few years, which is again attributed to demand in China, as was the cost and shortage of wood earlier in the year.¶ The above analyses rest upon the case that the determined "peaks" represent actual global production maxima. Indeed, more reserves of all minerals may yet be found if we look assiduously enough for them; but herein lies the issue of underpinning costs, both in terms of finance and energy. It is the latter that may determine the real peaking and decline of minerals, which extend beyond the simple facts, say, of mining and refining a metal from its crude ore. There is also the cost-contribution from the energy needed to garner energy-materials such as oil, gas, coal and uranium, and thence to turn them into power and machinery; and since fossil fuels are being relentlessly depleted, it takes an inexorable amount energy to produce them, resulting in a cumulative and rising energy demand overall.¶ The whole "extractive system" is interconnected through required underpinning supplies of fossil fuels, and it is perhaps this that explains why the production of so many minerals seems to be peaking during the period between the latter part of the 20th century and the start of the 21st, in a virtual mirror-image of the era when troubles in the production of fossil fuels were experienced across the globe. Hence, it may be the lack of fossil fuels which determines the real amount of all other minerals that can be brought onto the world markets. Even if we manage to solve our energy problems, we may not have enough "stuff" to make things from. Some salient points about potential metals shortages are apparent from the list of elements in Table 17, which gives the world total reserve of each, the expected time of exhaustion based on current rates of production, and their principal uses. The figures therein are based on known reserves, noting that more might be found if they were explored for with sufficient assiduousness. However, emerging new technologies and a growing world population mean that some key-metals are likely to be exhausted more quickly, as indicated in Table 27. The reserve lifetime of a resource (also known as the R/P ratio) is defined as the known economically recoverable amount (R) divided by the current rate of use (P) of it, hence the values in Table 1 and Table 2. Economics predicts that as the lifetime of a reserve shortens so its price increases. Consequently, demand for that reserve decreases and other sources, once thought too expensive, enter the market. This tends to make the original reserve last longer, in addition to the volume of the new reserves. For example, there is enough bauxite reckoned to provide aluminium for 70 years, but the latter is an abundant element and there are many alternative known sources of it, thought to add-up to over 1000 years worth. In practice many other factors are involved, particularly geopolitical situations, but the basic geological fact remains: reserves are limited and hence their present patterns of consumption and growth are not sustainable over the longer term. While some elements are very plentiful compared to the total amount of them required, the rate at which they can be recovered sets a limit on how quickly a given reserve can be exploited. The R/P ratio analysis is of course a gross approximation, as the Hubbert-type fits to production show, since a given amount of a resource/year cannot be produced up to the bitter end. Production must eventually decline, mainly as the Energy Returned on Energy Invested (EROEI) falls.

#### Rare earth metal depletion collapses civilization**Adams 10** – Mike Adams, Editor of NaturalNews, January 26, 2010, “Global supply of rare earth elements could be wiped out by 2012,” online: <http://www.naturalnews.com/028028_rare_earth_elements_mining.html>

It's the bubble you've probably never heard of: The rare earth bubble. And it's due to pop in 2012, potentially devastating the industries of western nations that depend on these rare elements. What industries are those? The automobile industry uses tens of thousands of tons of rare earth elements each year, and advanced military technology depends on these elements, too. Lots of "green" technologies depend on them, including wind turbines, low-energy light bulbs and hybrid car [batteries](http://www.naturalnews.com/batteries.html). In fact, much of western civilization depends on rare earth elements such as terbium, lanthanum and neodymium. So what's the problem with these rare elements? 97 percent of the world's supply comes from mines in China, and China is prepared to simply stop exporting these strategic elements to the rest of the world by [2012](http://www.naturalnews.com/2012.html). If that happens, the western world will be crippled by the collapse of available rare earth elements. Manufacturing of everything from computers and [electronics](http://www.naturalnews.com/electronics.html) to farm machinery will grind to a halt. Electronics will disappear from the shelves and prices for manufactured goods that depend on these rare elements will skyrocket. These 17 rare earth elements (REE) -- all of which are metals -- are strategic resources upon which entire nations are built. In many ways, they are similar to rubber -- a resource so valuable and important to the world that many experts call it the "fourth most important [natural](http://www.naturalnews.com/natural.html) resource in the world," right after [water](http://www.naturalnews.com/water.html), steel and oil. Without rubber, you couldn't drive your [car](http://www.naturalnews.com/car.html) to work or water your lawn. Many medical technologies would cease to work and virtually all commercial construction would grind to a halt. Many of the strategic battles fought in World War II were fought, in fact, over control of rubber, most of which now comes through Singapore and its surrounding regions (Malaysia and Indonesia). Global shortage of Rare Earth Elements coming... Now, by threatening to cut off the world's supply of rare earth elements, China appears to be attempting to monopolize this extremely important strategic resource. According to information received by The Independent, by 2012 China may cease all exports of rare earth elements, reserving them for its own economic expansion. An [article](http://www.naturalnews.com/article.html) in that paper quotes REE expert Jack Lifton as saying, "A real crunch is coming. In [America](http://www.naturalnews.com/America.html), Britain and elsewhere we have not yet woken up to the fact that there is an urgent need to secure the supply of rare earths from sources outside China." And yet virtually no one has heard of this problem! People are familiar with peak [oil](http://www.naturalnews.com/oil.html), global warming, ocean acidification, the national debt and the depletion of fossil water, but very few are aware of the looming crisis in rare metals... upon which much of western civilization rests.

## 1NC – Disad

#### Immigration reform will pass now – but obama’s political capital is necessary to get moderates on board

Connor Higgins, political columnist, M.A. in US History from George Mason University, 10/28 [“GOP civil war: Obama and immigration,” http://communities.washingtontimes.com/neighborhood/its-all-smoke-and-whiskey/2013/oct/28/gop-civil-war-obama-and-immigration/]

WASHINGTON, October 28, 2013 — Divide and conquer: that is what President Obama has in planned for his opponents in Washington. First he will divide them, squabble with one another, fight one another. Either in time or by his own doing, he will relegate the Republican party to the history books.¶ How, one might ask? What is the President doing that is causing so much stir and bad blood among the GOP?¶ President Obama is a brilliant politician, and what he lacks in actual substantial leadership he makes up for in his unflappable ability to spin any situation, no matter how disastrous, just as he wants it to be spun. Using this ability, he has waged an unceasing war on the Republican party and all things on the right of the political spectrum.¶ It is as if the President is a general, and he is leading his forces against the forces of his adversaries, the Republican party. On his side is the majority of major news outlets, billions of dollars in campaign and advertising funds, Hollywood, and Unions. On his side is also the perception that anything he does is the right thing to do for the country, he has everyone eating out of the palm of his hands, and doing exactly what he wants them to do.¶ On one front there is Obamacare, which has seen fighting since it was passed early in his tenure as President. That is dirty, slugging, bloody political trench warfare that has seen the Democrats and the President advance steadily towards the Republican line. Key victories were when the law was upheld at the Supreme Court level, and most recently when the Republicans were defeated over the shutdown. However, with the roll out of Healthcare.gov the Democrats and President Obama have suffered setbacks and many have lost face. The website cost over half a billion dollars and does not work properly, this amounts to a hole in their line which the Republicans are now trying to exploit for further political gain. However the President is prepared for that.¶ Instead of reinforcing his line on Obamacare, he has reopened a familiar front and attacked the Republicans on Immigration. Now, Republican resources will have to be pulled from the fight against Obamacare to hold the line on the immigration fight. In the meantime, President Obama is fighting a political guerrilla campaign against the issues of Benghazi, NSA, Journalist tapping, and the IRS scandal by simply running or sidestepping any attempt at being drawn out into an open fight. What is more, he masterfully uses the media and his political allies to hammer the Republicans for pursuing these issues. He makes the Republicans look petty, and most of the time he does not even involve himself in the fight to begin with. It is a win win for him.¶ The President got it right with Obamacare, no not in the sense that he was right to federalize the healthcare system in this country, but in the sense of what it gained him politically. By passing Obamacare when the Democrats controlled the House and the Senate it offered him a unique opportunity on so many fronts. In one way, the bill could potentially bring millions of more people under the direct care and charge of the federal government. It would grow the voter base, it would allow for the government to intercede further in the lives of citizens, and it was one step closer to a single payer system, which is the dream of every socialist in the country.¶ However, one of the main political victories the ACA scored was that it provided Republicans with a fixed point to set their sights on. Obamacare provided the Republicans with the objective of trying to repeal one of the largest expansions of federal government power since the DHS and the Patriot Act. The legislation that would basically make President Obama care taker n’ chief would drive many national elections, garner millions of dollars to see it repealed, and be the sole issue that many Republicans deal with on a daily basis. And all of that, makes Obamacare a win win for President Obama whether or not the bill stands or is repealed.¶ While Republicans were busy throwing everything they had at Obamacare, Democrats opened up fronts on gun control, spending, same sex marriage, ‘don’t ask don’t tell’, taxing the rich, billions of dollars to failed energy projects, drastically increasing the power and scope of the NSA surveillance programs, targeting conservatives through the IRS, and as mentioned before suppressing journalists who do not side with him. This does not mean, or suggest, that these issues were not encountered or addressed, it is suggesting that with so much effort and so much support thrown behind defeating Obamacare, there is far less effort and far less support available to counter the abovementioned issues. With every Republican slamming Obamacare, the liberal media, as well as the President and his allies, spin it as an old white racist who does not want to help anyone. And when the old white racists attempt to address an issue such as Benghazi, or the NSA, they are accused of attempting to distract Americans from the more pressing issues of the day.¶ The most recent government shutdown saw a major, blistering defeat for the Republicans. Members of their own party gave up the fight, or saw it was not worth dying on a hill for, so they retreated in the face of what they perceived to be overwhelming odds. In a double stroke of luck for President Obama and the Democrats, the Republican party has begun to stratify and turn on one another. They are fighting themselves, and while civil war wages within the GOP the President has seized his opportunity and pushed for lawmakers to once again take up immigration issues.¶ President Obama, as said before, has reopened an old front. He has reopened an old front at a time when those who should be addressing that front on behalf of the GOP are fighting one another. The Tea Party factions will resist most or any immigration issues that deal with amnesty, but the Establishment will more than likely be willing to work with the other side of the aisle in an effort to be able to say that they worked with the other side of the aisle. With the GOP house divided, President Obama could have greater success in achieving his immigration goals while further dividing his rivals. The Tea Party even came to power in opposition to legislation such as Obamacare, but the division among the GOP has afforded the President to turn the establishment GOP on the upstart “radical” conservatives. All the while, the GOP will be distracted from confronting the President on the problems with Obamacare, and they will instead be forced to spend assets to deal with immigration reform, which is a key issue for both sides in Washington.¶ President Obama is threatening to overwhelm the GOP. With faction in-fighting, inferior numbers in Washington, and against a more than capable opponent, the Republicans will have to find a way to reconcile their differences and stand united. If the Establishment and the Tea Party Republicans do not realize that they cannot fight effectively if they are divided they will fall victim to the Obama political machine and cease to be a viable option for conservatives who wish to see the rapid expansion of government size and power curtailed in Washington.

#### Renewable energy investment causes backlash

Leone 12 (Steve, Associate Editor of Renewable Energy World, "Part 2: Political Reality and the Way Forward for Renewable Energy," 4/3/12, http://www.renewableenergyworld.com/rea/news/article/2012/04/part-2-political-reality-and-the-way-forward-for-renewable-energy)

New Hampshire, U.S.A. -- Political heavyweights know this about their rough-and-tumble game – you project victory long before the results are in. And when you think you've won, you never give your opponent an opening. In Washington, it’s hard enough to craft legislation even in relatively amicable times. In the tense atmosphere on the Hill today, meaningful legislation takes a ringside seat, and the game becomes theater. That’s where we are now. In one corner is the House budget, essentially the Republican Party’s line in the sand that’s been drawn over the size of the federal government. A key component of this is the federal government’s more limited role in supporting a clean energy future. In the other corner is the White House and the Democrat-controlled Senate, which has vowed to stonewall any legislation that it says caters to the super-wealthy and the entrenched fossil fuels industry. Like two tired boxers in the ring, they’re content to leave it in the hands of the judges — in this case the voters, who will in many ways determine the force with which our federal government pursues a national policy built on clean energy. But the real prospects for any meaningful legislation is likely to come after the election, when the rhetoric cools and when political capital comes due. Until then, most industry observers don’t expect much chance of any real federal renewable energy legislation passing through a divided Congress. That means no Clean Energy Standard, no revival of the 1603 Treasury grant program, no extension of the Production Tax Credit until the end of the year at the earliest. There are just too few vehicles that can be used to pass any of the measures, and too little trust between key negotiators to find find common ground. One of the last best hopes — the transportation bill — included an amendment that addressed some of these concerns. Ultimately, the amendment went nowhere, and the renewable industry was left looking months down the road to when something could get resolved. The question now is will it be too late. For 1603 to be brought back to life, it would require a major shift in thinking, especially in the House. The PTC has a better shot, but international players in the wind industry are already indicating that they’ll get out of the market if the credit tied to energy produced expires. Will they wait around until the end of the year to see if it can be revived? It’s increasingly looking like the answer may be no.

#### Ag industry’s collapsing now---immigration’s key

Alfonso Serrano 12, Bitter Harvest: U.S. Farmers Blame Billion-Dollar Losses on Immigration Laws, Time, 9-21-12, http://business.time.com/2012/09/21/bitter-harvest-u-s-farmers-blame-billion-dollar-losses-on-immigration-laws/

The Broetjes and an increasing number of farmers across the country say that a complex web of local and state anti-immigration laws account for acute labor shortages. With the harvest season in full bloom, stringent immigration laws have forced waves of undocumented immigrants to flee certain states for more-hospitable areas. In their wake, thousands of acres of crops have been left to rot in the fields, as farmers have struggled to compensate for labor shortages with domestic help.¶ “The enforcement of immigration policy has devastated the skilled-labor source that we’ve depended on for 20 or 30 years,” said Ralph Broetje during a recent teleconference organized by the National Immigration Forum, adding that last year Washington farmers — part of an $8 billion agriculture industry — were forced to leave 10% of their crops rotting on vines and trees. “It’s getting worse each year,” says Broetje, “and it’s going to end up putting some growers out of business if Congress doesn’t step up and do immigration reform.”¶ (MORE: Why Undocumented Workers Are Good for the Economy)¶ Roughly 70% of the 1.2 million people employed by the agriculture industry are undocumented. No U.S. industry is more dependent on undocumented immigrants. But acute labor shortages brought on by anti-immigration measures threaten to heap record losses on an industry emerging from years of stiff foreign competition. Nationwide, labor shortages will result in losses of up to $9 billion, according to the American Farm Bureau Federation.

#### Extinction

Lugar 2k Chairman of the Senator Foreign Relations Committee and Member/Former Chair of the Senate Agriculture Committee (Richard, a US Senator from Indiana, is Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and a member and former chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee. “calls for a new green revolution to combat global warming and reduce world instability,” pg online @ http://www.unep.org/OurPlanet/imgversn/143/lugar.html)

In a world confronted by global terrorism, turmoil in the Middle East, burgeoning nuclear threats and other crises, it is easy to lose sight of the long-range challenges. But we do so at our peril. One of the most daunting of them is meeting the world’s need for food and energy in this century. At stake is not only preventing starvation and saving the environment, but also world peace and security. History tells us that states may go to war over access to resources, and that poverty and famine have often bred fanaticism and terrorism. Working to feed the world will minimize factors that contribute to global instability and the proliferation of [WMDs] weapons of mass destruction. With the world population expected to grow from 6 billion people today to 9 billion by mid-century, the demand for affordable food will increase well beyond current international production levels. People in rapidly developing nations will have the means greatly to improve their standard of living and caloric intake. Inevitably, that means eating more meat. This will raise demand for feed grain at the same time that the growing world population will need vastly more basic food to eat. Complicating a solution to this problem is a dynamic that must be better understood in the West: developing countries often use limited arable land to expand cities to house their growing populations. As good land disappears, people destroy timber resources and even rainforests as they try to create more arable land to feed themselves. The long-term environmental consequences could be disastrous for the entire globe. Productivity revolution To meet the expected demand for food over the next 50 years, we in the United States will have to grow roughly three times more food on the land we have. That’s a tall order. My farm in Marion County, Indiana, for example, yields on average 8.3 to 8.6 tonnes of corn per hectare – typical for a farm in central Indiana. To triple our production by 2050, we will have to produce an annual average of 25 tonnes per hectare. Can we possibly boost output that much? Well, it’s been done before. Advances in the use of fertilizer and water, improved machinery and better tilling techniques combined to generate a threefold increase in yields since 1935 – on our farm back then, my dad produced 2.8 to 3 tonnes per hectare. Much US agriculture has seen similar increases. But of course there is no guarantee that we can achieve those results again. Given the urgency of expanding food production to meet world demand, we must invest much more in scientific research and target that money toward projects that promise to have significant national and global impact. For the United States, that will mean a major shift in the way we conduct and fund agricultural science. Fundamental research will generate the innovations that will be necessary to feed the world. The United States can take a leading position in a productivity revolution. And our success at increasing food production may play a decisive humanitarian role in the survival of billions of people and the health of our planet.

## 1NC – Warming

#### No impact---mitigation and adaptation will solve---no tipping point or “1% risk” args

Robert O. Mendelsohn 9, the Edwin Weyerhaeuser Davis Professor, Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, Yale University, June 2009, “Climate Change and Economic Growth,” online: http://www.growthcommission.org/storage/cgdev/documents/gcwp060web.pdf

The heart of the debate about climate change comes from a number of warnings from scientists and others that give the impression that human-induced climate change is an immediate threat to society (IPCC 2007a,b; Stern 2006). Millions of people might be vulnerable to health effects (IPCC 2007b), crop production might fall in the low latitudes (IPCC 2007b), water supplies might dwindle (IPCC 2007b), precipitation might fall in arid regions (IPCC 2007b), extreme events will grow exponentially (Stern 2006), and between 20–30 percent of species will risk extinction (IPCC 2007b). Even worse, there may be catastrophic events such as the melting of Greenland or Antarctic ice sheets causing severe sea level rise, which would inundate hundreds of millions of people (Dasgupta et al. 2009). Proponents argue there is no time to waste. Unless greenhouse gases are cut dramatically today, economic growth and well‐being may be at risk (Stern 2006).

These statements are largely alarmist and misleading. Although climate change is a serious problem that deserves attention, society’s immediate behavior has an extremely low probability of leading to catastrophic consequences. The science and economics of climate change is quite clear that emissions over the next few decades will lead to only mild consequences. The severe impacts predicted by alarmists require a century (or two in the case of Stern 2006) of no mitigation. Many of the predicted impacts assume there will be no or little adaptation. The net economic impacts from climate change over the next 50 years will be small regardless. Most of the more severe impacts will take more than a century or even a millennium to unfold and many of these “potential” impacts will never occur because people will adapt. It is not at all apparent that immediate and dramatic policies need to be developed to thwart long‐range climate risks. What is needed are long‐run balanced responses.

#### Warming is slow – and not real

Taylor ’11 (7/27- senior fellow for environment policy at the Heartland Institute (2011, “New NASA Data Blow Gaping Hole In Global Warming Alarmism,” Forbes, http://blogs.forbes.com/jamestaylor/2011/07/27/new-nasa-data-blow-gaping-hold-in-global-warming-alarmism/)

NASA satellite data from the years 2000 through 2011 show the Earth’s atmosphere is allowing far more heat to be released into space than alarmist computer models have predicted, reports a new study in the peer-revewed science journal Remote Sensing. The study indicates far less future global warming will occur than United Nations computer models have predicted, and supports prior studies indicating increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide trap far less heat than alarmists have claimed. Study co-author Dr. Roy Spencer, a principal research scientist at the University of Alabama in Huntsville and U.S. Science Team Leader for the Advanced Microwave Scanning Radiometer flying on NASA’s Aqua satellite, reports that real-world data from NASA’s Terra satellite contradict multiple assumptions fed into alarmist computer models. “The satellite observations suggest there is much more energy lost to space during and after warming than the climate models show,” Spencer said in a July 26 University of Alabama press release. “There is a huge discrepancy between the data and the forecasts that is especially big over the oceans.” In addition to finding that far less heat is being trapped than alarmist computer models have predicted, the NASA satellite data show the atmosphere begins shedding heat into space long before United Nations computer models predicted. The new findings are extremely important and should dramatically alter the global warming debate. Scientists on all sides of the global warming debate are in general agreement about how much heat is being directly trapped by human emissions of carbon dioxide (the answer is “not much”). However, the single most important issue in the global warming debate is whether carbon dioxide emissions will indirectly trap far more heat by causing large increases in atmospheric humidity and cirrus clouds. Alarmist computer models assume human carbon dioxide emissions indirectly cause substantial increases in atmospheric humidity and cirrus clouds (each of which are very effective at trapping heat), but real-world data have long shown that carbon dioxide emissions are not causing as much atmospheric humidity and cirrus clouds as the alarmist computer models have predicted. The new NASA Terra satellite data are consistent with long-term NOAA and NASA data indicating atmospheric humidity and cirrus clouds are not increasing in the manner predicted by alarmist computer models. The Terra satellite data also support data collected by NASA’s ERBS satellite showing far more longwave radiation (and thus, heat) escaped into space between 1985 and 1999 than alarmist computer models had predicted. Together, the NASA ERBS and Terra satellite data show that for 25 years and counting, carbon dioxide emissions have directly and indirectly trapped far less heat than alarmist computer models have predicted. In short, the central premise of alarmist global warming theory is that carbon dioxide emissions should be directly and indirectly trapping a certain amount of heat in the earth’s atmosphere and preventing it from escaping into space. Real-world measurements, however, show far less heat is being trapped in the earth’s atmosphere than the alarmist computer models predict, and far more heat is escaping into space than the alarmist computer models predict. When objective NASA satellite data, reported in a peer-reviewed scientific journal, show a “huge discrepancy” between alarmist climate models and real-world facts, climate scientists, the media and our elected officials would be wise to take notice. Whether or not they do so will tell us a great deal about how honest the purveyors of global warming alarmism truly are.

#### Impossible to cut emissions – no modeling or momentum

Mead 10 (Walter Russell, senior fellow for U.S. foreign policy at the Council on Foreign Relations, The Death of Global Warming, February 1, <http://blogs.the-american-interest.com/wrm/2010/02/01/the-death-of-global-warming/>)

The global warming movement as we have known it is dead. Its health had been in steady decline during the last year as the once robust hopes for a strong and legally binding treaty to be agreed upon at the Copenhagen Summit faded away. By the time that summit opened, campaigners were reduced to hoping for a ‘politically binding’ agreement to be agreed that would set the stage for the rapid adoption of the legally binding treaty. After the failure of the summit to agree to even that much, the movement went into a rapid decline. The movement died from two causes: bad science and bad politics. After years in which global warming activists had lectured everyone about the overwhelming nature of the scientific evidence, it turned out that the most prestigious agencies in the global warming movement were breaking laws, hiding data, and making inflated, bogus claims resting on, in some cases, no scientific basis at all. This latest story in the London Times is yet another shocker; the IPCC’s claims that the rainforests were going to disappear as a result of global warming are as bogus and fraudulent as its claims that the Himalayan glaciers would melt by 2035. It seems as if a scare story could grab a headline, the IPCC simply didn’t care about whether it was reality-based. With this in mind, ‘climategate’ — the scandal over hacked emails by prominent climate scientists — looks sinister rather than just unsavory. The British government has concluded that University of East Anglia, home of the research institute that provides the global warming with much of its key data, had violated Britain’s Freedom of Information Act when scientists refused to hand over data so that critics could check their calculations and methods. Breaking the law to hide key pieces of data isn’t just ‘science as usual,’ as the global warming movement’s embattled defenders gamely tried to argue. A cover-up like that suggests that you indeed have something to conceal. The urge to make the data better than it was didn’t just come out of nowhere. The global warmists were trapped into the necessity of hyping the threat by their realization that the actual evidence they had — which, let me emphasize, all hype aside, is serious, troubling and establishes in my mind the need for intensive additional research and investigation, as well as some prudential steps that would reduce CO2 emissions by enhancing fuel use efficiency and promoting alternative energy sources — was not sufficient to get the world’s governments to do what they thought needed to be done. Hyping the threat increasingly doesn’t look like an accident: it looks like it was a conscious political strategy. Now it has failed. Not everything that has come out of the IPCC and the East Anglia Climate Unit is false, but enough of their product is sufficiently tainted that these institutions can best serve the cause of fighting climate change by stepping out of the picture. New leadership might help, but everything these two agencies have done will now have to be re-checked by independent and objective sources. The global warming campaigners got into this mess because they had a deeply flawed political strategy. They were never able to develop a pragmatic approach that could reach its goals in the context of the existing international system. The global warming movement proposed a complex set of international agreements involving vast transfers of funds, intrusive regulations in national economies, and substantial changes to the domestic political economies of most countries on the planet. As it happened, the movement never got to the first step — it never got the world’s countries to agree to the necessary set of treaties, transfers and policies that would constitute, at least on paper, a program for achieving its key goals. Even if that first step had been reached, the second and third would almost surely not have been. The United States Congress is unlikely to pass the kind of legislation these agreements would require before the midterm elections, much less ratify a treaty. (It takes 67 senate votes to ratify a treaty and only 60 to overcome a filibuster.) After the midterms, with the Democrats expected to lose seats in both houses, the chance of passage would be even more remote — especially as polls show that global warming ranks at or near the bottom of most voters’ priorities. American public opinion supports ‘doing something’ about global warming, but not very much; support for specific measures and sacrifices will erode rapidly as commentators from Fox News and other conservative outlets endlessly hammer away. Without a commitment from the United States to pay its share of the $100 billion plus per year that poor countries wanted as their price for compliance, and without US participation in other aspects of the proposed global approach, the intricate global deals fall apart. Since the United States was never very likely to accept these agreements and ratify these treaties, and is even less prepared to do so in a recession with the Democrats in retreat, even “success” in Copenhagen would not have brought the global warming movement the kind of victory it sought — although it would have created a very sticky and painful political problem for the United States. But even if somehow, miraculously, the United States and all the other countries involved not only accepted the agreements but ratified them and wrote domestic legislation to incorporate them into law, it is extremely unlikely that all this activity would achieve the desired result. Countries would cheat, either because they chose to do so or because their domestic systems are so weak, so corrupt or so both that they simply wouldn’t be able to comply. Governments in countries like China and India aren’t going to stop pushing for all the economic growth they can get by any means that will work — and even if central governments decided to move on global warming, state and local authorities have agendas of their own. The examples of blatant cheating would inevitably affect compliance in other countries; it would also very likely erode what would in any case be an extremely fragile consensus in rich countries to keep forking over hundreds of billions of dollars to poor countries — many of whom would not be in anything like full compliance with their commitments. For better or worse, the global political system isn’t capable of producing the kind of result the global warming activists want. It’s like asking a jellyfish to climb a flight of stairs; you can poke and prod all you want, you can cajole and you can threaten. But you are asking for something that you just can’t get — and at the end of the day, you won’t get it. The grieving friends and relatives aren’t ready to pull the plug; in a typical, whistling-past-the-graveyard comment, the BBC first acknowledges that even if the current promises are kept, temperatures will rise above the target level of two degrees Celsius — but let’s not despair! The BBC quotes one of its own reporters: “BBC environment reporter Matt McGrath says the accord lacks teeth and does not include any clear targets on cutting emissions. But if most countries at least signal what they intend to do to cut their emissions, it will mark the first time that the UN has a comprehensive written collection of promised actions, he says.”

#### Latin America will never adopt renewables – fossil fuels are too economically viable and oil lobby.

Meisen and Krumpel 09– President of the Global Energy Network Institute / Research-Associate at GENI (Peter and Sebastian, “Renewable Energy Potential of Latin America”, December 2009; < http://www.geni.org/globalenergy/research/renewable-energy-potential-of-latin-america/Potential%20of%20Renewables%20in%20Latin%20America-edited-12-16%20\_Letter\_.pdf>)//Beddow

In reality the situation of renewable energies in Latin America is not as positive or optimistic as we might want to think, or as certain statistical data lead us to believe. There are many problems associated with the implementation of renewables as well as their impact on the environment and society. In this context, the main problem for renewable energies in Latin America is in the way energy and development policies have been construct ed. In most cases, energy policies and strategies in Latin America have excluded renewables and other alternatives as being too costly and technologically unfeasible, or by arguing that the country does not have the capabilities to implement them. The easiest explanation for this, and one which is usually mentioned, is the lack of incentive and foresight. **Since the region has an abundance of resources such as oil, gas, and hydro, it is in general easier, cheaper and more technically feasible to keep exploiting conventional energy resources than to in vest in renewable energies or create appropriate renewable energy policies**. Another common explanation is that **the development of renewable energies clash wi th the interest of powerful players, particularly large energy companies, and, therefore, there are few incentives to promote them.**

#### Renewables can’t solve warming – they supplement, not replace, dirty energy

Angus 12– ecosocialist advocate, citing an extensive study by Richard York, professor at the University of Oregon with an MS in Environmental Studies from Bemidji State University (Iran, “Green energy won’t save the earth without social change”, 3/21/12; < http://climateandcapitalism.com/2012/03/21/green-energy-alone-wont-save-the-earth/>)//Beddow

The most popular techno-fix for global warming is green energy. If energy companies would only deploy wind, hydro, solar, geothermal or nuclear, then emission-intensive fossil fuels will eventually disappear. But will that actually work? A new study by Richard York of the University of Oregon shows that it isn’t that simple. **Rather than displacing fossil fuels, green energy sources have proven to be mostly additive.** “Do alternative energy sources displace fossil fuels?” published this month in Nature Climate Change, discusses what happened when alternative energy sources were introduced in countries around the world, over the past fifty years. Contrary to the accepted wisdom that new green energy replaces fossil-fuel use, York found that on average each unit of energy use from non-fossil-fuel sources displaced less than a quarter of a unit of energy use from fossil-fuel sources. The picture is worse with electricity, where **each new unit generated from green sources displaced less than one-tenth of a unit of fossil-fuel-generated electricity.** York writes: “Based on all of the results presented above, the answer to the question presented in the title of this paper – do alternative energy sources displace fossil fuels? – is yes, but only very modestly. **The common assumption that the expansion of production of alternative energy will suppress fossil-fuel energy production in equal proportion is clearly wrong**.” Why don’t the new sources replace the old? York identifies two key reasons: the inertia of a huge existing fossil-fuel infrastructure, and the power and influence of the coal and oil corporations. **“The failure of non-fossil energy sources to displace fossil ones is probably in part attributable to the established energy system where there is a lock-in to using fossil fuels as the base energy source because of their long-standing prevalence and existing infrastructure and to the political and economic power of the fossil-fuel industry**.” In other words, eliminating fossil-fuel as an energy source is at least as much a social and political problem as a technical one. “Of course all societies need energy. So, obviously, if societies are to stop using fossil fuels they must have other energy sources. However, the results from the analyses presented here indicate that the shift away from fossil fuel does not happen inevitably with the expansion of non-fossil-fuel sources, or at least in the political and economic contexts that have been dominant over the past fifty years around the world…. “The most effective strategy for curbing carbon emissions is likely to be one that aims to not only develop non-fossil energy sources, but also to find ways to alter political and economic contexts so that fossil-fuel energy is more easily displaced and to curtail the growth in energy consumption as much as possible. “A general implication of these findings is that polices aimed at addressing global climate change should not focus principally on developing technological fixes, but should also take into account human behaviour in the context of political, economic and social systems.” The evidence shows that simply introducing green energy isn’t enough: the introduction must be accompanied by “explicit policies aimed at reducing carbon emissions.” The article is published in a scientific journal, where political and social conclusions can only be expressed in muted form. But Richard York’s research and conclusions reinforce the argument that he and his co-authors (John Bellamy Foster and Brett Clark) made more explicitly in their recent book, The Ecological Rift: Capitalism’s War on the Planet. “We are confronting the question of a terminal crisis, threatening most life on the planet, civilization, and the very existence of future generations. … attempts to solve this through technological fixes, market magic, and the idea of a ‘sustainable capitalism’ are mere forms of ecological denial, since they ignore the inherent destructiveness of the current system of unsustainable development – capitalism.”

#### Mexico isn’t key – other countries emit more than Mexico – need to solve their renewables

#### It’s a double-bind: either market forces will drive innovation absent the aff, or the plan can’t stimulate investment.

Taylor and Van Doren 11– critic of federal energy and environmental policy, Wall Street Journal Contributor, served on congressional advisory bodies, member of International Association for Energy economics, writer for *The Energy Journal,* testified in Congress / editor of the quarterly journal *Regulation* and expert in the regulation of energy and environment, taught at the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton University, School of Organization and Management at Yale University, and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, former postdoctoral fellow in political economy at Carnegie Mellon University (Jerry and Peter, “The Green Energy Economy Reconsidered” 4/25/11; < http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/green-energy-economy-reconsidered>)//Beddow

Let’s assume, however, that we could afford that. Have we ever seen such a “green economy”? Yes we have; in the 13th century. Renewable energy is quite literally the energy of yesterday. Few seem to realize that we abandoned “green” energy centuries ago for five very good reasons. First, green energy is diffuse, and **it takes a tremendous amount of land and material to harness even a little bit of energy**. Jesse Ausubel, director of the Program for the Human Environment and senior research associate at Rockefeller University, calculates, for instance, that the entire state of Connecticut (that is, if Connecticut were as windy as the southeastern Colorado plains) would need to be devoted to wind turbines to power the city of New York. Second, **it is extremely costly.** In 2016 President Obama’s own Energy Information Administration estimates that onshore wind (the least expensive of these green energies) will be **80% more expensive than combined cycle, gas-fired electricity.** And that doesn’t account for the costs associated with the **hundreds of billions of dollars worth of new transmission systems that would be necessary to get wind and solar energy — which is generally produced far from where consumers happen to live — to ratepayers. Third, it is unreliable. The wind doesn’t always blow and the sun doesn’t always shine when the energy is needed**. We account for that today by having a lot of coal and natural gas generation on “standby” to fire-up when renewables can’t produce. Incidentally, the cost of maintaining this backup generation is likewise never fully accounted for in the cost estimates associated with green energy. But in a world where fossil fuels are a thing of the past, we would be forced — like the peasants of the Dark Age — to rely upon the vagaries of the weather. Fourth, it is scarce. While wind and sunlight are obviously not scarce, **the real estate where those energies are reliably continuous and in economic proximity to ratepayers is scarce.** Finally, **once the electricity is produced by the sun or wind, it cannot be stored because battery technology is not currently up to the task**. Hence, we must immediately “use it or lose it.” **Fossil fuels are everything that green energy is not.** Approximately 1,000 cubic feet of natural gas (which cost approximately $4.00) can generate the same amount of electricity as running an average rooftop solar system for 131 days. It is comparatively cheap. It is reliable; it will burn and produce energy whenever you want it. It is plentiful (we use only a tiny bit of oil in the electricity sector). And you can store fossil fuels until you need them. Proponents of green energy argue that if the government can put a man on the moon, it can certainly make green energy economically attractive. Well, notice that government was not trying to get a man to the moon profitably, which is more akin to the challenge here. Even before the Obama presidency began, about half the production costs of wind and solar energy were underwritten by the taxpayer to no commercial avail. There’s little reason to think that a more sustained, multi-decade commitment to subsidy would play out any differently. After all, the federal government once promised that nuclear energy was on the cusp of being “too cheap to meter.” That was in the 1950s. Sixty-one billion dollars of subsidies and impossible-to-price regulatory preferences later, it’s still the most expensive source of conventional energy on the grid. The fundamental question that green energy proponents must answer is this: if green energy is so inevitable and such a great investment, why do we need to subsidize it? If and when renewable energy makes economic sense, profit-hungry investors will build all that we need for us without government needing to lift a finger. But **if it doesn’t make economic sense, all of the subsidies in the world won’t change that fact.**

## 1NC – US Economy

#### No war

Miller 2K Morris Professor of Administration @ the University of Ottawa,

(Interdisciplinary Science Review, v 25 n4 2000 p ingenta connect)

The question may be reformulated. Do wars spring from a popular reaction to a sudden economic crisis that exacerbates poverty and growing disparities in wealth and incomes? Perhaps one could argue, as some scholars do, that it is some dramatic event or sequence of such events leading to the exacerbation of poverty that, in turn, leads to this deplorable denouement. This exogenous factor might act as a catalyst for a violent reaction on the part of the people or on the part of the political leadership who would then possibly be tempted to seek a diversion by finding or, if need be, fabricating an enemy and setting in train the process leading to war. According to a study under- taken by Minxin Pei and Ariel Adesnik of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, there would not appear to be any merit in this hypothesis. After studying ninety-three episodes of economic crisis in twenty-two countries in Latin America and Asia in the years since the Second World War they concluded that:19 Much of the conventional wisdom about the political impact of economic crises may be wrong ... The severity of economic crisis – as measured in terms of inflation and negative growth – bore no relationship to the collapse of regimes ... (or, in democratic states, rarely) to an outbreak of violence ... In the cases of dictatorships and semi-democracies, the ruling elites responded to crises by increasing repression (thereby using one form of violence to abort another).

#### **The US isn’t key to the global economy**

Merrill Lynch 6 (Merrill Lynch, “US Downturn Won’t Derail World Economy”, 9-18, http://www.ml.com/index.asp?id=7695\_7696\_8149\_63464\_70786\_71164)

A sharp slowdown in the U.S. economy in 2007 is unlikely to drag the rest of the global economy down with it, according to a research report by Merrill Lynch’s (NYSE: MER) global economic team. The good news is that there are strong sources of growth outside the U.S. that should prove resilient to a consumer-led U.S. slowdown. Merrill Lynch economists expect U.S. GDP growth to slow to 1.9 percent in 2007 from 3.4 percent in 2006, but non-U.S. growth to decline by only half a percent (5.2 percent versus 5.7 percent). Behind this decoupling is higher non-U.S. domestic demand, a rise in intraregional trade and supportive macroeconomic policies in many of the world’s economies. Although some countries appear very vulnerable to a U.S. slowdown, one in five is actually on course for faster GDP growth in 2007. Asia, Japan and India appear well placed to decouple from the United States, though Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore are more likely to be impacted. European countries could feel the pinch, but rising domestic demand in the core countries should help the region weather the storm much better than in previous U.S. downturns. In the Americas, Canada will probably be hit, but Brazil is set to decouple.

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

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

The final outcome addresses a dog that hasn’t barked: the effect of the Great Recession on cross-border conflict and violence. During the initial stages of the crisis, multiple analysts asserted that the financial crisis would lead states to increase their use of force as a tool for staying in power.37 Whether through greater internal repression, diversionary wars, arms races, or a ratcheting up of great power conflict, there were genuine concerns that the global economic downturn would lead to an increase in conflict. Violence in the Middle East, border disputes in the South China Sea, and even the disruptions of the Occupy movement fuel impressions of surge in global public disorder.

The aggregate data suggests otherwise, however. The Institute for Economics and Peace has constructed a “Global Peace Index” annually since 2007. A key conclusion they draw from the 2012 report is that “The average level of peacefulness in 2012 is approximately the same as it was in 2007.”38 Interstate violence in particular has declined since the start of the financial crisis – as have military expenditures in most sampled countries. Other studies confirm that the Great Recession has not triggered any increase in violent conflict; the secular decline in violence that started with the end of the Cold War has not been reversed.39 Rogers Brubaker concludes, “the crisis has not to date generated the surge in protectionist nationalism or ethnic exclusion that might have been expected.”40

None of these data suggest that the global economy is operating swimmingly. Growth remains unbalanced and fragile, and has clearly slowed in 2012. Transnational capital flows remain depressed compared to pre-crisis levels, primarily due to a drying up of cross-border interbank lending in Europe. Currency volatility remains an ongoing concern. Compared to the aftermath of other postwar recessions, growth in output, investment, and employment in the developed world have all lagged behind. But the Great Recession is not like other postwar recessions in either scope or kind; expecting a standard “V”-shaped recovery was unreasonable. One financial analyst characterized the post-2008 global economy as in a state of “contained depression.”41 The key word is “contained,” however. Given the severity, reach and depth of the 2008 financial crisis, the proper comparison is with Great Depression. And by that standard, the outcome variables look impressive. As Carmen Reinhart and Kenneth Rogoff concluded in This Time is Different: “that its macroeconomic outcome has been only the most severe global recession since World War II – and not even worse – must be regarded as fortunate.”42

#### Plan trades off with US jobs

GNEB 11 – Good Neighbor Environmental Board, The Good Neighbor Environmental Board was created in 1992 by the Enterprise for the Americas ¶ Initiative Act, Public Law 102-532.The purpose of the Board is to “advise the President and the ¶ Congress on the need for implementation of environmental and infrastructure projects (including ¶ projects that affect agriculture, rural development, and human nutrition) within the States of the ¶ United States contiguous to Mexico in order to improve the quality of life of persons residing on ¶ the United States side of the border.” ¶ The Board is charged with submitting an annual report to the President and the Congress. ¶ Management responsibilities for the Board were delegated to the Administrator of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency by Executive Order 12916 on May 13, 1994

(“The Potential Environmental and Economic Benefits of Renewable Energy Development in the U.S.-Mexico Border Region,” http://www.epa.gov/ofacmo/gneb/gneb14threport/English-GNEB-14th-Report.pdf)//BB

Some wind and geothermal developments in Mexico already are serving the California markets. The ¶ Los Angeles Department of Water and Power has a contract with Cerro Prieto, a geothermal development ¶ near Mexicali, to import some 50 MWs of power through a PPA.¶ 112 Most recently, Sempra, which owns ¶ San Diego Gas and Electric (SDG&E), has proposed a new cross-border transmission line to bring wind ¶ from the Sierra Juárez Wind Project into the California market. The more recent wind energy project, La ¶ Rumorosa in Baja California, is being developed in part to serve the Southern California market, although ¶ significant transmission constraints remain to fully develop these resources.¶ 113 The development of ¶ renewable energy in Mexico to provide power to the U.S. market has sparked concern over potential job ¶ displacement and the loss of economic development opportunities in the United States.

#### Unemployment impedes economic growth

Levine 13 (Linda Levine is a Specialist in Labor Economics, “Economic Growth and the Unemployment Rate”, January 7, 2013, http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R42063.pdf)

Thus, the key to the long-run relationship between changes in the rates of GDP growth and ¶ unemployment is the rate of growth in potential output. Potential output is an unobservable ¶ measure of the capacity of the economy to produce goods and services when available resources, ¶ such as labor and capital, are fully utilized. The rate of growth of potential output is a function of ¶ the rate of growth in potential productivity and the labor supply when the economy is at full ¶ employment.4 When the unemployment rate is high, as it is now, then actual GDP falls short of ¶ potential GDP. This is referred to as the output gap. ¶ In the absence of productivity growth, as long as each new addition to the labor force is ¶ employed, growth in output will equal growth in the labor supply. If the rate of GDP growth falls ¶ below the rate of labor force growth, there will not be enough new jobs created to accommodate ¶ all new job seekers. As a result, the proportion of the labor force that is employed will fall. Put ¶ differently, the unemployment rate will rise. If the rate of output growth exceeds the rate of labor ¶ force growth, some of the new jobs created by employers to satisfy the rising demand for their ¶ goods and services will be filled by drawing from the pool of unemployed workers. In other ¶ words, the unemployment rate will fall.5¶ If GDP growth equals labor force growth in the presence of productivity growth, more people ¶ will be entering the labor force than are needed to produce a given amount of goods and services. ¶ The share of the labor force that is employed will fall. Expressed differently, the unemployment ¶ rate will rise. Only as long as GDP growth exceeds the combined growth rates of the labor force ¶ and productivity (potential output) will the unemployment rate fall in the long run.

#### Turns the advantage

Castells- Quintana and Royula 12 (David Castells-Quintana BA in Economics from the Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona and Vicente Royuela economic researcher at Universitat de Barcelona,“Unemployment and long-run economic growth:The role of income inequality and urbanisation”, June 27th 2012, [http://www.aecr.org/images/ImatgesArticles/2012/12/7\_David\_Castells\_Quintana,\_Vicente\_Royuela.pdf](http://www.aecr.org/images/ImatgesArticles/2012/12/7_David_Castells_Quintana%2C_Vicente_Royuela.pdf), p. 155-156)

Unemployment may be associated with structural change and subsequent economic growth. Here, we focus on the mechanisms through which high and persistent ¶ unemployment may directly hinder economic growth. In the short run, economic¶ growth and unemployment are inversely related along the business cycle. However, ¶ structural unemployment mainly depends on factors related to the characteristics of ¶ the labour market. Moreover, when unemployment becomes high and persistent there ¶ are economic costs that can become detrimental to long-run growth. Unemployment ¶ not only represents a high social cost for the individual, it also represents a high economic cost for the society (Sanchis-i-Marco, 2011).¶ In the first place, high unemployment implies an inefficient use of resources ¶ and wasted work, not performed by the unemployed, which can never be recovered. ¶ Secondly, high unemployment also implies a lower aggregate demand; not only is ¶ consumption lower, harming current growth, but private investment in physical and ¶ human capital is also reduced, harming future production capacities. In this line, ¶ Bean and Pissarides (1993) analyse how unemployment may have an adverse effect on growth through lower savings available for investment. On the other hand, ¶ Chaterjee and Corbae (2007) report welfare costs of the Great Depression unemployment through lower consumption in the long-run. In parallel to this, high unemployment increases fiscal burden, through lower income revenues and higher ¶ welfare spending. A higher fiscal burden is likely to reduce public investment and to ¶ increase public debt, which handicaps future growth capacities 3. In the third place, ¶ unemployment can lead to an erosion of human capital; people unemployed for ¶ long periods may become de-skilled, as their professional skills become obsolete ¶ in an era of rapid technological change and associated rapidly changing job market ¶ (Pissarides, 1992). Martin and Rogers (2000) suggest that when growth is generated ¶ by learning-by-doing, short-term macroeconomic instability reduces human capital ¶ accumulation and therefore growth. Moreover, as unemployed workers become deskilled, their chances of finding a new job in the future decrease, initiating a vicious ¶ cycle. The time dimension is present in the «unemployment hysteresis hypothesis», ¶ according to which small increases in unemployment may result in pockets of longterm unemployment, as long-term unemployed do not perform a hard search for ¶ jobs and therefore do not exercise sufficient downward pressure on wages (Layard, ¶ Nickell and Jackman, 1991). Relatedly, Andrienko and Guriev (2004) found that ¶ high unemployment results in liquidity constraints, restricting labour migration and ¶ resulting in persistent unemployment and lower economic growth. Finally, high and ¶ persistent unemployment erodes individual self-esteem and life satisfaction, and ¶ confidence in the society as a whole (Ochsen and Welsch, 2011). Lower confidence ¶ and socio-economic deprivation, exclusion and marginalisation from unemployment increase social dislocation, leading to unrest and conflict (ILO, 2011) and ¶ decreasing labour market performance (Mares and Sirovátka, 2005), thus harming ¶ long-run growth.

# Block

**Firms like these**

**Bruns 11** (Adam, Managing Editor – Site Selection (Magazine about Real Estate Strategy and Economic Development, “Crossing Boundaries,” Site Selection, August, <http://www.siteselection.com/theEnergyReport/2011/aug/energy-storage.cfm>)

energy storage and smart grid firm Rubenius

Yea it includes wind..

SmartGrid News 12, http://www.smartgridnews.com/artman/publish/Technologies\_DG\_Renewables/Mexico-s-plan-to-ride-the-wind-to-a-secure-energy-future-4792.html#.UnQSoJQaeMw

Mexico is betting on its more than substantial wind energy resources to take it to the next level in its ambitious plan to build a secure energy future. And it's doing its best to prove it with the recent opening of Latin America's largest wind park.

 Smart grid, smart grid technologies, renewable energy, wind power, global business

Quoted in a Reuters news article, President Felipe Calderon said, "We're talking about the largest growth in wind power projects anywhere in the world" during the wind park's opening near La Ventosa in the southern state of Oaxaca. The park, owned by Spanish company Acciona SA, takes advantage one of the world's strongest wind tunnels on a narrow strip of land between the Pacific Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico.

Nuclear war destroys the ozone layer

Martin 82

[Brian Martin professor of social sciences at the University of Wollongong Journal of Peace Research, 1982, http://www.uow.edu.au/arts/sts/bmartin/pubs/82jpr.html]

 (b) Ozone. Nuclear war would cause an increase in ultraviolet light from the sun which reaches the earth's surface, due to reductions in stratospheric ozone caused by its catalytic destruction by nitrogen oxides produced in nuclear explosions. This would increase the incidence of skin cancer (which is mostly non-lethal) and possibly alter agricultural productivity, but would be most unlikely to cause widespread death.[7]

#### Optimistic climate

Jeanine Prezioso 10/10, Writer for Reuters, (“Yom Kippur War Tweet Prompts Higher Oil Prices”, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/10/10/yom-kippur-war-tweet-oil-prices-traders_n_4079634.html>, AW)

Oil prices jumped more than $2 to their highest in a month on Thursday on growing hope for a deal to extend funding of the U.S. government and concerns over supplies from Libya and the Middle East. Oil rose initially on news that Libyan Prime Minister Ali Zeidan was captured and held for several hours by former rebel militia. Later in the morning, a Twitter post commemorating the Yom Kippur war spooked traders, who initially mistook it as news of a serious escalation in Middle East violence. Brent crude oil gained steadily across the session, rising by $2.66 to $111.72 as of 1:11 p.m. EDT (1711 GMT).

Most predictive – November crude

Wallace Witowski 10/10, Marketwatch – WSJ, (“Oil futures end higher as OPEC output drops”, <http://www.marketwatch.com/story/oil-manages-meager-bounce-after-pullback-2013-10-09>, AW)

Oil futures rose Thursday after the Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries reported a drop in its September output and as the kidnapping of Libya’s prime minister renewed concerns over oil supplies from the Middle East and North Africa. Crude for November delivery CLX3 +1.30% climbed $1.40, or 1.4%, to settle at $103.01 a barrel on the New York Mercantile Exchange. That didn’t quite make up for Wednesday’s decline when the Nymex price of oil fell 1.8% pressured by data showing crude stockpiles for the week ended Oct. 4 rose by 6.8 million barrels, which was around three times more than expected.

#### **Plan causes a Saudi flood – massively increases output – the brink is now**

Rahemtulla 7/30 – Karim, Chief Investment Director of Oil and Energy Daily, BA in Economics and MA in Finance, (“Will Saudi Arabia Go Nuclear With An Oil Supply Shock?”, <http://www.oilandenergydaily.com/2013/07/30/saudi-arabia-oil-supply/>, AW)

The big advantage that Saudi Arabia has over the United States is that its oil is cheaper to extract. You see, Saudi oil sits very close to the surface and it’s not embedded in rock the way shale oil is. It doesn’t carry the added costs of labor and technology. All told, it only costs about $20 per barrel to extract, compared to the $80 to $90 per barrel it costs to get oil from shale. So Saudi Arabia and others could withstand much lower oil prices, whereas U.S. producers would be forced to cut their production if the price of crude fell to, say, $70 per barrel. Now, with oil trading over $100 per barrel, that’s not a problem… yet. But as we recently pointed out, oil prices are much higher than they should be right now. Fundamentally speaking, prices should be $20 to $30 lower. And if U.S. production continues to increase at its current pace, they will be. So what will happen if Saudi Arabia and other OPEC countries attempt to drive them lower by raising production? Prices would collapse to the point that producing oil from shale would be a money-losing endeavor. Think it can’t happen? Think again. Saudi Arabia is home to the world’s most prolific, consistent daily production of crude oil and the second-largest reserves in the world. The kingdom currently produces 12.5 million barrels per day. It has the capacity to produce another 2.5 million barrels per day. There just isn’t enough demand at current prices. Through its influence over OPEC, it can pretty much set the price for more than one third of the world’s daily oil usage of around 100 million barrels. So even if it doesn’t sell as much oil to the United States – most of our imports come from Canada, Venezuela and Mexico – Saudi Arabia is still a major factor in the price of the oil that we consume. More importantly, the Saudi royal family will do anything to maintain their grip on their kingdom, as well as their own personal power, prestige and wealth. If that means selling oil at a loss, so be it. The kingdom has NO other source of income and NO other choice. If Saudi Arabia were to feel a genuine threat, it could open the spigot and flood the market… literally. The other OPEC members would follow suit, as most are in the same boat as Saudi Arabia – with no other source of revenue and leaderships that are dependent on the largesse from oil sales. And if you want to get an idea of what can happen in an industry when supply increases faster than demand, or when prices plunge by more than half, just look at what happened to natural gas prices over the past decade. Wells sit idle and companies cut back production. So while oil may be trading at $106 per barrel today, it could just as easily be trading at half that price a few years from now, and that’s not even counting the increasing downward pressure from alternative energy sources like natural gas.

#### ALSO – speculation of the plan creates an immediate impact

Brannon, 12 **–** (Ike Brannon, Associated Press Staff Writer for National Review. March 29, 2012. “Domestic Oil Policies Do Impact Oil Prices,” http://www.nationalreview.com/corner/294768/domestic-oil-policies-do-impact-oil-prices-ike-brannon)//SDL

¶ If a speculator expects prices to rise in the future, he will make large investments in oil today that he may then sell at the later, higher price. For those with the means, there is much money to be made in this way, and the actions of speculators can and do influence the world price of oil. The expectation of higher prices leads to greater consumption which, like any increase in demand, leads to higher prices, creating a self-fulfilling prophesy.¶ ¶ It works the opposite way as well: If speculators began to anticipate prices falling in the future, they would want to sell their shares sooner rather than later, since delaying will force them to accept lower prices. This would result in an immediate increase in supply, which would in turn bring down prices today.

#### Declining oil prices trigger economic crisis in Russia

**Bush, 12 –** (Jason Bush, Associated Press Staff Writer for Reuters. July 2, 2012. “Oil-price slide highlights risks to Putin's Russia,” http://uk.reuters.com/article/2012/07/02/uk-russia-oil-idUKLNE86102820120702)//SDL

Falling oil prices could trigger a prolonged slump in Russia that would lay bare the growing fiscal risks, threatening President Vladimir Putin's election promise to increase wages and fanning public discontent.¶ The world's largest oil producer is well-placed in the short run to withstand sliding prices, thanks to sizeable cash reserves and a flexible rouble. An d P u tin, who returned to the Kremlin after March's election, is still widely popular.¶ But the oil price has fallen by over $30 dollars in the last three months, to close to $90 per barrel, and may fall further, narrowing his room for budgetary manoeuvre just as mass protests have underscored dissatisfaction with the government.¶ "This is not the best start for the new government," said Peter Westin, chief strategist Aton brokerage in Moscow.¶ "If the oil price is temporarily at these levels, or even lower, it's not a huge problem. The issue is whether it stays there."¶ Oil and gas taxes account for around half of revenues raised by the federal budget, which Putin, as prime minister, used to boost public sector pay and pensions as a way of overcoming the 2009 economic slump.¶ Putin, who has taken a more populist approach to dealing with his declining popularity, promised even more public sector pay rises as part of his election campaign.¶ While that would cushion the immediate blow of any slowdown, running down the fiscal reserves to maintain high social spending would only increase Russia's long-term vulnerability to yet another oil price shock.¶ "In the short term they can sustain a very low oil price, but they need to address the structural problems in health, education and pensions," said Ivan Tchakarov, chief Russia economist at Renaissance Capital.¶ "This is not a sustainable fiscal policy, there's no question about it."¶ DEPENDENCY¶ The last time oil prices fell so precipitously, in 2009, Russia's economy slumped by a dramatic 8 percent. Collapsing oil was also a catalyst for Russia's 1998 economic crisis that ended in devaluation and default.¶ Putin, in his annual statement on the budget on Thursday, acknowledged that Russia's reliance on energy prices was one of its biggest policy headaches.¶ "The Russian budgetary system is highly dependent on the situation on world commodity markets," he said. "This limits the opportunities for budget manoeuvre."¶ For now, Finance Minister Anton Siluanov has earmarked $6 billion that could be spent in 2012 f rom a budget rainy-day fund should a deteriorating global economy drag on growth in Russia.¶ "We hope we don't have to make use of these measures, because the steps being taken by the government and central bank are sufficient," Siluanov said.¶ He trimmed his 2013 budget deficit forecast to 1.5 percent of gross domestic product, assuming an average oil price of $97 per barrel. The fiscal plan will help keep the national debt, now around 10 percent of GDP, manageably low.¶ BUFFER¶ Analysts say the impact on Russia of lower oil prices may be milder than during previous falls.¶ "In the short term, in the next one to three years, we are fine," said Tchakarov.¶ He noted that according to Finance Ministry calculations, every one dollar fall in the oil price means that the government loses around 55 billion roubles in oil-related taxes over the course of a year.¶ With the budget presently balancing at around $115 per barrel, an oil price of $90 per barrel, if sustained over a full year, would leave the government short to the tune of around $40 billion a year.¶ But that is still just a fraction of the $185 billion that Russia has stashed away in two fiscal reserve funds, designed to stabilise the budget in just such an emergency.¶ Even at $60 per barrel - the average oil price during the crisis year of 2009 - the reserve funds could cover the shortfall for about two years.¶ "I find this worrying about the budget at this moment a little beside the point," said Clemens Grafe, chief Russia economist at Goldman Sachs.¶ "The fiscal buffers they have to absorb this are going to be sufficient without cutting expenditure."¶ Analysts also point out that since the previous financial crisis in 2008-2009, the central bank has radically changed the exchange rate regime, allowing the rouble to fall in line with the cheaper oil price.¶ Since oil began its latest slide in mid-March, the rouble has lost around 15 percent of its value against the dollar.¶ "The rouble weakened exactly in line with the oil price. And a weaker rouble is very good because it will secure the rouble equivalent of oil taxes for the budget," said Evgeny Gavrilenkov, chief economist at Troika Dialog.¶ SIGNIFICANT SLOWDOWN¶ Despite these buffers, most economists expect that a sustained fall in the oil price would cause a significant slowdown in Russia's economic growth - still a surprisingly resilient 4.2 percent in May.¶ "Between $70 and $80 per barrel you will have a recession," said Westin from Aton.¶ Russia's ability to maintain government spending is limited by the so called non-oil deficit - a measure of the underlying state of the budget once oil taxes are removed - that has ballooned from 5 percent of gross domestic product in 2008 to over 10 percent this year.¶ Even before the latest decline in the oil price, the International Monetary Fund and World Bank were urging Russia to scale back this underlying deficit by cutting down on bloated government spending.¶ In a recent interview with Reuters, Russia's deputy prime minister Igor Shuvalov vowed that while the government intended to use its reserves to maintain expenditures this year, next year's budget would be "very frugal, tight and responsible".¶ That implies that sooner or later, falling oil prices will force cutbacks that will hit the pockets of ordinary Russians.¶ "The silver lining of a failing oil price is that it does increase the urgency of social reform and budget cuts," says Kingsmill Bond, chief Russia strategist at Citigroup.

#### Officials vote for B-Laki – contextual to oil

Bershidsky 10/3, Leonid, Senior Writer for The Sydney Morning Herald, (“Leaders have few answers to Russia's stagnant economy”, <http://www.smh.com.au/business/leaders-have-few-answers-to-russias-stagnant-economy-20131002-2usq5.html>, AW)

Russian Prime Minister Dmitry Medvedev says he recognises the problems holding back the country's economy. Sadly, nobody has much confidence in his plans to address them. With the rate of economic growth declining towards zero, Mr Medvedev is making a renewed effort to show the business community that he knows what to do. In an unusually long article in the business daily Vedomosti, he acknowledged that the country's growth was largely artificial, the government was too dependent on revenue from the oil industry and that Russia offered a terrible environment for investment. ''Output growth is supported almost exclusively by large investment projects financed by the government and state-owned companies, salary rises in the public sector, an expansion of subsidies to agriculture and other sectors fuelled by the high oil price,'' Mr Medvedev wrote. In other words, Russia's economy might not be growing at all if the government was not pouring oil money into subsidies and infrastructure projects such as the preparations for the Sochi Winter Olympics in 2014 and the soccer World Cup in 2018.

#### Their ev is overly hyperbolic – reject it

Allegre et al 12 (Claude Allegre, former director of the Institute for the Study of the Earth, University of Paris; J. Scott Armstrong, cofounder of the Journal of Forecasting and the International Journal of Forecasting; Jan Breslow, head of the Laboratory of Biochemical Genetics and Metabolism, Rockefeller University; Roger Cohen, fellow, American Physical Society; Edward David, member, National Academy of Engineering and National Academy of Sciences; William Happer, professor of physics, Princeton; Michael Kelly, professor of technology, University of Cambridge, U.K.; William Kininmonth, former head of climate research at the Australian Bureau of Meteorology; Richard Lindzen, professor of atmospheric sciences, MIT; James McGrath, professor of chemistry, Virginia Technical University; Rodney Nichols, former president and CEO of the New York Academy of Sciences; Burt Rutan, aerospace engineer, designer of Voyager and SpaceShipOne; Harrison H. Schmitt, Apollo 17 astronaut and former U.S. senator; Nir Shaviv, professor of astrophysics, Hebrew University, Jerusalem; Henk Tennekes, former director, Royal Dutch Meteorological Service; Antonio Zichichi, president of the World Federation of Scientists, Geneva, “No Need to Panic About Global Warming”, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970204301404577171531838421366.html?mod=googlenews\_wsj)

Editor's Note: The following has been signed by the 16 scientists listed at the end of the article: A candidate for public office in any contemporary democracy may have to consider what, if anything, to do about "global warming."

Candidates should understand that the oft-repeated claim that nearly all scientists demand that something dramatic be done to stop global warming is not true. In fact, a large and growing number of distinguished scientists and engineers do not agree that drastic actions on global warming are needed. In September, Nobel Prize-winning physicist Ivar Giaever, a supporter of President Obama in the last election, publicly resigned from the American Physical Society (APS) with a letter that begins: "I did not renew [my membership] because I cannot live with the [APS policy] statement: 'The evidence is incontrovertible: Global warming is occurring. If no mitigating actions are taken, significant disruptions in the Earth's physical and ecological systems, social systems, security and human health are likely to occur. We must reduce emissions of greenhouse gases beginning now.' In the APS it is OK to discuss whether the mass of the proton changes over time and how a multi-universe behaves, but the evidence of global warming is incontrovertible?" In spite of a multidecade international campaign to enforce the message that increasing amounts of the "pollutant" carbon dioxide will destroy civilization, large numbers of scientists, many very prominent, share the opinions of Dr. Giaever. And the number of scientific "heretics" is growing with each passing year. The reason is a collection of stubborn scientific facts. Perhaps the most inconvenient fact is the lack of global warming for well over 10 years now. This is known to the warming establishment, as one can see from the 2009 "Climategate" email of climate scientist Kevin Trenberth: "The fact is that we can't account for the lack of warming at the moment and it is a travesty that we can't." But the warming is only missing if one believes computer models where so-called feedbacks involving water vapor and clouds greatly amplify the small effect of CO2. The lack of warming for more than a decade—indeed, the smaller-than-predicted warming over the 22 years since the U.N.'s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) began issuing projections—suggests that computer models have greatly exaggerated how much warming additional CO2 can cause. Faced with this embarrassment, those promoting alarm have shifted their drumbeat from warming to weather extremes, to enable anything unusual that happens in our chaotic climate to be ascribed to CO2. The fact is that CO2 is not a pollutant. CO2 is a colorless and odorless gas, exhaled at high concentrations by each of us, and a key component of the biosphere's life cycle. Plants do so much better with more CO2 that greenhouse operators often increase the CO2 concentrations by factors of three or four to get better growth. This is no surprise since plants and animals evolved when CO2 concentrations were about 10 times larger than they are today. Better plant varieties, chemical fertilizers and agricultural management contributed to the great increase in agricultural yields of the past century, but part of the increase almost certainly came from additional CO2 in the atmosphere. Enlarge Image Corbis Although the number of publicly dissenting scientists is growing, many young scientists furtively say that while they also have serious doubts about the global-warming message, they are afraid to speak up for fear of not being promoted—or worse. They have good reason to worry. In 2003, Dr. Chris de Freitas, the editor of the journal Climate Research, dared to publish a peer-reviewed article with the politically incorrect (but factually correct) conclusion that the recent warming is not unusual in the context of climate changes over the past thousand years. The international warming establishment quickly mounted a determined campaign to have Dr. de Freitas removed from his editorial job and fired from his university position. Fortunately, Dr. de Freitas was able to keep his university job. This is not the way science is supposed to work, but we have seen it before—for example, in the frightening period when Trofim Lysenko hijacked biology in the Soviet Union. Soviet biologists who revealed that they believed in genes, which Lysenko maintained were a bourgeois fiction, were fired from their jobs. Many were sent to the gulag and some were condemned to death. Why is there so much passion about global warming, and why has the issue become so vexing that the American Physical Society, from which Dr. Giaever resigned a few months ago, refused the seemingly reasonable request by many of its members to remove the word "incontrovertible" from its description of a scientific issue? There are several reasons, but a good place to start is the old question "cui bono?" Or the modern update, "Follow the money." Alarmism over climate is of great benefit to many, providing government funding for academic research and a reason for government bureaucracies to grow. Alarmism also offers an excuse for governments to raise taxes, taxpayer-funded subsidies for businesses that understand how to work the political system, and a lure for big donations to charitable foundations promising to save the planet. Lysenko and his team lived very well, and they fiercely defended their dogma and the privileges it brought them. Speaking for many scientists and engineers who have looked carefully and independently at the science of climate, we have a message to any candidate for public office: There is no compelling scientific argument for drastic action to "decarbonize" the world's economy. Even if one accepts the inflated climate forecasts of the IPCC, aggressive greenhouse-gas control policies are not justified economically. A recent study of a wide variety of policy options by Yale economist William Nordhaus showed that nearly the highest benefit-to-cost ratio is achieved for a policy that allows 50 more years of economic growth unimpeded by greenhouse gas controls. This would be especially beneficial to the less-developed parts of the world that would like to share some of the same advantages of material well-being, health and life expectancy that the fully developed parts of the world enjoy now. Many other policy responses would have a negative return on investment. And it is likely that more CO2 and the modest warming that may come with it will be an overall benefit to the planet. If elected officials feel compelled to "do something" about climate, we recommend supporting the excellent scientists who are increasing our understanding of climate with well-designed instruments on satellites, in the oceans and on land, and in the analysis of observational data. The better we understand climate, the better we can cope with its ever-changing nature, which has complicated human life throughout history. However, much of the huge private and government investment in climate is badly in need of critical review. Every candidate should support rational measures to protect and improve our environment, but it makes no sense at all to back expensive programs that divert resources from real needs and are based on alarming but untenable claims of "incontrovertible" evidence.

#### **No species extinction and no wars**

NIPCC 11 – the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change, an international panel of nongovernment scientists and scholars, March 8, 2011, “Surviving the Unprecedented Climate Change of the IPCC,” online: http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2011/mar/8mar2011a5.html

In a paper published in Systematics and Biodiversity, Willis et al. (2010) consider the IPCC (2007) "predicted climatic changes for the next century" -- i.e., their contentions that "global temperatures will increase by 2-4°C and possibly beyond, sea levels will rise (~1 m ± 0.5 m), and atmospheric CO2 will increase by up to 1000 ppm" -- noting that it is "widely suggested that the magnitude and rate of these changes will result in many plants and animals going extinct," citing studies that suggest that "within the next century, over 35% of some biota will have gone extinct (Thomas et al., 2004; Solomon et al., 2007) and there will be extensive die-back of the tropical rainforest due to climate change (e.g. Huntingford et al., 2008)."

On the other hand, they indicate that some biologists and climatologists have pointed out that "many of the predicted increases in climate have happened before, in terms of both magnitude and rate of change (e.g. Royer, 2008; Zachos et al., 2008), and yet biotic communities have remained remarkably resilient (Mayle and Power, 2008) and in some cases thrived (Svenning and Condit, 2008)." But they report that those who mention these things are often "placed in the 'climate-change denier' category," although the purpose for pointing out these facts is simply to present "a sound scientific basis for understanding biotic responses to the magnitudes and rates of climate change predicted for the future through using the vast data resource that we can exploit in fossil records."

Going on to do just that, Willis et al. focus on "intervals in time in the fossil record when atmospheric CO2 concentrations increased up to 1200 ppm, temperatures in mid- to high-latitudes increased by greater than 4°C within 60 years, and sea levels rose by up to 3 m higher than present," describing studies of past biotic responses that indicate "the scale and impact of the magnitude and rate of such climate changes on biodiversity." And what emerges from those studies, as they describe it, "is evidence for rapid community turnover, migrations, development of novel ecosystems and thresholds from one stable ecosystem state to another." And, most importantly in this regard, they report "there is very little evidence for broad-scale extinctions due to a warming world."

In concluding, the Norwegian, Swedish and UK researchers say that "based on such evidence we urge some caution in assuming broad-scale extinctions of species will occur due solely to climate changes of the magnitude and rate predicted for the next century," reiterating that "the fossil record indicates remarkable biotic resilience to wide amplitude fluctuations in climate."

#### Existing CO2 will cause warming for 1,000 years

**Maugh 9** (Thomas H, Los Angeles Times, Study says some global warming now irreversible, January 27, <http://articles.sfgate.com/2009-01-27/news/17198723_1_carbon-dioxide-warming-s-effect-dioxide-emissions/2>)

Even if by some miracle of environmental activism global carbon dioxide levels reverted to pre-industrial levels, it still would take 1,000 years or longer for the climate changes already triggered to be reversed, scientists said Monday. The gas that is already there and the heat that has been absorbed by the ocean will exert their effects for centuries, according to the analysis, published Monday in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Science. Over the long haul, the warming will melt the polar icecaps more than previously had been estimated, raising ocean levels substantially, the report said. And changes in rainfall patterns will bring droughts comparable to those that caused the 1930s Dust Bowl to the American Southwest, southern Europe, northern Africa and western Australia. "People have imagined that if we stopped emitting carbon dioxide, the climate would go back to normal in 100 years, 200 years," lead author Susan Solomon, a senior scientist at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, said in a telephone news conference. "That's not true." The changes will persist until at least the year 3000, said Solomon, who conducted the study with colleagues in Switzerland and France.

#### Probability- History proves food shortages are the most likely cause of extinction

**Brown ’11** (from World on the Edge: How to Prevent Environmental and Economic Collapse, by Lester R. Brown © 2011 Earth Policy Institute

For the Mayans, it was deforestation and soil erosion. As more and more land was cleared for farming to support the expanding empire, soil erosion undermined the productivity of their tropical soils. A team of scientists from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has noted that the extensive land clearing by the Mayans likely also altered the regional climate, reducing rainfall. In effect, the scientists suggest, it was the convergence of several environmental trends, some reinforcing others, that led to the food shortages that brought down the Mayan civilization. 26 Although we live in a highly urbanized, technologically advanced society, we are as dependent on the earth’s natural support systems as the Sumerians and Mayans were. If we continue with business as usual, civilizational collapse is no longer a matter of whether but when. We now have an economy that is destroying its natural support systems, one that has put us on a decline and collapse path. We are dangerously close to the edge. Peter Goldmark, former Rockefeller Foundation president, puts it well: “**The death of our civilization is no longer a theory** or an academic possibility; it is the road we’re on.” 2 **Judging by the archeological records of earlier civilizations, more often than not food shortages appear to have precipitated their decline and collapse**. Given the advances of modern agriculture, I had long rejected the idea that food could be the weak link in our twenty-first century civilization. **Today I think not only that it could be the weak link but that it is the weak link.**

#### Magnitude- food shortages mean extinction

**Takacs ‘96** (David, The Idea Of Diversity: Philosophies Of Paradise, 1996, p. 200-1.)

So biodiversity keeps the world running. It has value and of itself, as well as for us. Raven, Erwin, and Wilson oblige us to think about the value of biodiversity for our own lives. The Ehrlichs’ rivet-popper trope makes this same point; by eliminating rivets, we play Russian roulette with global ecology and human futures: “It is likely that destruction of the rich complex of species in the Amazon basin could trigger rapid changes in global climate patterns. Agriculture remains heavily dependent on stable climate, and human beings remain heavily dependent on food. By the end of the century the extinction of perhaps a million species in the Amazon basin could have entrained famines in which a billion human beings perished. And if our species is very unlucky, the famines could lead to a thermonuclear war, which could extinguish civilization.” Elsewhere Ehrlich uses different particulars with no less drama: What then will happen if the current decimation of organic diversity continues? Crop yields will be more difficult to maintain in the face of climatic change, soil erosion , loss of dependable water supplies, decline of pollinators, and ever more serious assaults by pests. Conversion of productive land to wasteland will accelerate; deserts will continue their seemingly inexorable expansion. Air pollution will increase, and local climates will become harsher. Humanity will have to forgo many of the direct economic benefits it might have withdrawn from Earth's well­stocked genetic library. It might, for example, miss out on a cure for cancer; but that will make little difference. As ecosystem services falter, mortality from respiratory and epidemic disease, natural disasters, and especially famine will lower life expectancies to the point where can­cer (largely a disease of the elderly) will be unimportant. Humanity will bring upon itself consequences depressingly similar to those expected from a nuclear winter. Barring a nuclear conflict, it appears that civilization will disappear some time before the end of the next century - not with a bang but a whimper.

#### Immigration reform necessary to sustain the economy and competitiveness

Javier Palomarez, Forbes, 3/6/13, The Pent Up Entrepreneurship That Immigration Reform Would Unleash, www.forbes.com/sites/realspin/2013/03/06/the-pent-up-entrepreneurship-that-immigration-reform-would-unleash/print/

The main difference between now and 2007 is that today the role of immigrants and their many contributions to the American economy have been central in the country’s national conversation on the issue. Never before have Latinos been so central to the election of a U.S. President as in 2012. New evidence about the economic importance of immigration reform, coupled with the new political realities presented by the election, have given reform a higher likelihood of passing. As the President & CEO of the country’s largest Hispanic business association, the U.S. Hispanic Chamber of Commerce (USHCC), which advocates for the interests of over 3 million Hispanic owned businesses, I have noticed that nearly every meeting I hold with corporate leaders now involves a discussion of how and when immigration reform will pass. The USHCC has long seen comprehensive immigration reform as an economic imperative, and now the wider business community seems to be sharing our approach. It is no longer a question of whether it will pass. Out of countless conversations with business leaders in virtually every sector and every state, a consensus has emerged: our broken and outdated immigration system hinders our economy’s growth and puts America’s global leadership in jeopardy. Innovation drives the American economy, and without good ideas and skilled workers, our country won’t be able to transform industries or to lead world markets as effectively as it has done for decades. Consider some figures: Immigrant-owned firms generate an estimated $775 billion in annual revenue, $125 billion in payroll and about $100 billion in income. A study conducted by the New American Economy found that over 40 percent of Fortune 500 companies were started by immigrants or children of immigrants. Leading brands, like Google, Kohls, eBay, Pfizer, and AT&T, were founded by immigrants. Researchers at the Kauffman Foundation released a study late last year showing that from 2006 to 2012, one in four engineering and technology companies started in the U.S. had at least one foreign-born founder — in Silicon Valley it was almost half of new companies. There are an estimated 11 million undocumented workers currently in the U.S. Imagine what small business growth in the U.S. would look like if they were provided legal status, if they had an opportunity for citizenship. Without fear of deportation or prosecution, imagine the pent up entrepreneurship that could be unleashed. After all, these are people who are clearly entrepreneurial in spirit to have come here and risk all in the first place. Immigrants are twice as likely to start businesses as native-born Americans, and statistics show that most job growth comes from small businesses. While immigrants are both critically-important consumers and producers, they boost the economic well-being of native-born Americans as well. Scholars at the Brookings Institution recently described the relationship of these two groups of workers as complementary. This is because lower-skilled immigrants largely take farming and other manual, low-paid jobs that native-born workers don’t usually want. For example, when Alabama passed HB 56, an immigration law in 2012 aimed at forcing self-deportation, the state lost roughly $11 billion in economic productivity as crops were left to wither and jobs were lost. Immigration reform would also address another important angle in the debate – the need to entice high-skilled immigrants. Higher-skilled immigrants provide talent that high-tech companies often cannot locate domestically. High-tech leaders recently organized a nationwide “virtual march for immigration reform” to pressure policymakers to remove barriers that prevent them from recruiting the workers they need. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, fixing immigration makes sound fiscal sense. Economist Raul Hinojosa-Ojeda calculated in 2010 that comprehensive immigration reform would add $1.5 trillion to the country’s GDP over 10 years and add $66 billion in tax revenue – enough to fully fund the Small Business Administration and the Departments of the Treasury and Commerce for over two years. As Congress continues to wring its hands and debate the issue, lawmakers must understand what both businesses and workers already know: The American economy needs comprehensive immigration reform.

#### Immigration key to clean tech – solves warming.

**Herman and Smith ‘10** (Richard T. Herman is the founder of Richard T. Herman & Associates, law firm in Cleveland, Ohio, also the co-founder of a chapter of TiE, a global network of entrepreneurs started in 1992 in Silicon Valley. He has appeared on National Public Radio, FOX News, and various affiliates of NBC, CBS, and ABC. He has also been quoted in such publications as USA Today,InformationWeek, PCWorld, ComputerWorld, CIO, Site Selection and National Lawyers Weekly, Robert L. Smith is a veteran journalist who covers international cultures and immigration issues for the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Ohio’s largest newspaper. Bob He has written extensively about immigration issues and has interviewed people at all points of the immigrant experience, from undocumented field workers to hugely successful entrepreneurs, Parts of this paper were excerpted from the book “Immigrant Inc.: Why Immigrant Entrepreneurs are Driving the New Economy (and how they will save the American worker)” (John Wiley & Sons, 2009) by Richard T. Herman & Robert L. Smith.  Available wherever books are sold, “Why Immigrants Can Drive the Green Economy,” Immigation Policy Center)

Raymond Spencer, an Australian-born entrepreneur based in Chicago, has a window on the future—and a gusto for investing after founding a high-technology consulting company that sold for more than $1 billion in 2006. “I have investments in maybe 10 start-ups, all of which fall within a broad umbrella of a ‘green’ theme,” he said. “And it’s interesting, the vast majority are either led by immigrants or have key technical people who are immigrants.” It should come as no surprise that immigrants will help **drive the green revolution**. America’s young scientists and engineers, especially the ones drawn to emerging industries like alternative energy, tend to speak with an accent. The 2000 Census found that immigrants, while accounting for 12 percent of the population, made up nearly **half of the all scientists and engineers** with doctorate degrees. Their importance will only grow. Nearly 70 percent of the men and women who entered the fields of science and engineering from 1995 to 2006 were immigrants. Yet, the connection between immigration and the development and commercialization of alternative energy technology is rarely discussed. Policymakers envision millions of new jobs as the nation pursues renewable energy sources, like wind and solar power, and builds a smart grid to tap it. But Dan Arvizu, **the leading expert** on solar power and the director of the National Renewable Energy Laboratory of the U.S. Department of Energy in Golden, Colorado, warns that **much of the clean-technology talent lies overseas**, in nations that began **pursuing alternative energy** sources **decades ago.** Expanding our **own clean-tech industry will require working closely with foreign nations and** foreign-born **scientists**, he said. Immigration restrictions are making collaboration difficult. His **lab’s** **efforts to work with a Chinese energy lab**, for example, **were** **stalled due to U.S. immigration barriers**. “We can’t get researchers over here,” Arvizu, the son of a once-undocumented immigrant from Mexico, said in an interview in March 2009, his voice tinged with dismay. “It makes no sense to me. We need a much more enlightened approach.” Dr. Zhao Gang, the Vice Director of the Renewable Energy and New Energy International Cooperation Planning Office of the Ministry of Science and Technology in China, says that America needs that enlightenment fast. “The Chinese government continues to impress upon the Obama administration that **immigration restrictions are creating major impediments to U.S.-China collaboration on clean energy** development,” he said during a recent speech in Cleveland. So what’s the problem? Some of it can be attributed to national security restrictions that impede international collaboration on clean energy. But Arvizu places greater weight on immigration barriers, suggesting that national secrecy is less important in the fast-paced world of green-tech development. “We are innovating so fast here, what we do today is often outdated tomorrow. Finding solutions to alternative energy is a complex, global problem that requires global teamwork,” he said. **We need** an **immigration** system **that prioritizes** the attraction and retention of **scarce, high-end talent** needed **to invent and commercialize alternative energy technology** and other emerging technologies. One idea we floated by Arvizu was a new immigrant “Energy Scientist Visa,” providing fast-track green cards for Ph.D.s with the most promising energy research, as reviewed by a panel of top U.S. scientists. Arvizu enthusiastically responded, “Wow, that’s a brilliant idea.” As the recent submission of the Startup Visa Act bill suggests, there’s really no shortage of good ideas of leveraging immigration to jumpstart the economy. The challenge is getting the American people to understand that high-skill immigration creates jobs, that the current system is broken, and that action is required now.

There’s a crucial framing argument for uniqueness – only moderate GOP members matter. Conservatives won’t vote for immigration no matter what and affirmative evidence quoting them is irrelevant.

Balz, 10/17(Dan, Washington Post, “Can Obama seize the moment and make Washington work?” http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/can-obama-seize-the-moment-to-make-washington-work/2013/10/17/d84c1934-3753-11e3-80c6-7e6dd8d22d8f\_story\_1.html)

Obama will continue to face unyielding opposition from the tea party Republicans in the House and the Senate. Sen. Ted Cruz (R-Tex.) made that clear Wednesday when he denounced the Senate compromise and praised those in the House whose opposition to the health-care law triggered the crisis.

The key now is whether the president has a strategy to govern around them by winning support from what he called the responsible Republicans.

Obama’s agenda

On Thursday, Obama called on Congress to focus on three priorities. But he offered few specifics about what he will ask and what he will give. Nor is it clear whether he has a strategy to win the support of some Republicans.

The first priority he talked about was the economy and the budget. Budget negotiations will resume with the goal of reaching an agreement by mid-December, lest the country face a repeat of what just happened.

Obama wants to replace the across-the-board spending reductions that have cut indiscriminately with more sensible spending priorities. He also says he is willing to negotiate over entitlements programs. He wants any agreement to include more revenue, although Republicans say he got his revenue package at the end of 2012. Republicans who opposed the shutdown (but quietly went along with it) are skeptical that Obama is truly willing to make concessions to get a satisfactory deal.

The two other legislative priorities the president cited were immigration reform and passage of the farm bill. No one can say what the prospects are for passage of an immigration bill. Much of that still depends on how House GOP leaders decide whether it is in the party’s long-term interest to pass it. Obama did not mention what should be his other major priority, the health-care law, whose implementation has gotten off to a stumbling start, to put it mildly.

All of that is on the table. Meanwhile, there is a question of how engaged Obama will be in the grinding work of trying to produce compromise with potentially willing Republicans.

#### GOP will fight each other now – enables passage

Fox News 10/27 [“Republican lobbying groups step up push on House to pass immigration reform,” http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2013/10/27/republican-lobbying-groups-step-up-push-on-house-to-pass-immigration-reform/]

Republicans who back immigration reform are ramping up their push to get the House to bring legislation to the floor, as the issue threatens to potentially create a public divide within the GOP.¶ The Wall Street Journal reports the group Republicans for Immigration Reform is building up its lobbying efforts in Washington, releasing a web ad last week urging the House to act that has been viewed over 600,000 times, according to the group.¶ This week, the New York Times reports a coalition of about 600 mostly Republican leaders in business and agriculture will begin an effort to lobby 80 GOP representatives on the issue. Some GOP donors are also reportedly privately withholding their contributions from members of Congress who oppose action of immigration reform.¶ The issue has the potential to divide GOP lawmakers again after public in-party fighting over the recent budget negotiations.

#### Obama is sidestepping every issue now to focus and push immigration – only the plan results in political costs

Connor Higgins, political columnist, M.A. in US History from George Mason University, 10/28 [“GOP civil war: Obama and immigration,” http://communities.washingtontimes.com/neighborhood/its-all-smoke-and-whiskey/2013/oct/28/gop-civil-war-obama-and-immigration/]

On one front there is Obamacare, which has seen fighting since it was passed early in his tenure as President. That is dirty, slugging, bloody political trench warfare that has seen the Democrats and the President advance steadily towards the Republican line. Key victories were when the law was upheld at the Supreme Court level, and most recently when the Republicans were defeated over the shutdown. However, with the roll out of Healthcare.gov the Democrats and President Obama have suffered setbacks and many have lost face. The website cost over half a billion dollars and does not work properly, this amounts to a hole in their line which the Republicans are now trying to exploit for further political gain. However the President is prepared for that.¶ Instead of reinforcing his line on Obamacare, he has reopened a familiar front and attacked the Republicans on Immigration. Now, Republican resources will have to be pulled from the fight against Obamacare to hold the line on the immigration fight. In the meantime, President Obama is fighting a political guerrilla campaign against the issues of Benghazi, NSA, Journalist tapping, and the IRS scandal by simply running or sidestepping any attempt at being drawn out into an open fight. What is more, he masterfully uses the media and his political allies to hammer the Republicans for pursuing these issues. He makes the Republicans look petty, and most of the time he does not even involve himself in the fight to begin with. It is a win win for him.

#### It’s top of the docket – Obama’s pushing CIR as a priority

Adriana Maestas, senior editor, 10/26 [“President Obama makes another public push for immigration reform,” http://politic365.com/2013/10/26/president-obama-makes-another-public-push-for-immigration-reform/]

On Thursday, President Obama urged the Congress to pass immigration reform. Essentially, President Obama asked that the House of Representatives pass the immigration bill that was passed by the Senate in June. He cited the leadership of faith communities, business and labor.¶ This push comes when the administration nears the 2 millionth deportation milestone.¶ Already some are saying that this push is purely political at this point as the attention turns to the 2014 midterm elections. As Zeke Miller at Time points out:¶ “The move is the latest in a pattern of efforts by Democrats to increase political pressure on Republicans, who have already ruled out the Senate bill, in the hopes of using the issue in the 2014 and 2016 elections. President Barack Obama took the podium in the White House State Dining Room last week to mark the end of the shutdown and laid out his priorities for the coming months. At the top of the list was a renewed push for comprehensive immigration reform. Congressional Democrats likewise are onboard with the new push. “I look forward to the next venture, which is making sure we do immigration reform,” Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid said last week.

#### Shutdown created momentum for moderate republicans

Jennifer Agiesta, Associated Press Director of Polling and Julie Pace, AP White House Correspondent, 10/24 [“Obama Calls for Immigration Law by End of the Year ,” http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/wireStory/obama-push-congress-act-immigration-20664540?singlePage=true]

Obama's renewed focus on immigration comes amid mounting criticism of the White House over computer problems that have plagued insurance enrollment under the 3-year-old health care law. It also comes nearly four months since a bipartisan majority in the Senate passed a comprehensive immigration bill that would tighten border security and provide a path to citizenship for the 11 million immigrants living here illegally.¶ "Rather than create problems, let's prove to the American people that Washington can actually solve some problems," Obama said during an event devoted to immigration at the White House.¶ The Senate measure has stalled in the House, where most Republicans reject a comprehensive approach and many question offering citizenship to people who broke U.S. immigration laws to be in this country.¶ Still, White House officials say they believe that the partial government shutdown, rather than poisoning the political atmosphere, may have created an opportunity for collaboration with Republicans seeking to repair their image, which polls show took a hit during the prolonged fight over financing the government and extending the nation's borrowing limit.¶ Moreover, Obama made a point of underscoring support for an immigration bill from the members of the business community, traditional Republican allies who criticized GOP tactics that led to the partial shutdown and to brinkmanship over a potentially economy-jarring default on U.S. debt.¶ The White House took notice when Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, indicated on Wednesday that he was hopeful that immigration legislation could be done before year's end.

#### Obama care doesn’t hurt Obama’s agenda

Mike Dorning, Business Week, 10/26/13, Obamacare Website Flaws Imperil President’s Activist Agenda, www.businessweek.com/news/2013-10-25/obamacare-website-flaws-imperil-activist-agenda-president-backs

Bill McInturff, a Republican pollster, says Obama has time, possibly even months, to fix the snags before suffering lasting political damage from the initial performance of the website.

The public isn’t likely to hold early difficulties with the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act against Obama if they fade quickly, said McInturff, who consulted with the Bush administration on the Medicare prescription-drug rollout.

“There’s some tolerance in the beginning,” he said. “In general, people are not shocked that you can have some problems as a major new federal program gets off the ground.”

#### Clean energy investment costs capital

**Etelson 12** (Erica, Relationship Marketing Specialist at Solar Mosaic, OBAMA 2.0: DELIVERING CLEAN ENERGY PROMISES?, 11/8/12, <http://www.solarfeeds.com/obama-2-0-delivering-clean-energy-promises/>)

Whether or not you voted for President Obama, the clean energy-loving part of you must be feeling hopeful that POTUS will deliver in his second term what we would have liked to have seen more of during the first — strong leadership driving forward the clean energy economy. Though I still have a bit of a hope hangover from November, 2008, I have reason to believe Obama 2.0 will put solar on the White House and leverage the power of the EPA and the Department of Energy to arrest coal-fired power production and ramp up renewables. Obama, like any politician, will do what the public demands. With public support for renewables at unprecedented levels and the memory of Hurricane Sandy and drought-stricken corn fields fresh in people’s minds, clean energy could jump to the top of Obama’s and Congress’ agenda. But only if we mobilize. And when I say “we”, I mean all of us–environmental activists with their arm bands and twitter feeds, Occupiers with sleeping bags and cell phones, homeowners with caulk guns and solar panels, commuters with EVs and bikes, students with campuses crying out for solar power, social entrepreneurs with double lattes and ramen noodles, and Mosaic investors with bank accounts. We all have a role to play in demonstrating our personal commitment to reducing our carbon footprint and demanding government policies that help others do the same. As Obama said last night, “The role of citizen does not end with your vote.” Take that as invitation to hold his feet to the fire. The climate clock hits midnight not long after Obama leaves office. It’s now or never, and I’m throwing cautious optimism to the wind and jumping on the reckless hope roller coaster. Because not hoping means not trying, and try we must if we expect Obama to spend his political capital on clean energy.

#### Engagement with Mexico sparks backlash – Congress doesn’t trust Mexico

AP ‘13

(5/2/13, Associated Press, “Obama to Pitch Immigration Overhaul in Mexico” <http://www.newsmaxworld.com/Newsfront/obama-immigration-mexico-trip/2013/05/02/id/502393>)

For Pena Nieto, Obama's visit is a chance for him to showcase his country's economic gains. After suffering along with the U.S. during the recession, its economy is now growing at a better clip than that of the U.S. Per capita income has gone from an annual $7,900 two years ago to $10,146. ¶ ¶ But Diana Negroponte, a Latin America expert at the Brookings Institution, says corruption remains endemic, human rights are still a problem, and efforts to change and improve the judicial system have been too slow.¶ ¶ "There is concern on our side of the border that greater help needs to be given in order for Mexico to reform its system," she said.¶ ¶ Pena Nieto's changes in the security relationship with the U.S. have prompted some U.S. officials to speculate that the new president might be embracing the policies of his Institutional Revolutionary Party, which long has favored centralized political and bureaucratic control.¶ ¶ Among those watching the new steps is Sen. Patrick Leahy, D-Vt., who has held up $228 million sought by the Obama administration for Mexico under a security cooperation agreement. Under the agreement, known as the Merida Initiative, Congress has already given Mexico more than $1.9 billion in aid since 2008.¶ ¶ But Leahy, chairman of the Senate Appropriations subcommittee that oversees the State Department budget, has been a critic of how the money has been used and with the results.¶ ¶ "Congress has been asked for a significant new investment, but it's not clear what the new Mexican government's intensions are," Leahy said in a statement to The Associated Press. "We're in a period of uncertainty until we know enough to be able to reset that part of our relationship. I'm not ready to sign off on more money without a lot more details."