# 1st off

#### Movements against neoliberalism are growing in Latin America – but the plan increases neoliberal control in the region. That crushes indigenous cultures and the environment which means that the only way to solve is a de-linking.

Harris 8 (Richard L Harris: Professor of Global Studies at California State University, Monterey Bay; Managing Editor of the Journal of Developing Societies (SAGE India); and Coordi­ nating Editor of Latin American Perspectives (SAGE USA). “Latin America’s Response to Neoliberalism and Globalization,” http://www.nuso.org/upload/articulos/3506\_2.pdf)

The economic, political and social development of the Latin American and Caribbean countries is obstructed by the power relations and international structures that regulate the world capitalist system. The structures of this system provide a hierarchical political and economic exoskeleton that constrains all national efforts to pursue any significant degree of self-directed, inward-oriented, balanced and environmentally sustainable development. Indeed, the geopolitical power structures that preserve and support the world capitalist system have made it almost impossible for the governments of the core as well as the peripheral countries in this system to pursue a path of inward-oriented, equitable, democratically controlled and environmentally sustainable development (Amin 2001b:20). Since the 1980s, inter-American relations and the economic, political and social development of the Latin American and Caribbean states have been shaped by these geo­ political structures and the neoliberal strategic agenda put forward by the government of the United States of America (USA), the major transnational corporations and the three major international financial institutions (IFIs) that operate in the Latin American and Caribbean region (Harris and Nef, 2008). This later group of IFIs includes the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank, and the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB). The policies of these IFIs based in Washington generally follow the dictates of the government of the USA due to the controlling influence that it exercises over these institutions. Their agenda for the Latin American and Caribbean region gives priority to promoting and protecting the interests of the major investors and transnational corporations that are largely based in the USA and operate in the region. It also serves to maintain and strengthen the geopolitical hegemony of the USA over the Western Hemisphere (Harris and Nef). But conditions are changing. Washington’s neoliberal agenda for controlling the capi­ talist development of the Western Hemisphere and maintaining US hegemony over the region is increasingly threatened by a progressive alternative agenda for the regio­ nal integration of the Latin American and Caribbean countries that has begun to gain widespread support in the region. This alternative agenda for the region calls for the autonomous economic development of the region free of the hegemonic control and influence of the USA and the IFIs based in Washington. Not only does this type of development pose a fundamental threat to the hegemony of the USA in the region, it threatens the dominance of transnational capital throughout the Americas. Moreover, it also poses a significant threat to the global expansion and integration of the world capitalist system in general and to the global hegemonic coalition led by the government and transnational corporations of the USA. Today, political and economic strategies are being developed for moving from the prevailing export-oriented neoliberal model of economic development to new in­ ward-oriented models of sustainable development, tailored to the diverse conditions, economic capacities, political structures, natural endowments and cultural values of the societies involved. Moreover, a growing number of international and regional civil society organizations have emerged in recent years to create such alternatives. What the forums, networks, programs, and activities of these various types of organizations reveal is that there is a growing international network of organizations and social movements committed to promoting new, more equitable forms of international cooperation and regulation that support inward-oriented and sustainable development as well as genuine democracy at the regional and national levels. At the same time, these organizations argue that the present global trading regime that has been erected under the WTO should and can be replaced by a new global trading system that replaces the present system of so-called free but in fact unfair trade, with a sys­ tem that ensures «fair trade» and promotes South-South economic exchange and coo­ peration. Most of the progressive alternatives advocated by these organizations and the new left-leaning governments that have been elected to office in the region give priority to aligning the external relations of the countries in the region to the internal needs of the majority of the population. That is to say, decisions about what to export and what to import should be aligned with the needs of the population rather than the interests of transnational capitalists and transnational corporations or the hegemonic interests of the USA. Some of these alternative strategies involve what Walden Bello (2002) has referred to as «deglobalization.» That is to say, they involve unlinking the economies of these peripheral capitalist societies from the advanced capitalist centers of the world economy, particularly in the USA. They also involve throwing off the constraints that have been imposed upon the economic policies and structures of the­ se countries by the IFIs (IMF, World Bank, and IDB), the WTO and the other agents and regulatory regimes that regulate the world capitalist system. In fact, there appears to be growing interest throughout Latin America in revivifying the Pan-American ideal of unification, currently perhaps best expressed in Hugo Chávez’ Bolivarian dream of turning South America into a regional economic hegemon (DeLong, 2005). The governments of Bolivia, Cuba, Ecuador, Nicaragua and Uruguay have indicated they want to join the government of Venezuela in creating a regional union. It has been proposed that this coalescing continental confederation should shift the region’s extra-continental trade towards Europe, Asia and South Africa and away from North America. The prospect of this happening appears to have alarmed Washington more than the increasing number of electoral triumphs of leftist politicians in the region (Delong). There has also been considerable talk in the region about creating a single currency for the South American countries that would be modeled on and perhaps tied to the Euro rather than the US Dollar. This discussion is symptomatic of what appears to be an emerging desire to create an integrated economic and political community that is strikingly different from the type of hemispheric economic integration scheme being pursued by the Washington and its allies in the region (DeLong). Moreover, there is an increasing tendency in the region to find alternatives to trading with the USA. In particular, several Latin American nations (Brazil, Cuba, Venezuela and Chile) have been strengthening their economic relations with Asia, particularly with China. But the widespread popular opposition to neoliberalism and so-called globalization, and the shift to the Left in the region’s politics, represent much more than a serious challenge to US hegemony, they also represent a serious threat to the existing pattern of capitalist development in the region. Central to Washington’s strategy for the hemisphere has been the imposition of a neoliberal model of capitalist development on the region which involves the increasing integration of the region’s economies into a hemispheric ‘free trade’ area or rather a trade bloc that is dominated by the USA. This project is itself an essential part of the strategy of the USA for the domination of the global economy by its transnational corporations. The restructuring of the economies of the region under the mantra of neoliberalism and the banner of globalization has been aimed at giving the USA-based transnational corporations and investors free reign within the region and a strong hemispheric base from which to dominate the world economy In opposition to the neoliberal, polyarchical and globalizing model of development that has been imposed by the government of the USA and its allies in the region, the growing movement for an alternative form of development that is both genuinely democratic, equitable and environmentally sustainable appears to be gaining ground in various parts of Latin America and the Caribbean. This alternative model of development requires the reorganization and realignment of the existing economies in the region. It also requires the replacement of the existing political regimes, which serve the interests of the transnational bloc of social forces that are behind the integration of the region into the new global circuits of accumulation and production that the major trans­ national corporations and the IFIs have been constructing since the 1970s. In addition to fundamental economic changes, most of the existing pseudo-democratic political regimes in the region need to be thoroughly democratized so that they are responsive to and capable of serving the needs and interests of the majority of the people rather than the ruling polyarchies and the transnational corporations operating in the region. An essential requirement for realigning the region’s economies so that they produce people-centered and environmentally sustainable development is the integration of these economies into a regional economic and political union that has the resources, structures and the power to operate independently of the government of the USA and the transnational corporations based in the USA as well as in the European Union and Japan. If this type of regional integration takes place, it will enable the Latin American and Caribbean states to break free of the hegemonic influence of the USA, and reverse the denationalization (‘globalization’) of the Latin American and Caribbean economies. Instead of the corporate-driven hemispheric integration of the region under the hegemony of the USA, a new system of regional economic cooperation and both equitable as well as environmentally sustainable development is desperately needed to improve the lives of the vast majority of the people living in Latin America and the Caribbean. This type of regional, equitable and sustainable development can only be success­ fully carried out by truly democratically elected political leaders with broad-based popular support who are sincerely committed to achieving this alternative rather than the elitist neoliberal model. It probably will also require democratic socialist political institutions and structures of production and distribution. Regionalism has been the dream of the democratic left for some time. The European Union has its origins in the French socialist dream of ending Franco-German enmity through unifying Europe, and African regionalism was the vision of African socialists such as Julius Nyerere of Tanzania who saw regional integration as the only means to progress beyond tribalism and colonialism and create a united and democratic Africa (Faux, 2001:4). Viewed from the perspective of those who want to create a people-cen­ tered, democratic, equitable and environmentally sustainable social order in the Ame­ ricas, the corporate-dominated process of capitalist pseudo-globalization taking place in the region and around the world urgently needs to be replaced by what Samir Amin has referred to as a new system of «pluricentric regulated globalization» (Amin, 2001a). This alternative form of globalization requires the development of regional economic and political unions in Africa, Asia, Latin America, the Caribbean, the Middle East and elsewhere, which collaboratively promote people-centered, democratic and envi­ ronmentally sustainable forms of development on a regional basis. According to Amin, these regional unions of states are needed to collaborate as partners in collecti­ vely regulating the global restructuring of the world economy for the benefit of the vast majority of humanity rather than the transnational corporations and the northern centers of the world capitalist system in the USA, Europe and Japan. This type of regional-based regulative order is needed to regulate and redirect inter­ national economic, social, and political relations so that these relations serve the inte­ rests and needs of the vast majority of the world’s population. The present power structures and regulatory regime of the world capitalist system support the transna­ tional corporate-driven restructuring and denationalization of the economies of both the societies at the core and in the periphery of this system. The Latin American and Caribbean countries need to ‘de-link’ step-by-step from this exploitative and inequitable system. They need to redirect and restructure their eco­ nomies so that they serve the needs of the majority of their people while also protec­ ting their natural resources and ecosystems. The alternative policies of economic, poli­ tical and social development proposed and in some cases adopted by the new leftist leaders, the progressive civil society organizations and their supporters, combined with the project of regional integration associated with the new Unión de Naciones Suramericanas (UNASUR), are significant indications of unprecedented and pro­ found transformation unfolding in the Americas. A growing number of civil society organizations and social movements throughout the Americas are pressuring the governments of the region to follow what the pro­ gressive civil society networks such as the Alianza Social Continental/ Hemispheric Social Alliance (ASC/HSA) describes as a regional model of integration that supports the environmentally sustainable and democratic development of all the societies in the region (see ASC-HSA, 2006). The ASC/HSA also contends that the UNASUR pro­ ject and the Bolivarian dream of unification is threatened by the so-called free trade agreements that Washington has negotiated with Chile, Colombia, Peru, the Central American countries and the Dominican Republic. As the ASC/HSA makes clear in its documents and public information campaigns, these agreements compromise the national sovereignty, obstruct the local production of medicines, threaten public health, facilitate the profit-driven privatization of water and vital services such as health and sanitation, and threaten the survival of indigenous cultures, biodiversity, food sovereignty, and local control over natural resources. The «Alternatives for the Americas» proposal developed by this inter-American network of progressive civil society organizations and social movements calls on all governments in the region to subordinate trade and investments to sustainability and environmental protection as well as social justice and local democratic control over economic and social development (ASC/HSA 2002:5). The growing number and political influence of these kinds of networks, organizations and movements provide unquestionable evidence of the emergence of the social for­ ces and political conditions that Panitch (1996:89) and others (Harris, 1995:301-302; Jo­ nas and McCaughan, 1994) predicted in the 1990s would arise in opposition to neoli­ beralism, corporate-dominated pseudo globalization and the extension and consolida­ tion of the hegemony of the USA. It now seems increasingly possible that these forces and the political mobilization that they have helped to create will transform the politi­ cal regimes in the region as well as the nature of inter-American relations, bring about the regional integration of the Latin American countries and free these countries from US hegemony and the form of ‘turbo-capitalism’ to which they have been subjected. At this point, we can only speak in general terms about the new model(s) of develop­ ment that will replace the neoliberal model of uneven and inequitable development that has pillaged most of the region.

#### You have an ethical obligation to reject neoliberalism. Utilitarian rationality cannot account for the degraded life chances of billions because capital makes its victims anonymous

Daly 2004 Glyn. Lecturer in International Studies at the University College Northampton. Conversations with Žižek. 14-19

For Žižek it is imperative that we cut through this Gordian knot of postmodern protocol and recognize that our ethico-political responsibility is to confront the constitutive violence of today's global capitalism and its obscene naturalization/anonymization of the millions who are subjugated by it throughout the world. Against the standardized positions of postmodern culture - with all its pieties concerning 'multiculturalist' etiquette - Žižek is arguing for a politics that might be called 'radically incorrect' in the sense that it breaks with these types of positions and focuses instead on the very organizing principles of today's social reality: the principles of global liberal capitalism. This requires some care and subtlety. For too long, Marxism has been bedevilled by an almost fetishistic economism that has tended towards political morbidity. With the likes of Hilferding and Gramsci, and more recently Laclau and Mouffe, crucial theoretical advances have been made that enable the trascendence of all forms of economism. In this new context, however, Žižek argues that the problem that now presents itself is almost that of the opposite fetish. That is to say, the prohibitive anxieties surrounding the taboo of economism can function as a way of not engaging with the economic reality and as a way of implicitly accepting the latter as a basic horizon of existence. In an ironic Freudian-Lacanian twist, the fear of economism can end up reinforcing a de facto economic necessity in respect of contemporary capitalism (i.e. the initial prohibition conjures up the very thing it fears). This is not to endorse any retrograde return to economism. Žižek's point is rather that in rejecting economism we should not lose sight of the systemic power of capital in shaping the lives and destinies of humanity and our very sense of the possible. In particular, we should not overlook Marx's central insight that in order to create a universal global system the forces of capitalism seek to conceal the politico-discursive violence of its construction through a kind of gentrification of that system. What is persistently denied by neo-liberals such as Rorty (1989) and Fukuyama (1992) is that the gentrification of global liberal capitalism is one whose 'universalism' fundamentally reproduces and depends upon a disavowed violence that excludes vast sectors of the world's population. In this way, neo-liberal ideology attempts to naturalize capitalism by presenting its outcomes of winning and losing as if they were simply a matter of chance and sound judgement in a neutral marketplace. Capitalism does indeed create a space for a certain diversity, at least for the central capitalist regions, but it is neither neutral nor ideal and its price in terms of social exclusion is exorbitant. That is to say, the human cost in terms of inherent global poverty and degraded 'life-chances' cannot be calculated within the existing economic rationale and, in consequence, social exclusion remains mystified and nameless (viz. the patronizing reference to the developing world). And Žižek's point is that this mystification is magnified through capitalism's profound capacity to ingest its own excesses and negativity; to redirect (or misdirect) social antagonisms and to absorb them within a culture of differential affirmation. Instead of Bolshevism, the tendency of today is towards a kind of political boutiquism that is readily sustained by postmodern forms of consumerism and lifestyle. Against this Žižek argues for a new universalism whose primary ethical directive is to confront the fact that our forms of social existence are founded on exclusion on a global scale. While it is perfectly true that universalism can never become Universal (it will always require a hegemonic-particular embodiment in order to have any meaning), what is novel about Žižek's universalism is that it would not attempt to conceal this fact or to reduce the status of the abject Other to that of a 'glitch' in an otherwise sound matrix. The response of the left to global capitalism cannot be one of retreat into the nation-state or into organicist forms of community’ and popular identities that currently abound in Europe and elsewhere. For Žižek it is, rather, a question of working with the very excesses that, in a Lacanian sense, are in capitalism more than capitalism. It is a question, therefore, of transcending the provincial ‘universalism’ of capitalism. To illustrate the point, Žižek draws attention to the category of ‘intellectual property’ and the increasingly absurd attempts to establish restrictive dominion over technological advance – genetic codes, DNA structures, digital communications, pharmaceutical breakthroughs, computer programs and so on – that either affect us all and/or to which there is a sense of common human entitlement. Indeed, the modern conjuncture of capitalism is more and more characterized by a prohibitive culture: the widespread repression of those forms of research and development that have real emancipatory potential beyond exclusive profiteering; the restriction of information that has direct consequences for the future of humanity; the fundamental denial that social equality could be sustained by the abundance generated by capitalism. Capitalism typically endeavours to constrain the very dimensions of the universal that are enabled by it and simultaneously to resist all those developments that disclose its specificity-artificially as merely one possible mode of being. The left, therefore, must seek to subvert these ungovernable excesses in the direction of a political and politicizing universalism; or what Balibar would call égaliberté. This means that the left should demand more globalization not less. Where neo-liberals speak the language of freedom – either in terms of individual liberty or the free movement of goods and capital – the left should use this language to combat today’s racist obsessions with ‘economic refugees’, ‘immigrants’ and so on, and insist that freedoms are meaningless without the social resources to participate in those freedoms. Where there is talk of universal rights, the left must affirm a responsibility to the universal, one that emphasizes real human solidarity and does not lose sight of the abject within differential discourses. Reversing the well-known environmentalists’ slogan, we must say that the left has to involve itself in thinking locally and acting globally. That is to say, it should attend to the specificity of today’s political identities within the context of their global (capitalist) conditions of possibility precisely in order to challenge those conditions. Yet here I would venture that, despite clearly stated differences (Butler et al., 2000), the political perspective of Žižek is not necessarily opposed to that of Laclau and Mouffe and that a combined approach is fully possible. While Žižek is right to stress the susceptibility of today’s ‘alternative’ forms of hegemonic engagement to deradicalization within a postmodern-p.c. imaginary – a kind of hegemonization of the very terrain (the politico-cultural conditions of possibility) that produces and predisposes the contemporary logics of hegemony – it is equally true to say that the type of political challenge that Žižek has in mind is one that can only advance through the type of hegemonic subversion that Laclau and Mouffe have consistently stressed in their work. The very possibility of a political universalism is one that depends on a certain hegemonic breaking out of the existing conventions/grammar of hegemonic engagement. It is along these lines that Žižek affirms the need for a more radical intervention in the political imagination. The modern (Machiavellian) view of politics is presented in terms of a basic tension between (potentially) unlimited demands/appetites and limited resources; a view which is implicit in the predominant ‘risk society’ perspective where the central (almost Habermasian) concern is with more and better scientific information. The political truth of today’s world, however, is the opposite of this view. That is to say, the demands of the official left (especially the various incarnations of the Third Way left) tend to articulate extremely modest demands in the face of a virtually unlimited capitalism that is more than capable of providing every person on this planet with a civilized standard of living. For Žižek, a confrontation with the obscenities of abundance capitalism also requires a transformation of the ethico-political imagination. It is no longer a question of developing ethical guidelines within the existing political framework (the various institutional and corporate ‘ethical committees’) but of developing a politicization of ethics; an ethics of the Real.8 The starting point here is an insistence on the unconditional autonomy of the subject; of accepting that as human beings we are ultimately responsible for our actions and being-in-the-world up to and including the constructions of the capitalist system itself. Far from simple norm-breaking or refining/reinforcing existing social protocol, an ethics of the Real tends to emerge through norm-breaking and in finding new directions that, by definition, involve traumatic changes: i.e. the Real in genuine ethical challenge. An ethics of the Real does not simply defer to the impossible (or infinite Otherness) as an unsurpassable horizon that already marks every act as a failure, incomplete and so on. Rather, such an ethics is one that fully accepts contingency but which is nonetheless prepared to risk the impossible in the sense of breaking out of standardized positions. We might say that it is an ethics which is not only politically motivated but which also draws its strength from the political itself. For Žižek an ethics of the Real (or Real ethics) means that we cannot rely on any form of symbolic Other that would endorse our (in)decisions and (in)actions: for example, the ‘neutral’ financial data of the stockmarkets; the expert knowledge of Beck’s ‘new modernity’ scientists, the economic and military councils of the New World Order; the various (formal and informal) tribunals of political correctness; or any of the mysterious laws of God, nature or the market. What Žižek affirms is a radical culture of ethical identification for the left in which the alternative forms of militancy must first of all be militant with themselves. That is to say, they must be militant in the fundamental ethical sense of not relying on any external/higher authority and in the development of a political imagination that, like Žižek’s own thought, exhorts us to risk the impossible.

#### Reject the 1AC and its hegemonic knowledge production in favor of alternatives to knowledge production. That’s enough to re-politicize the political sphere and solve the impact to the K.

Sheppard and Leitner 9 (Eric Sheppard, PhD, geographer and Regents Professor of Economic geography at the University of Minnesota, Helga Leitner “ Quo vadis neoliberalism? The remaking of global capitalist governance after the Washington Consensus,” http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/geog/downloads/7235/496.pdf)

We have argued that the shifting global governance discourses directed toward the third world since the 1970s can be conceptualized as capitalism’s supplements. As supplements, they have reafﬁrmed a persistent developmentalist socio-spatial imaginary. Recent discussions of such shifts (e.g., Evans, 2008; Wade, 2008) invoke Karl Polanyi’s double movement: struggles within nationstates of North Atlantic capitalism, dating back to the 18th century, between those propagating free markets and those seeking to protect society through ‘‘powerful institutions designed to check the action of the market relative to labor, land and money” (Polanyi, 2001 [1944], p. 79). The Washington Consensus entailed a shift from the latter to the former pole, albeit at a global scale, generating some nostalgia for national Keynesianism among critical scholars (cf. Peck and Tickell, 2002, p. 38). Yet, while new development economics discourses resonate with Keynesian imaginaries, it is doubtful that we are experiencing a return to Polanyi’s institutions, even at a supra-national scale. The decommodiﬁcation of land, labor and money is not evident, and emergent governance discourses in the US and the UK stress a paternalistic ‘nudging’ of individuals to make the right choices (Thaler and Sunstein, 2003). Nevertheless neoliberalism, as we know it, is in question. The current crisis has made Hayekian nostrums unpopular, but faith in the market runs deep, and it will probably take a decade before it becomes clear what supplement emerges to manage this crisis. There is no shortage of candidates for post-neoliberal governance regimes—both progressive and regressive (Brand and Sekler, 2009)—and in a moment of crisis, when supplements are in question, contestations can play a vital role in shaping capitalism’s trajectories, and viability. Challenging the developmentalist sociospatial imaginary, however, will require not just probing the limits of neoliberalism, but exploring imaginaries that exceed capitalism. Within the academy, a plenitude of conceptual alternatives highlight capitalism’s complicity in producing the inequalities and hierarchies that the developmentalist socio-spatial imaginary claims to overcome, including Marxist, world-systemic, feminist, post-colonial and post-developmental scholarship (cf. Sheppard et al., 2009). These alternatives imagine capitalism, development and governance otherwise – seeking more just and sustainable alternatives that create space for variegated trajectories, uneven connectivities and ineluctable difference, instead of stageism, ﬂattening and commodiﬁcation. Beyond the academy, civil society is expanding the range of alternatives—and is arguably better equipped to disrupt the current experimentations of global policymakers. Experiencing the disabling effects of capitalism and its supplements, those living precariously actively contest neoliberalization, articulating alternative imaginaries and practices through actions ranging from local initiatives to transnational activist networks. The World Social Forum is just the most prominent of innumerable inter-related counter-neoliberal globalization movements (Fisher et al., 2003; Glassman, 2001; Evans, 2008; Notes From Nowhere, 2003; Reitan, 2007). Santos (2008, p. 258) regards its gatherings as a productive forum for ‘‘alternative thinking of alternatives”—where different kinds of knowledge about social transformation and emancipation, exceeding the hegemonic epistemologies of the West, are valorized and actively debated, and where the existence of alternatives is asserted without deﬁning their content It may seem unlikely that such emerging alternatives constitute a serious near-term challenge to capitalist imaginaries, but they are provincializing Western understandings of governance and social transformation, and re-politicizing capitalism. Politicization is essential to make space for transformative rather than afﬁrmative remedies, changing the frameworks that generate unequal power relations, and dismantling EuroAmerican centrism ‘‘so as to undo the vicious circle of economic and cultural subordination” (Fraser, 1997, p. 28).

# 2nd off

#### PC is holding off a vote on Iran sanctions – failure destroys U.S. global credibility

Leverett 1/20 (Flynt, professor at Pennsylvania State University’s School of International Affairs and is a Visiting Scholar at Peking University’s School of International Studies, and Hillary Mann Leverett, Senior Professorial Lecturer at the American University in Washington, DC and a Visiting Scholar at Peking University in Beijing, “Iran, Syria and the Tragicomedy of U.S. Foreign Policy,” http://goingtotehran.com/iran-syria-and-the-tragicomedy-of-u-s-foreign-policy)

Regarding President Obama’s ongoing struggle with the Senate over Iran policy, Hillary cautions against premature claims of “victory” for the Obama administration’s efforts to avert new sanctions legislation while the Joint Plan of Action is being implemented. She points out that “the foes of the Iran nuclear deal, of any kind of peace and conflict resolution in the Middle East writ large, are still very strong and formidable. For example, the annual AIPAC policy conference—a gathering here in Washington of over 10,000 people from all over the country, where they come to lobby congressmen and senators, especially on the Iran issue—that will be taking place in very early March. There’s still a lot that can be pushed and played here.” To be sure, President Obama and Secretary of State John Kerry “have put a lot of political capital on the line.” No other administration has so openly staked out its opposition to a piece of legislation or policy initiative favored by AIPAC and backed by a bipartisan majority on Capitol Hill since the 1980s, when the Reagan administration successfully defended its decision to sell AWACs planes to Saudi Arabia. But, Hillary notes, if the pro-Israel lobby is able to secure a vote on the new sanctions bill, and to sustain the promised veto of said bill by President Obama, “that would be such a dramatic blow to President Obama, and not just on his foreign policy agenda, but it would be devastating to his domestic agenda.” So Obama “has a tremendous amount to lose, and by no means is the fight anywhere near over.” Of course, to say that Obama has put a lot of political capital on the line over the sanctions issue begs the question of whether he is really prepared to spend the far larger amounts of capital that will be required to close a final nuclear deal with Tehran. As Hillary points out, if Obama were “really trying to lead this country on a much more constructive, positive trajectory after failed wars and invasions in Iraq and Afghanistan and Libya—Libya entirely on President Obama’s watch—[he] would be doing a lot more, rather than just giving these lukewarm talks, basically trying to continue to kiss up to major pro-Israel constituencies, and then trying to bring in some of political favors” on Capitol Hill. Compare Obama’s handling of Iran and other Middle East challenges to President Nixon’s orchestration of the American opening to China—including Nixon’s willingness to “break the crockery” of the pro-Taiwan lobby—and the inadequacy of Obama’s approach become glaringly apparent. And that, Hillary underscores, is why we wrote our book, Going to Tehran—because “we think it’s absolutely essential for President Obama to do what Nixon did and go to Tehran, as Nixon went to China,” for “the Middle East is the make-or-break point for the United States, not just in our foreign affairs but in our global economic power and what we’re able to do here at home. If we can’t get what we’re doing in the Middle East on a much better, more positive trajectory, not only will we see the loss of our power, credibility, and prestige in the Middle East, but we will see it globally.”

<insert link>

#### Global nuclear war in a month if talks fail – US sanctions will wreck diplomacy

Press TV 11/13 “Global nuclear conflict between US, Russia, China likely if Iran talks fail”, <http://www.presstv.ir/detail/2013/11/13/334544/global-nuclear-war-likely-if-iran-talks-fail/>

A global conflict between the US, Russia, and China is likely in the coming months should the world powers fail to reach a nuclear deal with Iran, an American analyst says.¶ “If the talks fail, if the agreements being pursued are not successfully carried forward and implemented, then there would be enormous international pressure to drive towards a conflict with Iran before [US President Barack] Obama leaves office and that’s a very great danger that no one can underestimate the importance of,” senior editor at the Executive Intelligence Review Jeff Steinberg told Press TV on Wednesday. ¶ “The United States could find itself on one side and Russia and China on the other and those are the kinds of conditions that can lead to miscalculation and general roar,” Steinberg said. ¶ “So the danger in this situation is that if these talks don’t go forward, we could be facing a global conflict in the coming monthsand years and that’s got to be avoided at all costs when you’ve got countries like the United States, Russia, and China with” their arsenals of “nuclear weapons,” he warned. ¶The warning came one day after the White House told Congress not to impose new sanctions against Tehran because failure in talks with Iran could lead to war.¶White House press secretary Jay Carney called on Congress to allow more time for diplomacy as US lawmakers are considering tougher sanctions. ¶ "This is a decision to support diplomacy and a possible peaceful resolution to this issue," Carney said. "The American people do not want a march to war." ¶ Meanwhile, US Secretary of State John Kerry is set to meet with the Senate Banking Committee on Wednesday to hold off on more sanctions on the Iranian economy. ¶ State Department spokeswoman Jen Psaki said Kerry "will be clear that putting new sanctions in place would be a mistake."¶ "While we are still determining if there is a diplomatic path forward, what we are asking for right now is a pause, a temporary pause in sanctions. We are not taking away sanctions. We are not rolling them back," Psaki added.

# 3th off

The Director of the Western Hemisphere affairs Bureau of the United States Department of State should issue and publish in the Federal Register a policy memorandum that relevant United States entities should substantially increase its economic engagement towards the government of Mexico in the area of renewable energy.

**Competes---the CP’s policy statement is not legally binding---it doesn’t enact the plan, it simply recommends its mandates**

Charles H. Koch 5, the Dudley W. Woodbridge Professor of Law, William and Mary School of Law, Spring 2005, “Policymaking by the Administrative Judiciary,” Alabama Law Review, 56 Ala. L. Rev. 693, p. lexis

n110 E.g., Consol Edison Co of New York v. FERC, 315 F.3d 316, 323 (D.C. Cir 2003)

"Policy statements" differ from substantive rules that carry the "force of law," because they lack "present binding effect" on the agency. When an agency hears a case under an established policy statement, it may decide the case using that policy statement if the decision is not otherwise arbitrary and capricious.

Id.

n111 One brand of nonlegislative rule, "statements of policy," may not have a binding effect on the agency, resulting in even more ambiguous application to administrative judges Several courts distinguish statements of policy from other nonlegislative rules because the latter are not "binding norms" which control the agency For example, the D.C. Circuit described a statement of policy in these terms

An agency policy statement does not seek to impose or elaborate or interpret a legal norm. It merely represents an agency position with respect to how it will treat--typically enforce--the governing legal norm By issuing a policy statement, an agency simply lets the public know its current enforcement or adjudicatory approach . . . Policy statements are binding on neither the public, nor the agency

Syncor Int'l Corp v. Shalala, 127 F.3d 90, 94 (D.C. Cir. 1997).

A statement might not be binding because it serves the dual purpose of "informing the public of the agency's future plans and priorities for exercising its discretionary power," as well as educating and providing direction to agency personnel who are required to implement the agency's policies and exercise its discretionary powers in specific cases. Mada-Luna v. Fitzpatrick, 813 F.2d 1006, 1013 (9th Cir. 1987). A statement acts only prospectively and it does not establish a "binding norm." Id. at 1014 Nonetheless, even a statement may confine the agency's discretion where it would be unfair to deny the statement some effect. Ronald Levin urges that statements and interpretative rules have virtually the same effect Ronald in Levin, Nonlegislative Rules and the Administrative Open Mind, 41 DUKE L J 1497, 1503 (1992).

**Solves the Case---the practical result is the same as binding law---the policy statement sends the signal of the plan and causes agencies to implement it**

James Hunnicutt 99, J.D., Boston College Law School, December 1999, “NOTE: Another Reason to Reform the Federal Regulatory System: Agencies' Treating Nonlegislative Rules as Binding Law,” Boston College Law Review, 41 B.C. L. Rev 153, p. lexis

Depending on whether a rule is adopted with or without notice-and-comment process, the rule will have different legal effects. n113 Legislative rules produced after notice-and-comment procedures constitute substantive law and legally bind both agencies and private parties in future legal and administrative proceedings. n114 Conversely, nonlegislative rules generally may not have binding legal effects. n115 Nonlegislative rules, however, sometimes have practical legal effects. n116

 [\*171] A. Nonlegislative Rules Generally Cannot Have Binding Legal Effects

Rules created without process--interpretative rules, general statements of policy, rules of agency organization and other nonlegislative rules--generally cannot have legally binding effects. n117 In administrative and judicial proceedings, nonlegislative rules are not treated as law, but as influential agency thought that may factor into a proceeding's outcome. n118

According to the courts, nonlegislative rules cannot be the decisive factor in a court proceeding or enforcement action. n119 For example, in 1986, in Thomas v. New York, the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit held that a letter written by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency could not have binding legal effects because it had not been subjected to notice-and-comment process. n120 Several eastern states--including New York, national environmental groups, American citizens owning property in Canada and a Congressman brought suit against Lee Thomas, Administrator of the EPA under President Reagan in the early 1980s, for not revising certain air pollution standards. n121 Prior to Thomas taking the helm of the EPA, Douglas Costle had been the EPA's Administrator under President Carter. n122 Days before Reagan took office, Costle wrote a letter to then Secretary of State Edmund Muskie indicating that based on the findings of an official joint American-Canadian commission, he believed pollution emitted by the United States was responsible for causing acid rain in Canada. n123 According to the 1977 amendments to the Clean Air Act, if the Administrator of the EPA determines that American air pollution is causing significant harm in Canada, the EPA must order the states causing the acid rain to reduce [\*172] air pollution. n124 Then, those states would be obligated to intensify the regulation of the private parties contributing to air pollution within the states' jurisdictions. n125 The new Administrator, Thomas, chose to ignore the letter. n126 Intent on reducing acid rain in Canada, the plaintiffs brought suit, arguing that the letter obliged the EPA to force the generating states to revise their air pollution controls. n127

The court found that the letter constituted a rule within the meaning of the APA and that it had not been created as a result of any rulemaking process. n128 The court reasoned that the rule did not fall within any of the § 553(b)(A) exceptions because it affected individual rights and obligations by causing the states to heighten their regulations, which would result in the termination or restriction of numerous utilities and manufacturers. n129 Because the EPA had not followed the notice-and-comment process to create the rule, the EPA was not required to constrain its discretion by abiding by the letter. n130 The holding in Thomas evidences the principle that nonlegislative rules cannot have binding legal effects. n131 Reality, however, may differ from this principle. n132

B. Agencies May Try to Apply Nonlegislative Rules as Law Against Private Parties

When agencies treat a nonlegislative rule as law, those rules will have the practical effect of binding law because people tend to acquiesce to that which the government informs them constitutes the law. n133 Most members of the public assume all agency rules constitute legitimate law, so they simply conform to all rules. n134 By treating nonlegislative [\*173] rules as law, agencies can convince the public into following nonlegislative rules. n135

Occasionally, agencies rely upon nonlegislative rules for enforcement actions. n136 For example, in 1989 in United States v. Picciotto, the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia reversed a conviction based upon a nonlegislative rule because, by virtue of prescribing unlawful conduct, the rule imposed binding obligations on the public. n137 In 1981, Concepcion Picciotto began a six year, twenty-four-hour-per-day protest against nuclear war across the street from the White House in LaFayette Park. n138 In 1988 the Park Service issued an "additional condition" without performing any notice-and-comment procedures. n139 The additional condition prohibited the storage of property in LaFayette Park beyond that which is reasonably necessary to stage a twenty-four hour protest. n140 A Park Service police officer arrested Picciotto for violating the additional condition. n141 The United States District Court for the District of Columbia found her guilty and gave her a ten-day suspended prison sentence and six months unsupervised probation. n142 The Court of Appeals reversed the conviction, holding that the additional condition was substantive because it imposed obligations enforceable by criminal penalty, even though the Park Service had created it without notice-and-comment. n143 Although Picciotto won her appeal, this case demonstrates how agencies may create rules without notice-and-comment and treat them as binding law. n144 Besides initiating or threatening enforcement actions based on nonlegislative rules, agencies often rely on them to grant or deny applications and permits. n145 Similarly, federal [\*174] agencies can utilize nonlegislative rules to influence programs administered by the states. n146

As the trial court did in Picciotto, courts sometimes agree with the agencies and treat nonlegislative rules as binding law. n147 For instance, in 1993, in United States v. American National Red Cross, the District Court for the District of Columbia issued an injunction against the Red Cross, as part of a settlement, ordering the Red Cross to conform with all of the FDA's nonlegislative rules regarding blood. n148 Concerned with the integrity of the blood supply, the FDA passed numerous legislative and nonlegislative rules regarding how blood was to be handled. n149 Finding that the Red Cross had failed to meet the standards imposed by the FDA, the court specifically differentiated between the FDA's legislative rules and nonlegislative rules, and ordered the Red Cross to abide by both. n150 Therefore, rules created without notice-and-comment became binding law for the Red Cross. n151

 [\*175] C. Analysis of the Legal Effects of Nonlegislative Rules

The situation in Red Cross must be avoided because it robs the public of the opportunity to offer input on nonlegislative rules. n152 Because the Red Cross, the FDA and the court agreed to this settlement, the FDA's nonlegislative rules regarding blood bind the Red Cross, even though the rules create new law, impose legal obligations, have immediate effects, are not necessarily published in the Federal Register and may have significant effects on the public. n153 Moreover, the public lost the opportunity to participate in the creation of laws that will affect many people, including patients in need of blood transfusions. n154

When courts allow nonlegislative rules to have substantive effects on the public, they undermine the foundation underlying the APA and the notice-and-comment procedures therein. n155 Nonlegislative rules should not impose obligations or immediate effects on the public, and courts and agencies should strive to avoid using them in such a manner. Too often, nonlegislative rules have a practical binding legal effect because people do not realize those rules are not binding. The parties affected by the rules choose to acquiesce to the rules rather than attract agency attention, they lack the resources to challenge the rules, or they have already fought the rule in court and have given up on the appeals process. n156

**The CP avoids politics---but the plan and perm link**

Connor N. Raso 10, J.D., Yale Law School, January 2010, “Note: Strategic or Sincere? Analyzing Agency Use of Guidance Documents,” The Yale Law Journal, 119 Yale L.J. 782, p. lexis

Guidance documents generally attract less attention from Congress and the President, giving agency leaders greater latitude to impose their preferred policy choices. Guidance is not subject to the many procedural requirements devised to alert the political branches to agency rulemaking activity. n92 In addition, guidance documents arouse less attention and opposition. Agencies can generally issue a guidance document without attracting advance publicity. The agency therefore has the opportunity to set a new status quo before opponents mobilize. This status quo may generate self-reinforcing feedbacks that strengthen the agency's position. By contrast, agencies must solicit comments on legislative rules. This process generates political activity that may be noticed by Capitol Hill and the White House; some important legislative rulemakings gain political salience as interest group conflict escalates during [\*800] the notice and comment process. n93 This comparison is not intended to suggest that interest groups are unaware of guidance documents. Rather, at the margin, legislative rules arouse more interest group attention and opposition, which results in greater congressional interest. Guidance documents, therefore, are relatively more attractive in cases where Congress and the President are likely to intervene against the agency.

# 3rd off

#### A. Interpretation – “economic engagement” means the aff must be an exclusively economic action – it cannot encompass broader forms of engagement

Jakstaite, 10 - Doctoral Candidate Vytautas Magnus University Faculty of Political Sciences and Diplomacy (Lithuania) (Gerda, “CONTAINMENT AND ENGAGEMENT AS MIDDLE-RANGE THEORIES” BALTIC JOURNAL OF LAW & POLITICS VOLUME 3, NUMBER 2 (2010), DOI: 10.2478/v10076-010-0015-7)

The approach to engagement as economic engagement focuses exclusively on economic instruments of foreign policy with the main national interest being security. Economic engagement is a policy of the conscious development of economic relations with the adversary in order to change the target state‟s behaviour and to improve bilateral relations.94 Economic engagement is academically wielded in several respects. It recommends that the state engage the target country in the international community (with the there existing rules) and modify the target state‟s run foreign policy, thus preventing the emergence of a potential enemy.95 Thus, this strategy aims to ensure safety in particular, whereas economic benefit is not a priority objective. Objectives of economic engagement indicate that this form of engagement is designed for relations with problematic countries – those that pose a potential danger to national security of a state that implements economic engagement. Professor of the University of California Paul Papayoanou and University of Maryland professor Scott Kastner say that economic engagement should be used in relations with the emerging powers: countries which accumulate more and more power, and attempt a new division of power in the international system – i.e., pose a serious challenge for the status quo in the international system (the latter theorists have focused specifically on China-US relations). These theorists also claim that economic engagement is recommended in relations with emerging powers whose regimes are not democratic – that is, against such players in the international system with which it is difficult to agree on foreign policy by other means.96 Meanwhile, other supporters of economic engagement (for example, professor of the University of California Miles Kahler) are not as categorical and do not exclude the possibility to realize economic engagement in relations with democratic regimes.97 Proponents of economic engagement believe that the economy may be one factor which leads to closer relations and cooperation (a more peaceful foreign policy and the expected pledge to cooperate) between hostile countries – closer economic ties will develop the target state‟s dependence on economic engagement implementing state for which such relations will also be cost-effective (i.e., the mutual dependence). However, there are some important conditions for the economic factor in engagement to be effective and bring the desired results. P. Papayoanou and S. Kastner note that economic engagement gives the most positive results when initial economic relations with the target state is minimal and when the target state‟s political forces are interested in development of international economic relations. Whether economic relations will encourage the target state to develop more peaceful foreign policy and willingness to cooperate will depend on the extent to which the target state‟s forces with economic interests are influential in internal political structure. If the target country‟s dominant political coalition includes the leaders or groups interested in the development of international economic relations, economic ties between the development would bring the desired results. Academics note that in non-democratic countries in particular leaders often have an interest to pursue economic cooperation with the powerful economic partners because that would help them maintain a dominant position in their own country.98 Proponents of economic engagement do not provide a detailed description of the means of this form of engagement, but identify a number of possible variants of engagement: conditional economic engagement, using the restrictions caused by economic dependency and unconditional economic engagement by exploiting economic dependency caused by the flow. Conditional economic engagement, sometimes called linkage or economic carrots engagement, could be described as conflicting with economic sanctions. A state that implements this form of engagement instead of menacing to use sanctions for not changing policy course promises for a target state to provide more economic benefits in return for the desired political change. Thus, in this case economic ties are developed depending on changes in the target state‟s behaviour.99 Unconditional economic engagement is more moderate form of engagement. Engagement applying state while developing economic relations with an adversary hopes that the resulting economic dependence over time will change foreign policy course of the target state and reduce the likelihood of armed conflict. Theorists assume that economic dependence may act as a restriction of target state‟s foreign policy or as transforming factor that changes target state‟s foreign policy objectives.100 Thus, economic engagement focuses solely on economic measures (although theorists do not give a more detailed description), on strategically important actors of the international arena and includes other types of engagement, such as the conditional-unconditional economic engagement.

#### B. Violation –Energy is non-economic engagement

**Australian Government, 11** (“The White Paper and Australia’s Strategic Relationship with China”, 9/28

<http://asiancentury.dpmc.gov.au/sites/default/files/public-submissions/nd.doc>

Australia risks losing a healthy relationship with Asia due to overdependence on trade relations and shortcomings of soft power. As trade and economic ties continue to grow between Australia and China, non-economic bilateral relations must be improved in order for general engagement to remain stable. To keep pace with the Asian Century, Australia must strive to find greater common ground with China outside of trade and commerce. The White Paper should take into consideration issues of non-economic relations in order to fully address Australia’s long term relationship with China. Some possible considerations for the White Paper to take into account in building a strategy for improving non-economic engagement with China:  Increased frequency of diplomatic visits and high-level visits; building a policy for minimum frequency and level of such diplomatic engagement  Increasing volume and breadth of non-diplomatic high-level exchanges such as academic conferences, exchange trips between sister agencies, and two-way exchanges between schools by dramatically increasing government funding or subsidization of such engagement  Encouraging bilateral cooperation and partnerships between non-economically driven organisations such as public sector agencies and think tanks for the purpose of fostering mutual investments between China and Australia where more than trade or profit is in question  Encouraging cultural literacy in the Australian population through people-to-people exchange, tourism, and language training; in particular encouraging Mandarin study for non-heritage students from an early age  Increasing funding for China-Australia partnerships on development in science, math, energy, environment and technology; mitigating the risk and impact of China’s capabilities surpassing those of Australia in the near future  Cultivating soft power through aid funding and development projects

#### C. Voting issue –

#### 1. Limits – they explode the topic – blurring the lines between economic and other forms of engagement makes any positive interaction with another country topical. It’s impossible to predict or prepare

#### 2. Ground – the economic limit is vital to critiques of economics, trade disads, and non-economic counterplans

# Case

## Heg

#### Oil is too important especially in Latin America – the transition is too slow to solve their impacts

Stassen 11/19/13 (Murray Stassen, reporter for World News/Finance, acclaimed writer. “US fuel exports to Latin America double in last five years.” *World Finance News*. 11/19/13. <http://www.worldfinance.com/markets/energy/us-fuel-exports-to-latin-america-double-in-last-five-years>) //JJV

Figures reported by the Energy Information Administration (EIA) show that 1.36 million barrels per day were being purchased by the biggest Latin American importers. In 2008 the region was importing around half of this amount, close to 657,000 barrels per day. According to a report by Reuters, the twelve primary Latin American fuel importers spent a total of $65bn on US fuel in 2012.¶ The shale gas exploration explosion in the US has reduced the demand for crude oil imports from its Latin American neighbours. Since 2008, imports from South America to the US have been reported to have fallen by 18.6 percent. There are currently around 2.4 million barrels of crude oil being exported to the US per day.¶ According to the International Energy Agency and the OECD, the demand for fuel in South America is expected to grow the fastest in the world after Asia in the next seven years. It is estimated that by 2020, this demand will have increased to almost 10 million barrels per day.¶ Experts have indicated that the region hopes to limit fuel imports by investing in the construction of new refineries. However, a slow pace of development is expected to ensure that the region continues to import substantial amounts of fuel from the US.

#### 1. High Energy prices set energy policy more effectively than government action

Marotta, ‘4 – writer for San Francisco Chronicle [David and George, 8/18/2004, San Francisco Chronicle, “Fear not – There’s a silver lining to high oil prices,” http://articles.sfgate.com/2004-08-18/opinion/17439976\_1\_oil-prices-high-oil-prices-decrease, DS]

The good news is that high oil prices are beneficial in the long term. Without any coercion, high prices set energy policy more effectively than any government action. High prices decrease the use of oil. As gasoline prices increase, marginal driving will be reduced, and carpooling and use of public transit will increase, and people will use their bikes and even walk more. Higher oil prices will foster conservation. They ensure that the oil we use will be directed to the most valuable purposes. Reduced oil consumption means reduced pollution. Higher oil prices will encourage alternative-energy development. As the price rises, the extraction of oil from shale deposits may become competitive. The increased use of ethanol made from U. S. agricultural crops such as corn would be a boon to our domestic farmers. Wind and hydroelectric power will become more competitive. Development of solar energy will ensue. We might even be encouraged to rethink our negative attitudes toward nuclear-generated power, on which France relies so heavily. Higher oil prices will encourage the production of fuel-efficient cars, including hybrid cars. The domestic and foreign production of such cars (which use both gasoline and batteries) can hardly keep up with the present increased demand. At present, the U.S. government must subsidize billions on research to try to develop efficient and pollution-free hydrogen engines for automobiles. Higher oil prices will naturally make this research cost effective. Higher oil prices will encourage more domestic-oil production. The disadvantages of taking more oil from the north slope of Alaska will have to be balanced against our heavy dependence on unstable Middle East oil supplies that jeopardizes our national-security interests. If federal, state and local governments want to help car owners, they could reduce the high taxes on gasoline, which in some areas equal one-quarter of the cost of a gallon of gas. Gasoline taxes are a regressive tax. Poor families pay a higher percentage of their income on these consumption taxes than do the wealthy. Overall, however, the higher cost of oil provides the negative feedback that will decrease consumption and encourage either alternative or additional production. Markets are brilliant in their ability to determine the optimal value and use of limited resources. Let the free market work its magic.

#### 2. High prices increase global growth—trends prove.

McKillop ‘4 Andrew McKillop, Energy economist and consultant. “A counterintuitive notion: economic growth bolstered by high oil prices, strong oil demand,” Oil and Gas Journal, Lexis.

The standard comment that "high oil prices hurt economic growth" is totally undermined by real-world and real-economy trends. Comparing oil and natural gas price averages in the US in late 1998 with price averages in late 2003, we find that crude oil import prices and bulk gas supply prices have risen more than 200%. Meanwhile, claimed economic growth of the US economy was running at more than 7% on an annual basis in late 2003. It is therefore not difficult to argue that sharply rising oil and gas prices in fact increase economic growth rates, not the reverse.

#### 3. High oil prices catalyze a popular transition to renewables

Dorning, 3/17 – reporter for Bloomberg News [Mike, 3/17/2011, Business Week, “For Obama, High Oil Prices Have a Green Lining,” http://www.businessweek.com/magazine/content/11\_13/b4221037244553.htm, DS]

When gasoline prices go up, Presidential approval ratings historically go down. So the current occupant of the White House is offering sympathy to drivers suffering sticker shock at the pump and publicly ruminating about releasing oil from the nation's strategic reserves. "For Americans already facing tough times, it's an added burden," Barack Obama said at a Mar. 11 news conference. Still, there's a silver lining in higher oil prices—or, rather, a green lining—for Obama, who has made clean energy one of his paramount causes. Rising fuel costs could go a long way toward advancing Obama's "Win the Future" vision of an economy remade by green technologies, including electric vehicles, advanced batteries, wind and solar power, and high-speed trains. "If you want to make people switch toward cleaner energy sources," says Nigel J. Gault (IHS), chief U.S. economist for IHS Global Insight, "you need to change the price incentives people are facing. One way to do that would be to make traditional energy much more expensive." Take electric vehicles. Obama set a goal of putting 1 million on the road by 2015. Based on the $2.66 per gallon average price of unleaded regular gasoline at the beginning of last year, it would take 10 years to break even on the cost of an electric Nissan Leaf and home charging station, compared with a comparable gasoline-powered car. That's even factoring in federal tax breaks. The Leaf is a better deal now: At the $3.54 per gallon national average on Mar. 10, a typical car buyer would break even in seven years and save almost $6,000 over 12 years, according to Bloomberg New Energy Finance. Truth be told, higher prices are what it takes to change the energy consumption habits of large numbers of Americans. "Somehow we have to figure out how to boost the price of gasoline to the levels in Europe," Energy Secretary Steven Chu told The Wall Street Journal in 2008 when he was director of the University of California's Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory. Chu has backed away from that view since taking office. Higher energy prices are precisely what Obama's proposed cap-and-trade legislation to control carbon emissions would have achieved. Had it passed Congress, the system of tradable permits would have raised the cost of carbon-generating fossil fuels, making clean energy sources more competitive. Unlike limits on carbon emissions, higher oil prices don't directly boost alternative power-generating technologies such as wind and solar energy. Oil is used to generate less than 1 percent of U.S. electricity, which is mostly produced by coal, natural gas, and nuclear energy. Still, over time, greater use of electric vehicles and hybrids could make a difference. "If you start substituting electricity for gasoline, it does transfer," says Martin Lagod, managing director of Firelake Capital Management, a $400 million clean-energy investment fund. Only perceptions of a sustained change in gasoline prices will shift consumer car-buying habits. After all, the savings from driving an electric, hybrid, or fuel-efficient conventional automobile are spread over many years. The timing of this price surge early in the expansionary phase of the business cycle may be propitious, says Mark Zandi, chief economist at Moody's Analytics (MCO). It jolts consumers out of complacency after the recessionary ebb in oil prices. "The higher oil prices are, the more viable alternative energy and conservation efforts become," says Zandi, who predicts oil, trading at $97.98 on Mar. 16, will average $125 per barrel in five years. Obama made a similar point during the Mar. 11 news conference, arguing that the jump in prices provided new justification for his energy initiatives. "When prices go back down, we slip back into a trance. And then when prices go up, suddenly we're shocked," Obama said. The White House is not overly concerned that the runup in oil prices to date will cause major damage to the economic recovery. The President's advisers are telling him a $10-a-barrel increase will cut between 0.2 percentage points and 0.3 percentage points from 2011's economic growth, a senior Administration official says. Since the 1970s, the nation has become much less vulnerable to oil price shocks as the economy shifts away from manufacturing and businesses become more energy efficient. Energy consumption per real dollar of U.S. gross domestic product is more than 8 percent lower than in 2005 when Hurricane Katrina disrupted supplies, according to the U.S Energy Information Agency. That's not to say the White House is privately celebrating. Americans already are feeling pinched, and motorists are reminded of gas prices each time they fill their tanks. From Richard Nixon during the 1973 OPEC oil embargo to George W. Bush after Katrina, many a President has seen his popularity decline after sudden oil price jumps. Obama's own job approval, which had been rising since mid-December, reversed direction in early February and began declining as gas prices rose. Mississippi Governor Haley Barbour, who is mulling a run for President in 2012, says Obama's policies "have been designed to drive up the cost of energy." That's not quite right. Three months before the last presidential election, Obama called for tapping the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to bring down gasoline prices, which had recently reached $4.11 a gallon. In the current price runup, Obama seems less willing to release oil from the reserve, but his hand may yet be forced. Obama the policy wonk understands the value of higher gasoline prices in curbing climate change and cleaning up the environment. Obama the politician appreciates the peril that high oil prices present to his standing with voters. The bottom line: If Obama releases oil from the U.S. Strategic Petroleum Reserve, he may delay progress on his green energy goals.

#### 4. High Oil Prices reveal oil dependence – shift away kills food production

Mark 6 (Jason Mark, AlterNet Co-author, “Will the End of Oil Be the End Of Food?”, http://www.alternet.org/story/41023/?page=entire, August 31, 2006) SV

For farmers like Randall, today's challenges may be tomorrow's crises. The problems of coping with high oil prices reveal how utterly dependent our food production system is on nonrenewable fuels. As long as oil is plentiful, that dependence isn't a concern. But in some circles fears are growing that if global petroleum production begins a steady decline, our entire food system will be strained, testing our ability to feed ourselves."How dependent on oil is our food system?" Richard Heinberg, a leading "peak oil" scholar and the author of The Party's Over: Oil, War and the Fate of Industrial Societies said in an interview. "Enormously dependent. Fatally dependent, I would say." Of course, you won't find any oil on your dinner plate, but petroleum and other fossil fuels are inside of every bite you eat. About one-fifth of all U.S. energy use goes into the food system. The synthetic nitrogen fertilizers that are essential for high crop yields are a byproduct of natural gas. Gasoline and diesel fuels power the combines that rumble through the grain fields. Countless kilowatts of electricity are burned up in the factories that process all of the packaged goods that line the supermarket shelves. And then there's the gasoline required simply to get food to market. We now have a globalized food system, one in which the typical American meal travels 1,500 miles from farm to fork. Organic products -- though they may have a more sustainable veneer -- are in many respects no different; 10 percent of organic products come from abroad. Without oil, we would all be on one harsh diet. "We've created an agricultural system where, on average, for every energy of food calorie we produce, we need to expend about 10 calories of fossil fuels," Heinberg said. Such an imbalance would not be worrisome if there were an inexhaustible supply of oil. But, as every child learns in elementary science class, petroleum is a nonrenewable resource. A heated debate is under way about when that resource will begin to decline. Some say that we have already passed the summit of peak oil and point to a leveling of global petroleum production as proof. The U.S. government argues that we have decades before oil extraction begins to decline. Others calculate that we will hit the peak oil mark sometime in the next 10 years. Regardless of when exactly oil production starts to drop, it's clear that in this century humanity will have to learn to live without cheap, abundant oil. What this means for our food system is also up for debate. At the very least, costlier oil will lead to more expensive food, especially for processed and packaged goods. At the very worst, peak oil could seriously disrupt agriculture, especially in highly industrialized nations like the United States, where food systems are heavily reliant on oil. "This era of increasing globalization of our food supply is going to draw to a close here in the next decade or so," Ronnie Cummins, executive director of the Organic Consumers Association, said. "I think it (eventual oil scarcities) is going to mean the end of importing billions of dollars of food from overseas. It's going to mean the end of relatively cheap food in the U.S. And it's going to mean a significant increase in starvation and malnourishment across the world."

#### 1. Hegemony is resilient – the US is way ahead of everyone else

Brooks and Wohlforth, 08

(Stephen G Brooks & William C. Wohlforth Associate Professors in the Department of Government @ Dartmouth College. World Out of Balance, p. 27-31)

“**Nothing has ever existed like this disparity of power; nothing,”** historian Paul Kennedy observes: “I have returned to all of the comparative defense spending and military personnel statistics over the past 500 years that I compiled in The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers, and **no other nation comes close.” Though assessments of U.S. power have changed since those words were written in 2002, they remain true. Even when capabilities are understood broadly to include economic, technological, and other wellsprings of national power, they are concentrated in the United States to a degree never before experienced in the history of the modern system of states and thus never contemplated by balance-of-power theorists. The United States spends more on defense that all the other major military powers combined, and most of those powers are its allies. Its massive investments in the human, institutional, and technological requisites of military power, cumulated over many decades, make any effort to match U.S. capabilities even more daunting** that the gross spending numbers imply. **Military research and development (R&D) may best capture the scale of the long-term investment that give the United States a dramatic qualitative edge in military capabilities.** As table 2.1 shows, in 2004 **U.S. military R&D expenditures were more than six times greater than those of Germany, Japan, France, and Britain combined.** By some estimates **over half the military R&D expenditures in the world are American.** And this disparity has been sustained for decades: over the past 30 years, for example, the United States has invested over three times more than the entire European Union on military R&D. These vast commitments have created a preeminence in military capabilities vis-à-vis all the other major powers that is unique after the seventeenth century. While other powers could contest U.S. forces near their homelands, especially over issues on which nuclear deterrence is credible, **the United States is and will long remain the only state capable of projecting major military power globally. This capacity arises from “command of the commons” – that is, unassailable military dominance over the sea, air, and space**. As Barry Posen puts it, Command of the commons is the key military enabler of the U.S global power position. It allows the United States to exploit more fully other sources of power, including its own economic and military might as well as the economic and military might of its allies. **Command of the commons also helps the United States to weaken its adversaries, by restricting their access to economic, military, and political assistance….Command of the commons provides the United States with more useful military potential for a hegemonic foreign policy than any other offshore power has ever had**. Posen’s study of American military primacy ratifies Kennedy’s emphasis on the historical importance of the economic foundations of national power. It is the combination of military and economic potential that sets the United States apart from its predecessors at the top of the international system. Previous leading states were either great commercial and naval powers or great military powers on land, never both. The British Empire in its heyday and the United States during the Cold War, for example, shared the world with other powers that matched or exceeded them in some areas. Even at the height of the Pax Britannica, the United Kingdom was outspent, outmanned, and outgunned by both France and Russia. Similarly, at the dawn of the Cold War the United States was dominant economically as well as in air and naval capabilities. But the Soviet Union retained overall military parity, and thanks to geography and investment in land power it had a superior ability to seize territory in Eurasia. **The United States’ share of world GDP in 2006, 27.5 percent, surpassed that of any leading state in modern history, with the sole exception of its own position after 1945** (when World War II had temporarily depressed every other major economy). **The size of the U.S economy means that its massive military capabilities required roughly 4 percent of its GDP in 2005, far less than the nearly 10 percent it averaged over the peak years of the Cold War, 1950-70, and the burden borne by most of the major powers of the past. As Kennedy sums up, “Being Number One at great cost is one thing; being the world’s single superpower on the cheap is astonishing.”**

#### 2. US withdrawal won’t cause power wars – forward deployment only encourages NATO growth and Russian expansionism

Gholz, Press, and Sapolsky, 97

(Eugene Gholz and Daryl Press, doctoral candidates in political science at MIT. Harvey Sapolsky, professor of public policy at MIT. International Security, Vol. 21, No. 4. Spring 1997)

**Several prominent analysts favor a policy of selective engagement. These** **analysts fear that American military retrenchment would increase the risk of great power war.** **A great power war today would be a calamity, even for those countries that manage to stay out of the fighting. The best way to prevent great power war, according to these analysts, is to remain engaged in Europe and East Asia. Twice in this century the United States has pulled out of Europe, and both times great power war followed. Then America chose to stay engaged, and the longest period of European great power peace ensued. In sum, selective engagers point to the costs of others' great power wars and the relative ease of preventing them.** **The selective engagers' strategy is wrong for two reasons. First, selective engagers overstate the effect of U.S. military presence as a positive force for great power peace. In today's world, disengagement will not cause great power war, and continued engagement will not reliably prevent it.** In some circumstances, **engagement may actually increase the likelihood of conflict.** **Second, selective engagers overstate the costs of distant wars and seriously understate the costs and risks of their strategies. Overseas deployments require a large force structure. Even worse**, **selective engagement will ensure that when a future great power war erupts, the United States will be in the thick of things. Although distant great power wars are bad for America, the only sure path to ruin is to step in the middle of a faraway fight.** Selective engagers overstate America's effect on the likelihood of future great power wars. **There is little reason to believe that withdrawal from Europe or Asia would lead to deterrence failures. With or without a forward U.S. presence, America's major allies have sufficient military strength to deter any potential aggressors.** **Conflict is far more likely to erupt from a sequence described in the spiral model. The danger of spirals leading to war in East Asia is remote. Spirals happen when states, seeking security, frighten their neighbors. The risk of spirals is greatest when offense is easier than defense, because any country's attempt to achieve security will give it an offensive capability against its neighbors. The neighbors’ attempts to eliminate the vulnerability give them fleeting offensive capabilities and tempt them to launch preventive war. Bu**t **Asia**, as discussed earlier, **is blessed with inherent defensive advantages. Japan and Taiwan are islands, which makes them very difficult to invade. China has a long land border with Russia, but enjoys the protection of the East China Sea, which stands between it and Japan. The expanse of Siberia gives Russia, its ever trusted ally, strategic depth. South Korea benefits from mountainous terrain which would channel an attacking force from the north.** Offense is difficult in East Asia, so spirals should not be acute. In fact, no other region in which great powers interact offers more defensive advantage than East Asia. **The prospect for spirals is greater in Europe, but continued US engagement does not reduce that danger; rather, it exacerbates the risk. A West European military union, controlling more than 21 percent of the world's GOP, may worry Russia. But NATO, with 44 percent of the world's COP, is far more threatening, especially if it expands eastward. The more NATO frightens Russia, the more likely it is that Russia will turn dangerously nationalist, redirect its economy toward the military, and try to re-absorb its old buffer states. But if the U.S. military were to withdraw from Europe, even Germany, Europe's strongest advocate for NATO expansion, might become less enthusiastic, because it would be German rather than American troops standing guard on the new borders.**

#### American hegemony does not solve conflict

Bandow, Senior Fellow at the Cato institute, 13

(Doug Bandow, special assistant to President Reagan, editor of political magazine *Inquiry*, 7-5-13, “Egypt and American Hubris,” http://nationalinterest.org/commentary/egypt-american-hubris-8692, 7-7-13, JZ)

American foreign policy is a wreck. The presumption that Washington controls events around the globe has been exposed to all as an embarrassing illusion.

Egypt teeters on the brink, again. Syria worsens by the day. Israeli-Palestinian negotiations are dead, with another intifada in the wind. North Korea threatens to nuke the world. Violence grows in Nigeria. The Europeans have gone from disillusioned to angry with President Barack Obama. Argentina, Brazil, Ecuador and Venezuela reject U.S. leadership in Latin America. Even Iranian reformers support Iran’s nuclear program. Zimbabwe’s vicious Robert Mugabe is likely to retain power in upcoming elections. Iraq is friendly with Iran and supporting Bashar al-Assad. The Afghan government remains corrupt, incompetent, and without legitimacy. Bahrain cracks down on democracy supporters with Washington’s acquiescence. China and Russia resist U.S. priorities in Syria and elsewhere. Venezuela without Chavez looks like Venezuela with Chavez.

It wasn’t supposed to be this way. America was the unipower, the hyperpower, the sole superpower, the essential nation. Washington was the benevolent hegemon. Only members of the axis of evil had something to fear from the United States. All the U.S. government had to do was exercise “leadership” and all would be well.

That U.S. pride swelled with the end of the Cold War is hardly a surprise. But what unfortunately emerged was a rabid arrogance, the view that “what we say goes.” It was the very hubris about which the ancient Greeks warned.

Alas, this all proved to be a world of illusion, filled with smoke and mirrors. On 9/11 a score of angry young Muslims brought war to America, destroying the World Trade Center and damaging the Pentagon. A bunch of ill-equipped and ignorant Afghan fundamentalists refused to admit that they were defeated, and more than a decade later still resist the United States backed by a multitude of allies and a covey of local elites. The invasion of Iraq was met by IEDs instead of flowers, and created an ally in name only, with Baghdad ready to thwart U.S. military objectives when it saw fit.

American pleading, threats, promises and sanctions had no effect on the course of events in North Korea. Civil and military conflicts ebbed and flowed and political contests waxed and waned in Congo, Sudan, Kenya, Nigeria and Zimbabwe with Washington but an ineffective bystander. Russia’s Vladimir Putin ignored U.S. priorities both before and after the fabled “reset” in relations. China protected North Korea and bullied its other neighbors, despite diplomatic pleadings and military pivots.

As for succeeding events, where is the evidence that Morsi, Egypt’s generals and the Egyptian people sat around awaiting the opinion of U.S. policymakers? Washington’s support for the odious Mubarak left it with little credibility. Maybe the generals can be bought with the promise of more military aid, but even they know that the U.S. cannot protect them if their soldiers refuse their orders. Morsi’s fate was decided in Cairo, not Washington.

Americans understandably pine for a simpler world in which Washington is the center of the world and the U.S. orchestrates international events. Alas, that world never really existed. It certainly does not exist today.

Instead of embracing the illusion of Washington’s omniscience, Washington officials should acknowledge the limitations on their power and influence. They should reflect on events spinning out of control in Egypt. It’s time for the more “humble” foreign policy that candidate George W. Bush promised in what seems to be a lifetime ago.

## Renewables

#### Energy coop high now—No chance of conflict

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

Despite the challenges, the United States and Mexico are working together on a wide variety of renewable energy and energy efficiency projects. The U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) ¶ is working with Mexico to develop a national Low-Emission Development Strategy (LEDS) for Mexico ¶ and also is working with Mexican federal, state, and municipal governments on a range of programs, from ¶ encouraging the use of renewables to energy efficient mortgages and renewable standards. ¶ In 2010, the United States and Mexico expanded their Methane to Markets Partnership with the ¶ launch of the Global Methane Initiative (GMI) to expand and accelerate global methane reductions. ¶ In addition, EPA cooperates with the Mexican Secretariat of Environment and Natural Resources ¶ (SEMARNAT) on reducing heavy vehicle emissions through Mexico’s Transporte Limpio program, ¶ which is based on EPA’s SmartWay program, aimed at reducing transportation-related emissions by ¶ creating incentives to improve supply chain fuel efficiency. DOE and SENER share information on ¶ smart grid, renewable energy, and energy efficiency technologies, and work with EPA and SEMARNAT ¶ on a partnership to develop a program similar to ENERGY STAR to promote the use of more efficient ¶ building materials and appliances in Mexico. Mexico has taken the lead within the Energy and Climate ¶ Partnership of the Americas on an Energy Efficiency Working Group for the region, and supports ¶ regional interconnections and energy access efforts. Mexico also is part of the Clean Energy Ministerial process, where it leads with other countries on energy efficiency, smart grid, and renewable energy ¶ initiatives. Finally, as part of a 1993 bilateral agreement to the North American Free Trade Agreement ¶ (NAFTA), the United States and Mexico formed the North American Development Bank (NADB) ¶ and Border Environment Cooperation Commission (BECC), which recently have begun assessing and ¶ financing some renewable energy projects in the border area.

#### **Mexico won’t be pursuing renewables, no solvency**

Meisen 09, - (Peter, 12/09, “RENEWABLE ENERGY POTENTIAL OF LATIN AMERICA”, http://www.geni.org/globalenergy/research/renewable-energy-potential-of-latin-america/Potential%20of%20Renewables%20in%20Latin%20America-edited-12-16%20\_Letter\_.pdf)//JJV

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 constructed. 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 invest in renewable energies or create appropriate renewable energy policies. Another common explanation is that the development of renewable energies clash with the interest of powerful players, particularly large energy companies, and, therefore, there are few incentives to promote them. The Latin American renewable energy sector is almost entirely dominated by only two forms of renewables: hydro and biofuels, which make up respectively 36% and 62% share of the total of renewables. Other forms of renewable energies represent only an insignificant fraction of total energy production (1.4%). The problem itself is that these two forms of energy are not in all cases the most adequate and in fact questionable to the extent of being renewable and sustainable.

#### Renewable investment inevitable and increasing now—conventional energy problems and renewable cost competitiveness prove

Sawin 4

Senior Fellow at the Worldwatch Institute and a member of the Institute's Energy and Climate Change team (Janet, Mainstreaming Renewable Energy In The 21st Century, WorldWatch Institute, March 30, 2004, http://books.google.com/books?id=RDypMDiConIC&dq=%22renewable+energy%22+inevitable&lr=&source=gbs\_navlinks\_s)//AG

In 1999, **the International Energy Agency noted that “the world is in the early stages of an inevitable transition to a sustainable energy system** that will be largely dependent on renewable resources.” This is a bold statement for an organization that represents North America, Europe, and Japan—areas that depend so heavily on fossil fuels. But **it seems logical, given the many problems associated with the use of conventional energy and the tremendous surge in renewable energy investments over recent years. Global investment in renewable energy exceeded $20.3 billion in 2003**, and cumulative investments totaled at least $100 billion between 1995 and 2003. **Markets for new renewable energy are expected to approach $85 billion annual**ly within the next decade. The technical progress of many renewable technologies has been faster than anticipated even a few years ago, and this trend is expected to continue. While a **costs** are still a concern with some technologies, they **are falling rapidly due to technological advances, automated manufacturing, economies of scale through increased production volumes**, and learning by doing. Solar and wind are the best-known renewables but inexhaustible energy supplies are also offered by biomass, geothermal, hydropower, ocean energy (from tides, currents, and waves), and ocean thermal energy. **The remainder of this paper focuses on wind power and photovoltaics for electricity generation** because they are the fastest-growing renewables, they share the challenges of being intermittent and having high up-front capital costs, solar and wind resources are nearly ubiquitous, and they have the greatest potential for helping all countries to achieve a more sustainable energy future. **During the past two decades, wind energy technology has evolved to the point where it can compete with conventional forms of power generation** at good sites. **Costs have declined 12-18 percent for each doubling of global capacity**. As a result, the average cost of wind-generated electricity has fallen from about 46 per kilowatthour in 1980 to 3-5 cents at good wind sites today

#### Alt cause- Chinese government intervention means the US can’t be competitive in renewable energy

Hart, 12

(Melanie, policy analyst for Chinese energy and climate policy at the Center for American Progress, “Shining a Light on U.S.-China Clean Energy Cooperation”, 2/9/12, AD: 7/8/12, http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2012/02/china\_us\_energy.html | SinA.

Nonetheless, **over the past decade U.S. companies have gotten much better at manufacturing, deploying, and operating renewable energy technologies**, and as a result prices are coming down rapidly. As prices decrease renewable energy gains market share and speeds our transition toward a more sustainable energy economy. **The problem is China is particularly good at making things cheaply**. At the lower end of the value chain, that is primarily **due to** the country’s **low labor costs** and **massive supply chains**. Also advantageous are **China’s lax labor, safety, health, and environmental standards.** At the higher end, that is often **because the Chinese government provides generous subsidies and other forms of support for high-technology research, development, and commercialization**. **Low-cost Chinese manufacturing plays a large role in driving prices down** for a wide range of products, including renewable energy technologies. Chinese manufacturing also plays a large role in **pricing some U.S. manufacturers out of business, with many of those manufacturers claiming that the “China price” is driven by Chinese government intervention** rather than natural market forces**. If the Chinese government is intervening in a way that breaks trade rules then that type of rule breaking should be remedied in some way**. Determining whether China is playing by the rules requires taking a close look at their renewable energy policies—not only at the national level but also at the provincial and local levels. Those policies are often difficult to parse because **China’s economic system is not like that of the United States**. **It is a nonmarket economy with a top-down, command-and-control energy planning process that is often nontransparent with even more opaque interactions between the central government** in Beijing **and the provincial and local governments** when these policies are implemented. **All this makes it very difficult to figure out whether the country is abiding by international trade rules.**

#### Empirically, there will be no resource wars – oil is not an exception

Salehyan 8

(Idean Salehyan (Professor of Political Science at the University of North Texas) May 2008 “From Climate Change to Conflict? No Consensus Yet\*” Journal of Peace Research, vol. 45, no. 3 http://emergingsustainability.org/files/resolver%20climate%20change%20and%20conflict.pdf

First, the deterministic view has poor predictive power as to where and when conflicts will break out. **For every potential example of an environmental catastrophe or resource shortfall that leads to violence, there are many more counter-examples in which conflict never occurs. But popular accounts typically do not look at the dogs that do not bark**. Darfur is frequently cited as a case where desertification led to food scarcity, water scarcity, and famine, in turn leading to civil war and ethnic cleansing.5 Yet, **food scarcity and hunger are problems** endemic to many countries – particularly in sub-Saharan Africa – but similar problems elsewhere have not led to large-scale violence**.** According to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, **food shortages and malnutrition** Aff**ect more than a third of the population in Malawi, Zambia, the Comoros, North Korea, and Tanzania,6 although none of these countries have experienced fullblown civil war and** **state failure**. Hurricanes, coastal flooding, and droughts – which are all likely to intensify as the climate warms – are frequent occurrences which rarely lead to violence. The Asian Tsunami of 2004, although caused by an oceanic earthquake, led to severe loss of life and property, flooding, population displacement, and resource scarcity, but it did not trigger new wars in Southeast Asia. Large-scale migration has the potential to provoke conflict in receiving areas (see Reuveny, 2007; Salehyan & Gleditsch, 2006), yet **most migration flows do not lead to conflict, and**, in this regard, social integration and citizenship policies are particularly important (Gleditsch, Nordås & Salehyan, 2007). In short, resource scarcity, natural disasters, and long-term climatic shifts are ubiquitous, while armed conflict is rare; therefore, **environmental conditions**, by themselves, **cannot predict violent outbreaks**. Second, **even if local skirmishes over access to resources arise, these do not always escalate to open warfare and state** **collapse**. While interpersonal violence is more or less common and may intensify under resource pressures, sustained armed conflict on a massive scale is difficult to conduct. Meier, Bond & Bond (2007) show that, under certain circumstances, environmental conditions have led to cattle raiding among pastoralists in East Africa, but **these conflicts rarely escalate to sustained violence**. Martin (2005) presents evidence from Ethiopia that, while a large refugee influx and population pressures led to localized conflict over natural resources, effective resource management regimes were able to ameliorate these tensions. Both of these studies emphasize the role of local dispute-resolution regimes and institutions– not just the response of central governments – **in preventing resource conflicts from spinning out of control**. Martin’s analysis also points to the importance of international organizations, notably the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, in implementing effective policies governing refugee camps. Therefore, local hostilities need not escalate to serious armed conflict and can be managed if there is the political will to do so. Third, states often bear responsibility for environmental degradation and resource shortfalls, either through their own projects and initiatives or through neglect of the environment. Clearly, climate change itself is an exogenous stressor beyond the control of individual governments. However, government policies and neglect can compound the effects of climate change. Nobel Prizewinning economist Amartya Sen finds that, even in the face of acute environmental scarcities, countries with democratic institutions and press freedoms work to prevent famine because such states are accountable to their citizens (Sen, 1999). Others have similarly shown a strong relationship between democracy and protection of the environment (Li & Reuveny, 2006). Faced with global warming, some states will take the necessary steps to conserve water and land, redistribute resources to those who need them most, and develop disaster-warning and -response systems. Others will do little to respond to this threat. While a state’s level of income and technological capacity are certainly important, democracy – or, more precisely, the accountability of political leaders to their publics – is likely to be a critical determinant of how states respond to the challenge. Fourth, **violent conflict is an inefficient and sub-optimal reaction to changes in the environment and resource scarcities.** As environmental conditions change, several possible responses are available, although many journalists and policymakers have focused on the potential for warfare. Individuals can migrate internally or across borders, or **they can invest in technological improvements, develop conservation strategies**, and shift to less climate-sensitive livelihoods, **among other adaptation mechanisms. Engaging in armed rebellion is quite costly and risky** and requires large-scale collective action**. Individuals and households are more likely to engage in simpler, personal, or smallscale coping strategies**. Thus, organized violence is inefficient at the individual level. But, more importantly, armed violence against the state is used as a means to gain leverage over governments so as to gain some form of accommodation, namely, the redistribution of economic resources and political power. Organized armed violence rarely (if ever) arises spontaneously but is usually pursued when people perceive their government to be unwilling to listen to peaceful petitions. As mentioned above, rebellion does not distribute resources by itself, and protracted civil wars can have devastating effects on the economy and the natural environment, leaving fewer resources to bargain over. Thus, organized violence is inefficient at the collective level. Responsive, accountable political leaders – at all levels of government – are more likely to listen to citizen demands for greater access to resources and the means to secure their livelihoods. Political sensitivity to peaceful action can immunize states from armed insurrection.

#### Grid collapse is inevitable- solar storms

Cooper & Sovocal, 11

Christopher is a Smart Grid Fellow at the Institute on Energy & the Environment at Vermont Law School and Benjamin is an Assistant Professor at the Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy at the University of Singapore, “Not Your Father's Y2K: Preparing the North American Power Grid for the Perfect Solar Storm,” <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1040619011000972>

For1 two days in February 2010, senior government officials and a handful of representatives from select public–private entities from the UnitedStates, Sweden, and the European Union quietly gathered at the David Skaggs Research Center in Boulder, Colo. They had been called together by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to simulate what would happen if, as they were meeting, the North American bulk power system were struck by a severe solar storm.¶ The results were sobering. Within the first hour, the simulated storm would cause cascading power outages throughout the eastern and mid-Atlantic U.S. and eastern Canada. Power stations across the northern hemisphere would report numerous step-up and transmission transformer failures. Lacking back-up transformers and with virtually no domestic manufacturing capability, repairs and replacements would take several weeks, with full grid recovery taking at least six months. Within the first few days, emergency response personnel would face critical infrastructure failure as water distribution, sewage, medical care, phone service, and fuel supply systems collapsed. Service disruption of satellite and GPS communications would severely hamper emergency response and recovery. Utility workers in affected populated areas soon would abandon their posts to be with their families as civil society crumbled around them.2¶ It might be easy to dismiss this scenario as more the synopsis of a Hollywood big-budget disaster flick than the realistic assessment of the world's best emergency management experts. But the group's findings were enough to compel Britain's chief science advisor to warn that a severe solar storm could lead to a “global Katrina” costing the world's economies as much as $2 trillion.3¶ Solar storms in the form of coronal mass ejections (CME)—superheated gas and charged particles discharged from the sun—have the potential to inflict massive damage on electricity infrastructure. As the FEMA and DHS simulation revealed, currents induced by a CME can impair the security and performance of high-voltage transmission lines, communication satellites, GPS navigation systems, data centers, and air traffic control facilities.4 They can cause large voltage differences between grounding points in power lines and force a huge amount of DC power through system components incapable of handling it.¶ Some of the world's best solar researchers have concluded that the planet is overdue for a severe solar storm. They warn that the chance for a major geomagnetic disturbance is increasing as the sun is entering its next solar maximum.5 Recently, NOAA's Space Weather Prediction Center has observed signs of significant activity, alerting the start of the new solar cycle (cycle #24). Some scientists are predicting storm intensities similar to the most powerful CME events since they were first recognized in 1859. Adding to this concern is the surprise discovery in 2007 of a breach in the earth's protective magnetosphere that has contributed to predictions that cycle #24 could be far more destructive than any recorded in human history.6¶ The group's findings were enough to compel Britain's chief science advisor to warn that a severe solar storm could lead to a “global Katrina.”¶ Indeed, in June 2010, the Space Weather Enterprise Forum (SWEF), a coalition of federal agency and private-sector space officials engaged in monitoring space weather and its effects on critical civil and national security infrastructure, issued a report stating that the potential impacts of space weather are not widely known or poorly understood. As a result, the study cautioned that the nation is not ready for an extreme weather event, nor is it prepared to cope with the nationwide impacts that would result from even a solar storm of modest size.7 One SWEF participant, FEMA Administrator W. Craig Fumate, gave his own agency poor grades for its preparedness for catastrophic solar storms and declared that the nation was in dire need of better forecasting, preparation and coordination.8¶ This article begins by explaining briefly how CMEs are formed before discussing the impact of space weather on transmission lines, transformers, grid stability, and the entire electricity system. It then proposes a set of eight recommendations that policymakers and utility planners in the UnitedStates (and elsewhere) can take to minimize system-wide vulnerabilities to solar storms. These suggestions include augmenting NERC reliability standards and requiring better solar storm forecasting, as well as establishing an early warning and alert system and improving situational awareness at utilities through faster data acquisition and more complex analysis communicated to operators. We also recommend faster control of system components through automated voltage control and power flow management at both the transmission and distribution levels, and adaptive adjustment of protective mechanisms through embedded intelligent devices capable of providing dynamic selective load shedding and intentional islanding.9 Finally, we call on the federal government to invest in local manufacturing of system components and to provide adequate funding to coordinate government efforts at responding to solar storms.

#### New Tech solves- multiple responses available to grid collapse

Business Wire, 1

(Dec. 17. “Innovative technologies can improve national security; optimal technologies software able to make nation’s power grid more secure” written by business editors/high-tech and energy writers. http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_m0EIN/is\_2001\_Dec\_17/ai\_80858553)

**Optimal Technologies announced this week the ability to improve national security with breakthrough electric power system technologies. If one part of a power grid were to fail due to intentional disruption -- or accident, operating error, or natural disaster -- Optimal's tools could allow multiple responses to avoid grid collapse,** including automated recontrolling of key connections, rerouting of power flows, and precise management of loads. Optimal's new Aempfast(TM) (pronounced aim-fast**) software, now being tested, has the unique ability to "see" the power grid as a whole and in great detail. Aempfast can swiftly find blockages in power flow, identify and direct system adjustments eliminating the congestion points, and reroute power -- in seconds**, as opposed to hours -- thereby avoiding blackouts and brownouts. **"This software is fundamental for electric power contingency planning and crisis management,"** said Roland Schoettle, founder and CEO of Optimal Technologies.

#### No deaths from nuclear meltdowns

Drum, 11

Kevin, political blogger for Mother Jones, "Nukes and the Free Market", March 14, www.motherjones.com/kevin-drum/2011/03/nukes-and-free-market

We’re currently told that the death toll in Japan will be at least 10,000 people of whom approximately zero seem to have perished in nuclear accidents. What happens when a tsunami hits an offshore drilling platform or a natural gas pipeline? What happens to a coal mine in an earthquake? How much environmental damage is playing out in Japan right now because of gasoline from cars pushed around? The main lesson is “try not to put critical infrastructure near a fault line” but Japan is an earthquakey country, so what are they really supposed to do about this?¶ This is a good point: energy sources of all kind cause problems. Sometimes the problems create screaming headlines (nuke meltdowns, offshore oil explosions, mining disasters) and sometimes they don't (increased particulate pollution, global warming, devastation of salmon runs). But the dangers are there for virtually every type of energy production.¶ Still, it's worth pointing out that the problem with nuclear power isn't so much its immediate capacity to kill people. As Matt points out, no one has died in Japan from the partial meltdowns at its damaged nuclear plants, and it's unlikely anyone ever will. The control rods are in place, and even in the worst case the containment vessels will almost certainly restrict the worst damage.

#### Net effects of meltdowns are ecologically positive

Lynas, 11

Visiting Research Associate at Oxford University’s School of Geography and the Environment. (Mark, How a nuclear disaster can be good for ecology, [www.marklynas.org/2011/06/how-a-nuclear-disaster-can-be-good-for-ecology/](http://www.marklynas.org/2011/06/how-a-nuclear-disaster-can-be-good-for-ecology/))

It is an article of faith for most greens that nuclear power is an ‘environmental’ issue. Ergo, nuclear power is bad for ‘the environment’ and should be replaced with ‘clean, renewable power’ like windmills and solar panels. This is in effect what the German government has agreed to do, under pressure from its resurgent Green Party, in phasing out nuclear by 2022. (Ignore for the moment the fact that in reality this will almost certainly lead to a vast increase in fossil fuelled carbon emissions.)¶ The truth, insofar as ecological science can establish it, is rather different. Here is what Robert Baker and Ronald Chesser, two ecologists studying biodiversity around Chernobyl, wrote more than ten years ago in the journal Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry:¶ Mention of the Chornobyl nuclear disaster usually brings thoughts of death, destruction, cancer, massive economic loss, and other negative images. Clearly, the economic impacts have been devastating for the Ukrainian economy, and the harmful effects such as elevated cancer rates in humans and the killing of pine trees in the Red Forest are real. However, the sum effect for the flora and fauna in the highly radioactive, restricted zone has been overwhelmingly positive in favor of biodiversity and abundance of individuals. Our 12 expeditions to the most radioactive areas of these zones reveal that animal life is abundant. Parts of the 10-km exclusion zone around Reactor 4 are strikingly, yet deceptively, beautiful. Only the clicks and whistles of our electronic equipment indicated that the habitat was contaminated with radioactivity.¶ Of course, this is not to say that radiation in and of itself somehow benefits wildlife. What brings the big boon to biodiversity is the removal of humans from the equation. Baker and Chesser reported frequent sightings of moose, deer, foxes, wild boar and river otters inside the 30-kilometre Chernobyl exclusion zone – whereas in the still-cultivated area outside the zone, the only wildlife they saw was a single rabbit. The researchers concluded:¶ … the benefit of excluding humans from this highly contaminated ecosystem appears to outweigh significantly any negative cost associated with Chornobyl radiation¶ and that¶ … typical human activity (industrialization, farming, cattle raising, collection of firewood, hunting, etc.) is more devastating to biodiversity¶ ¶ and abundance of local flora and fauna than is the worst nuclear power plant disaster¶ Why this ecological knowledge has failed to penetrate amongst self-professed ‘environmentalists’ is a mystery. In the popular imagination the area around Chernobyl is a blighted wasteland, a mental picture kept alive by the apocalyptic (and superlatively unscientific) myths put about by the likes of Greenpeace. Take the recent piece by the Observer’s Robin McKie, who – as far as I can tell – visited Chernobyl on a stage-managed Greenpeace press tour and penned an obedient piece titled ‘Chernobyl 25 years on: A poisoned landscape‘. Employing the traditional scary imagery, he writes:¶ The Ukrainian steppe is still frost-burned and the trees leafless at this time of year. There are no buds on branches and little hint of greenery, a combination that only enhances the eerie desolation inside the 30km exclusion zone around the reactor…¶ But the clue to why McKie saw a ‘poisoned landscape’ lies in the first sentence: he went in winter. When I visited last summer, I saw a very different scene – the vibrant profusion of vegetation was extraordinary, as was the noise of bird calls and buzzing insects. It seemed like life was exploding everywhere.¶ So on, inevitably, to Fukushima. Once again, this is not an ‘environmental’ disaster in any sense in which the word is commonly understood. There will be no discernible ecological impacts, despite the substantial amounts of radiation that have been released through the triple meltdown and containment failures seen immediately after the tsunami. Unlike with Chernobyl the contamination of surrounding areas is not serious enough to require the permanent evacuation of its human population, so the benefits to wild plants and animals will be minimal. At sea – where most of the radiation went – the impact could well be positive if it reduces the fishing pressure for which Japan is notorious in terms of its impact on marine ecology.