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**Market solutions make wind a neoliberal messiah—assumes a “natural” consumerism that can’t be sustained**

**Glover et al, 06** – \*Policy Fellow at the Center for Energy and Environmental Policy, University of Delaware, \*\*Directs the Urban Studies and Wheaton in Chicago programs, selected to the Chicago Council on Global Affairs Emerging Leaders Program for 2011-2013, \*\*\*2007 Nobel Peace Prize winner, Distinguished Professor of Energy & Climate Policy at the University of Delaware, Head of the Center for Energy and Environmental Policy (Leigh Glover, Noah Toly, John Byrne, “Energy as a Social Project: Recovering a Discourse”, in “Transforming Power: Energy, Environment, and Society in Conflict”, p. 1-32, http://www.ceep.udel.edu/energy/publications/2006\_es\_energy\_as\_a\_social\_project.pdf)//VP

The search for harmonized market-style policies to strengthen the energy¶ status quo in the face of its mounting challenges reflects the growing political power of energy neoliberalism in an era of economic globalization¶ (Dubash, 2002; Dubash and Williams, 2006). The two processes build a com-¶ plimentary, if circular, politics in support of conventional energy: the logic is¶ that global economic development requires energy use, which can only be¶ properly planned if international capitalist institutions can be assured that¶ the lubricant of globalization, namely, the unfettered power of markets, is¶ established by enforceable policy (Byrne et al., 2004). Correspondingly, resulting carbon emissions can only eventually be abated if economic globalization is protected so that international capitalist institutions find it profitable¶ to begin to lower carbon emissions and/or sequester them.¶ 15¶ Consumers and¶ producers, rather than citizens, are judged to be the proper signatories to the¶ social contract because these participants, without the stain of politics, can¶ find rational answers to our problems.¶ In sum, conventionalists counsel against preconceiving the social and¶ environmental requirements for an energy transition, preferring a continuation of the existing energy regime that promises to deliver a “reasonable,”¶ “practical” future consistent with its past. Scheer (2002: 137) describes the¶ erroneous assumption in such reasoning: “The need for fossil energy is a¶ practical constraint that society must respect, for better or worse; whereas¶ proposals for a swift and immediate reorientation...are denounced as irresponsible.” An orderly transition is thus forecast from the current energy¶ status quo of fossil fuel and nuclear energy dominance to a new energy status¶ quo with possibly less carbon, but surely with giant-sized fossil and nuclear¶ energy systems in wide use.¶ **The Sustainable Energy Quest**¶The problems of the conventional energy order have led some to regard¶ reinforcement of the status quo as folly and to instead champion sustainable¶ energy strategies based upon non-conventional sources and a more intelligent ideology of managed relations between energy, environment, and society consonant with environmental integrity. This regime challenger seeks to¶ evolve in the social context that produced the conventional energy regime,¶ yet proposes to fundamentally change its relationship to the environment (at¶ least, this is the hope). Technologies such as wind and photovoltaic electricity are purported to offer building blocks for a transition to a future in which¶ ills plaguing modernity and unsolved by the conventional energy regime¶ can be overcome (Lovins, 1979; Hawken et al., 2000; Scheer, 2002; Rifkin,¶ 2003; World Bank, 2004b).¶ While technical developments always include social, material, ecological, intellectual, and moral infrastructures (Winner, 1977: 54 - 58; Toly, 2005),¶ and may, therefore, be key to promoting fundamentally different development pathways, it is also possible that technologies, even environmentally¶ benign ones, will be appropriated by social forces that predate them and,¶ thereby, can be thwarted in the fulfillment of social promises attached to the¶ strategy. Indeed, if unaccompanied by reflection upon the social conditions¶ in which the current energy regime thrives, the transition to a renewable¶ energy regime may usher in very few social benefits and little, if any, political¶ and economic transformation. This is the concern that guides our analysis¶ (below) of the sustainable energy movement.¶ At least since the 1970s when Amory Lovins (1979) famously posed the¶ choice between “hard” and “soft” energy paths, sustainable energy strategies¶ have been offered to challenge the prevailing regime. Sometimes the promise¶ was of no more than “alternative” and “least cost” energy (Energy Policy¶ Project of the Ford Foundation, 1974a, 1974b; O’Toole, 1978; Sant, 1979),¶ but adjectives such as “appropriate,” “natural,” “renewable,” “equitable,”¶ and even “democratic” have also been envisioned (Institute for Local SelfReliance, 2005; Scheer, 2002: 34).¶ 16¶ The need to depart from the past, especially in light of the oil crises of the 1970s and the energy-rooted threat of¶ climate change that has beset policy debate since the late 1980s, united¶ disparate efforts to recast and reconceive our energy future.¶ Partly, early criticisms of the mainstream were reflective of a broader social¶ agenda that drew upon, among other things, the anti-war and anti-corporate¶ politics of the 1960s. It was easy, for example, to connect the modern energy¶ regime to military conflicts of the period and to superpower politics; and it¶ was even easier to ally the mainstream’s promotion of nuclear power to the¶ objectives of the Nuclear Club. With evidence of profiteering by the oil¶ majors in the wake of the 1973-1974 OPEC embargo, connecting the energy¶ regime with the expanding power of multinational capital was, likewise, not¶ difficult. Early sustainable energy strategies opposed these alliances, offering promises of significant political, as well as technological, change.¶ However, in the thirty years that the sustainable energy movement has¶ aspired to change the conventional regime, its social commitments and politics have become muddled. A telling sign of this circumstance is the shifted¶ focus from energy politics to economics. To illustrate, in the celebrated work¶ of one of the movement’s early architects, subtitles to volumes included¶ “breaking the nuclear link” (Amory Lovins’ Energy/War, 1981) and “toward¶ a durable peace” (Lovins’ Soft Energy Paths, 1979). These publications offered poignant challenges to the modern order and energy’s role in maintaining that order.¶ Today, however, the bestsellers of the movement chart a course toward¶ “natural capitalism” (Hawken et al., 2000), a strategy that anticipates synergies between soft path technologies and market governance of energy-environment-society relations. Indeed, a major sustainable energy think tank has¶ reached the conclusion that “small is profitable” (Lovins et al., 2002) in¶ energy matters and argues that the soft path is consistent with “economic¶ rationalism.” Understandably, a movement that sought basic change for a¶ third of a century has found the need to adapt its arguments and strategies to¶ the realities of political and economic power. Without adaptation, the conventional energy regime could have ignored soft path policy interventions¶ like demand-side management, integrated resource planning, public benefits¶ charges, and renewable energy portfolio standards (see Lovins and Gadgil,¶ 1991; Sawin, 2004), all of which have caused an undeniable degree of decentralization in energy-society relations. In this vein, it is clear that sustainability¶ proponents must find ways to speak the language and communicate in the¶ logic of economic rationalism if they are to avoid being dismissed. We do not¶ fault the sustainable energy camp for being strategic. Rather, the concern is¶ whether victories in the everyday of incremental politics have been balanced¶ by attention to the broader agenda of systemic change and the ideas needed¶ to define new directions.¶ A measure of the sustainable energy initiative’s strategic success is the¶ growing acceptance of its vision by past adversaries. Thus, Small is Profitable was named ‘Book of the Year’ in 2002 by The Economist, an award¶ unlikely to have been bestowed upon any of Lovins’ earlier works. As acceptance has been won, it is clear that sustainable energy advocates remain¶ suspicious of the oil majors, coal interests, and the Nuclear Club. But an¶ earlier grounding of these suspicions in anti-war and anti-corporate politics¶ appears to have been superseded by one that believes the global economy¶ can serve a sustainability interest if the ‘raison de market’ wins the energy¶ policy debate. Thus, it has been suggested that society can turn “more profit¶ with less carbon,” by “harnessing corporate power to heal the planet” (Lovins,¶ 2005; L. H. Lovins and A. B. Lovins, 2000). Similarly, Hermann Scheer (2002:¶ 323) avers: “The fundamental problem with today’s global economy is not¶ globalization per se, but that this globalization is not based on the sun—the¶ only global force that is equally available to all and whose bounty is so great¶ that it need never be fully tapped.” However, it is not obvious that market¶ economics and globalization can be counted upon to deliver the soft path¶ (see e.g. Nakajima and Vandenberg, 2005). More problematic, as discussed¶ below, the emerging soft path may fall well short of a socially or ecologically¶ transforming event if strategic victories and rhetorics that celebrate them¶ overshadow systemic critiques of energy-society relations and the corresponding need to align the sustainable energy initiative with social movements to¶ address a comprehensive agenda of change.¶ **Catching the Wind**¶To date, the greatest success in ‘real’ green energy development is the¶ spread of wind power. From a miniscule 1,930 MW in 1990 to more than¶ 47,317 MW in 2005, wind power has come of age. Especially noteworthy is¶ the rapid growth of wind power in Denmark (35 percent per year since 1997),¶ Spain (30 percent per year since 1997), and Germany (an astonishing 68¶ percent per year since 2000), where policies have caused this source to threaten¶ the hegemony of fossil fuels and nuclear energy. Wind now generates more¶ than 20 percent of Denmark’s electricity and the country is the world leader in¶ turbine manufacture. And as the Danes have demonstrated, offshore wind has¶ the potential to skirt some of the land-use conflicts that have sometimes beset¶ renewable energy alternatives. Indeed, some claim that offshore wind alone¶ might produce all of Europe’s residential electricity (Brown, 2004). National¶ energy strategists and environmental movements in and beyond Europe have¶ recognized the achievements of the Danes, Spaniards, and Germans with initiatives designed to imitate their success.¶ What are the characteristics of this success? One envied feature is the¶ remarkable decline in the price of wind-generated electricity, from $0.46 per¶ kWh in 1980 to $0.03 to $0.07 per kWh today (Sawin, 2004), very close to¶ conventionally-fueled utility generating costs in many countries, even before environmental impacts are included. Jubilant over wind’s winning market performance, advocates of sustainable energy foresee a new era that is¶ ecologically much greener and, yet, in which electricity remains (comparatively) cheap. Lester Brown (2003: 159) notes that wind satisfies seemingly¶ equally weighted criteria of environmental benefit, social gain, and economic efficiency:¶ Wind is...clean. Wind energy does not produce sulfur dioxide emissions or nitrous¶ oxides to cause acid rain. Nor are there any emissions of health-threatening mercury¶ that come from coal-fired power plants. No mountains are leveled, no streams are¶ polluted, and there are no deaths from black lung disease. Wind does not disrupt the¶ earth’s climate...[I]t is inexhaustible...[and] cheap.¶ This would certainly satisfy the canon of economic rationalism.¶ It is also consistent with the ideology of modern consumerism. Its politics¶ bestow sovereignty on consumers not unlike the formula of Pareto optimality,¶ a situation in which additional consumption of a good or service is warranted¶ until it cannot improve the circumstance of one person (or group) without¶ decreasing the welfare of another person (or group).¶ 17¶ How would one know¶ “better off” from “worse off” in the wind-rich sustainable energy era? Interestingly, proponents seem to apply a logic that leaves valuation of “better” and¶ “worse” devoid of explicit content. In a manner reminiscent of modern economic thinking, cheap-and-green enthusiasts appear willing to set wind to¶ the task of making “whatever”—whether that is the manufacture of low-cost¶ teeth whitening toothpaste or lower cost SUVs. In economic accounting, all¶ of these applications potentially make some in society “better off” (if one¶ accepts that economic growth and higher incomes are signs of improvement).¶ Possible detrimental side effects or externalities (an economic term for potential harm) could be rehabilitated by the possession of more purchasing power,¶ which could enable society to invent environmentally friendly toothpaste¶ and make affordable, energy-efficient SUVs. Sustainable energy in this construct cooperates in the abstraction of consumption and production. Consumption-of-what, -by-whom, and -for-what-purpose, and, relatedly,¶ production-of-what, -by-whom, and -for-what-purpose are not issues. The¶ construct altogether ignores the possibility that “more-is-better” consumption-production relations may actually reinforce middle class ideology and¶ capitalist political economy, as well as contribute to environmental crises¶ such as climate change. In the celebration of its coming market victory, the¶ cheap-and-green wind version of sustainable energy development may not¶ readily distinguish the economic/class underpinnings of its victory from those¶ of the conventional energy regime.¶ Wind enthusiasts also appear to be largely untroubled by trends toward¶ larger and larger turbines and farms, the necessity of more exotic materials to¶ achieve results, and the advancing complications of catching the wind. There¶ is nothing new about these sorts of trends in the modern period. The trajectory of change in a myriad of human activities follows this pattern. Nor is a¶ critique per se intended in an observation of this trend. Rather, the question¶ we wish to raise is whether another feature in this pattern will likewise be¶ replicated—namely, a “technological mystique” (Bazin, 1986) in which social life finds its inspiration and hope in technical acumen and searches for¶ fulfillment in the ideals of technique (Mumford, 1934; Ellul, 1964; Marcuse,¶ 1964; Winner, 1977, 1986; Vanderburg, 2005).¶ This prospect is not a distant one, as a popular magazine recently illustrated. In a special section devoted to thinking “After Oil,” National Geographic approvingly compared the latest wind technology to a well-known¶ monument, the Statue of Liberty, and noted that the new machines tower¶ more than 400 feet above this symbol (Parfit, 2005: 15 - 16). It was not hard to¶ extrapolate from the story the message of Big Wind’s liberatory potential.¶ Popular Science also commended new wind systems as technological marvels, repeating the theme that, with its elevation in height and complexity¶ lending the technology greater status, wind can now be taken seriously by¶ scientists and engineers (Tompkins, 2005). A recent issue of The Economist¶ (2005) included an article on the wonder of electricity generated by an artificial tornado in which wind is technologically spun to high velocities in a¶ building equipped with a giant turbine to convert the energy into electricity.¶ Indeed, wind is being contemplated as a rival able to serve society by the¶ sheer technical prowess that has often been a defining characteristic of modern energy systems.¶ Obviously, wind energy has a long way to go before it can claim to have¶ dethroned conventional energy’s “technological cathedrals” (Weinberg,¶ 1985). But its mission seems largely to supplant other spectacular methods of¶ generating electricity with its own. The politics supporting its rapid rise¶ express no qualms about endorsing the inevitability of its victories on tech-¶ nical grounds. In fact, Big Wind appears to seek monumental status in the¶ psyche of ecologically modern society. A recent alliance of the American¶ Wind Energy Association and the U.S. electric utility industry to champion¶ national (subsidized) investment in higher voltage transmission lines (to¶ deliver green-and-cheap electricity), illustrates the desire of Big Wind to¶ plug into Giant Power’s hardware and, correspondingly, its ideology (see¶ American Wind Energy Association, 2005, supporting “Transmission Infrastructure Modernization”). The transformative features of such a politics are¶ unclear. Indeed, wind power—if it can continue to be harvested by everlarger machines—may penetrate the conventional energy order so successfully that it will diffuse, without perceptible disruption, to the regime. The air¶ will be cleaner but the source of this achievement will be duly noted: science¶ will have triumphed still again in wresting from stingy nature the resources¶ that a wealthy life has grown to expect. Social transformation to achieve¶ sustainability may actually be unnecessary by this political view of things, as¶ middle-class existence is assured via clean, low-cost and easy-to-plug-in wind¶ power.

**The aff’s fantasy of control will only produce a “never-ending war” for security—blowback ensures efforts to create order out of disorder will fail**

Ritchie 11— PhD, Research Fellow at the Department of Peace Studies @ University of Bradford, Executive Committee of the British Pugwash Group and the Board of the Nuclear Information Service (Nick, “Rethinking security: a critical analysis of the Strategic Defence and Security Review” International Affairs Volume 87, Issue 2, lexis)//VP

Third, the legitimating narrative of acting as a ‘force for good’ that emerged in the 1998 SDR to justify an expensive, expeditionary, war-fighting military doctrine in the name of ‘enlightened self-interest’ must be scrutinized. But the relationship between the rhetoric and the reality is highly questionable. From a critical perspective it can be argued that successive governments have framed interventionist policy choices as positive, progressive and ‘good’ to generate support for ‘risk transfer’ military operations of choice that are presented as essential to the security of UK citizens but in fact reproduce a state-centric construction of a particular ‘national role’. This reflects Hirshberg’s contention that ‘the maintenance of a positive national self-image is crucial to continued public acquiescence and support for government, and thus to the smooth, on-going functioning of the state’. 86 The notion that Afghanistan is a ‘noble cause’ for the British state reflects a state-centric concern with ideas of status and prestige and the legitimating moral gloss of the ‘force for good’ rhetoric. 87 Furthermore, the rhetoric of ‘enlightened self-interest’ implies that the exercise of UK military force as a ‘force for good’ will lessen security risks to the British state and citizenry by resolving current security threats and pre-empting future risks. But, returning again to Iraq and Afghanistan, we must ask whether sacrificing solders’ lives, killing over 100,000 Iraqi civilians including a disproportionate number of women and children, destroying the immediate human security of several million others through injury, displacement, persecution and trauma, and sparking long-term trends of rising crime rates, property destruction, economic disruption, and deterioration of health-care resources and food production and distribution capabilities, all while providing profits for largely western corporations through arms deals, service contracts and private military contractors, constitutes being a ‘force for good’ when the outcomes of these major military interventions have proven at best indeterminate. 88 The legitimacy of this question is reinforced by Curtis’s analysis of the deadly impact of British foreign policy since the 1950s. Curtis argues that ‘the history of British foreign policy is partly one of complicity in some of the world’s worst horrors … contrary to the extraordinary rhetoric of New Labour leaders and other elites, policies are continuing on this traditional course, systematically making the world more abusive of human rights as well as more unequal and less secure’. 89 Add to this the statistic that the UK was involved in more wars between 1946 and 2003 (21 in total) than any other state, and the ‘force for good’ rationale begins to unravel. 90 Furthermore, the militarized ‘force for good’ narrative encompasses the active defence of the ‘rules-based system’ as a global good. But it is clear that the current ‘rules-based system’ of western-dominated multilateral institutions and processes of global governance does not work for billions of people or for planetary ecological systems. The Human Development Reports produced by the United Nations Development Programme routinely highlight the global political and economic structures and systems that keep hundreds of millions of people poor, starving, jobless, diseased and repressed. 91 A stable ‘rules-based system’ is no doubt in the interests of UK citizens and the interests of global human society. With stability comes predictability, which can minimize uncertainty, risk and insecurity. But there is a growing consensus that long-term stability, particularly the reduction of violent conflict, will require far greater political, economic and environmental equity on a global scale, as advocated in the Department for International Development’s 2009 white paper on Eliminating world poverty. 92 An interventionist, military-oriented, state-centric, global risk management doctrine and the risks it can generate are unlikely to stabilize and transform the rules-based system into a more equitable form. A growing literature now argues that prevailing western approaches to understanding, managing and ameliorating global insecurity and its violent symptoms are inadequate and unsustainable. They are proving, and will continue to prove, increasingly incapable of providing security for both the world’s poor and immiserated, concentrated in the Global South, and the world’s elite of around one billion, mainly located in the North Atlantic community, Australasia and parts of East Asia, which will remain unable to insulate itself from violent responses to pervasive insecurity. 93 This is not to suggest that the UK should not exercise elements of national power to alleviate others’ suffering as a consequence of natural or man-made disasters. Indeed, the Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty’s 2001 ‘responsibility to protect’ doctrine sets out clearly the principle of conditional sovereignty and the grounds for legitimate intervention when a state cannot or will not protect its citizens from pervasive and severe harm. 94 More broadly, if we accept that in an increasingly complex, interdependent world the human security of UK citizens enmeshed in global networks of risk and opportunity is intertwined with the human security of others, particularly in conflict-prone regions often characterized by poverty, weak governance and underdevelopment, then actions to improve others’ long-term human security does constitute a form of ‘enlightened self-interest’. But we must question the assumption that war-fighting interventionist missions of choice do, in fact, serve the long-term human security interests of UK citizens as opposed to the interests of the state based on prevailing conceptions of national role. Utility of force Connected to this critique is a reappraisal of the utility of force within the conception of national security as global risk management, on two counts. First, security risks are increasingly likely to arise from a complex mixture of interdependent factors. Environmental, economic, military and political sources of insecurity could include the effects of climate change, mass poverty and economic injustice, global pandemic disease, mass migration and refugee flows, poor governance, weak and failing states, international terrorism and asymmetric warfare, the spread of WMD and advanced conventional military technologies, ethnic and sectarian nationalism, and competition over access to key resources such as oil and water. Future conflicts are therefore likely to be complex and diverse. They are unlikely to be susceptible to purely military solutions, and the use of military force in regional crises will be messy, indeterminate and of limited value and effectiveness. 95 It is not obvious that the armed forces have a significant war-fighting role to play in mitigating these risks, as opposed to supporting police, intelligence and security forces in countering terrorist plots—and possibly launching a limited, precision strike against WMD capabilities in the event of the extreme scenario of robust intelligence that a WMD attack is imminent. In fact, the 2009 National Security Strategy limited the role of the armed forces to ‘defence against direct threats to the UK and its overseas territories’ (which one could qualify as ‘direct violent, or military, threats’) together with a contributory role in ‘tackling threats to our security overseas by helping to address conflict, instability and crises across the globe’. 96 This broad but essentially supportive remit for the military was reinforced in the 2010 National Security Strategy’s catalogue of priority risks. The three-tiered list enumerated 15 risks, which can be reduced to five: terrorism, civil emergencies, international crime, trade disputes and an attack by another state. 97 The role of military force is limited in all of these except the last, which remains by far the least likely. As Jenkins argues, almost none of the above is a threat. They are crimes, catastrophes, or, in the case of being ‘drawn in’ to a foreign conflict, a matter of political choice … as for the threat of conventional attack on the British Isles by another state, we can only ask who? The threat is so negligible as to be insignificant. It is like insuring one’s house for billions of pounds against an asteroid attack. 98 Bob Ainsworth, then Defence Secretary, seemed to grasp this in 2009, arguing that ‘our initial conclusions on the character of warfare should be first that international intervention will be more difficult not less. We will have to consider carefully how to apply military force in pursuit of national security. And second, and related to this, that the timely application of soft power and methods of conflict prevention will be a high priority.’ 99 Yet the government also insists on maintaining an interventionist, expeditionary military doctrine and corresponding capabilities based on a seemingly unquestioned national security role as a ‘force for good’ in global risk management operations. Second, risk management through military intervention in a complex international security environment characterized by asymmetric cultures, actors and distributions of power and knowledge, and interconnections on many levels, can generate significant negative feedback, or ‘blowback’, from unintended outcomes that create more risk. This challenges notions of effective risk management and control through linear change via the exercise of military power. 100 In fact, as Williams argues, the decision to act to mitigate a risk itself becomes risky: in the attempt to maintain control, negative feedback from the effects of a decision ‘inevitably leads to a loss of control’. 101 The danger is that military-based risk management becomes a cyclical process with no end in sight. 102 Rogers, for example, presciently envisaged a post-9/11 ‘never-ending war’ of military-led risk mitigation generating new and potentially more dangerous risks deemed susceptible to further military solutions, and so on. 103 This risk is not limited to distant theatres of conflict, but also applies to the very ‘way of life’ the current militarized risk management doctrine is meant to protect, through the erosion of civil liberties and the securitization of daily life. There is a powerful argument that the exercise of UK military force for optional expeditionary war-fighting operations will be an increasingly dangerous, expensive and ethically dubious doctrine that could generate more, and potentially more lethal, risks than it resolves or contains. Since absolute security cannot be achieved, the value of any potential, discretionary increment in UK security through the exercise of military force must take into account its political, economic and human cost. As Wolfers argues, ‘at a certain point, by something like the economic law of diminishing returns, the gain in security no longer compensates for the added costs of attaining it’, and the exercise of military force becomes ineffective or, worse, wholly counterproductive. 104 After following George W. Bush on a risky adventure into Iraq, the UK must question the effectiveness of a militarized ‘risk transfer’ strategy as the foundation for managing globalized security risks in relation to the long-term human security needs of British citizens.

**Technocratic management makes extinction inevitable—no aff proposal can solve**

Crist, 07 – Associate Professor of Science and Technology in Society at Virginia Tech University (Eileen Crist, 2007, “Beyond the Climate Crisis: A Critique of Climate Change Discourse,” *Telos*, Volume 141, Winter, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via Telos Press, p. 49-51)//VP

If mainstream environmentalism is catching up with the solution promoted by Teller, and perhaps harbored all along by the Bush administration, it would certainly be ironic. But the irony is deeper than incidental politics. The projected rationality of a geoengineering solution, stoked by apocalyptic fears surrounding climate change, promises consequences (both physical and ideological) that will only quicken the real ending of wild nature: "here we encounter," notes Murray Bookchin, "the ironic perversity of a 'pragmatism' that is no different, in principle, from the problems it hopes to resolve."58 Even if they work exactly as hoped, geoengineering solutions are far more similar to anthropogenic climate change than they are a counterforce to it: their implementation constitutes an experiment with the biosphere underpinned by technological arrogance, unwillingness to question or limit consumer society, and a sense of entitlement to transmogrifying the planet that boggles the mind. It is indeed these elements of techno-arrogance, unwillingness to advocate radical change, and unlimited entitlement, together with the profound erosion of awe toward the planet that evolved life (and birthed us), that constitute the apocalypse underway—if that is the word of choice, though the words humanization, colonization, or occupation of the biosphere are far more descriptively accurate. Once we grasp the ecological crisis as the escalating conversion of the planet into "a shoddy way station,"59 it becomes evident that inducing "global dimming" in order to offset "global warming" is not a corrective action but another chapter in the project of colonizing the Earth, of what critical theorists called world domination. Domination comes at a huge cost for the human spirit, a cost that may or may not include the scale of physical imperilment and suffering that apocalyptic fears conjure. Human beings pay for the domination of the biosphere—a domination they are either bent upon or resigned to—with alienation from the living Earth.60 This alienation manifests, first and [end page 50] foremost, in the invisibility of the biodiversity crisis: the steadfast denial and repression, in the public arena, of the epochal event of mass extinction and accelerating depletion of the Earth's biological treasures. It has taken the threat of climate change (to people and civilization) to allow the tip of the biodepletion iceberg to surface into public discourse, but even that has been woefully inadequate in failing to acknowledge two crucial facts: first, the biodiversity crisis has been occurring independently of climate change, and will hardly be stopped by windmills, nuclear power plants, and carbon sequestering, in any amount or combination thereof; and second, the devastation that species and ecosystems have already experienced is what largely will enable more climate-change-driven damage to occur. Human alienation from the biosphere further manifests in the recalcitrance of instrumental rationality, which reduces all challenges and problems to variables that can be controlled, fixed, managed, or manipulated by technical means. Instrumental rationality is rarely questioned substantively, except in the flagging of potential "unintended consequences" (for example, of implementing geoengineering technologies). The idea that instrumental rationality (in the form of technological fixes for global warming) might save the day hovers between misrepresentation and delusion: firstly, because instrumental rationality has itself been the planet's nemesis by mediating the biosphere's constitution as resource and by condoning the transformation of Homo sapiens into a user species; and secondly, because instrumental rationality tends to invent, adjust, and tweak technical means to work within given contexts—when it is the given, i.e., human civilization as presently configured economically and culturally, that needs to be changed.

**Vote neg – must investigate epistemological underpinnings of energy production – alternative prevents a “growth at all costs” society that culminates in endless crises and oppression**

**Holleman, 12** – Assistant Professor of Sociology at the University of Oregon (Hannah, “ENERGY JUSTICE AND FOUNDATIONS FOR A SUSTAINABLE SOCIOLOGY OF ENERGY”, <http://scholarsbank.uoregon.edu/jspui/bitstream/1794/12419/1/Holleman_oregon_0171A_10410.pdf>)///VP

All work on energy, society, and climate change may be divided into two broader theoretically significant categories based on its main underlying assumptions. On the one hand, there are sociologists whose proposals to solve global issues like climate change involve tweaking the system through policy, personal consumption choices, or technological change. On the other hand, you have sociologists calling for system-wide social and ecological change. In other words, some sociologists limit their studies to changes that are possible within the capitalist system, while others document the ways in which capitalism is incompatible with ecological and social justice goals and call for a more significant transformation of the world system. One reason this central divide is so relevant to energy studies is that climate change has been driven by the economic growth inherent to capitalism. The key conflict that arises in climate negotiations, and which is constantly alluded to in environmental negotiations between nations, is that between ecological, social, and economic priorities (Clark and York 2005; Bazilian 2009; York 2010). Energy developments are conditioned by these competing priorities. The U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA 2008) puts the issue plainly: “Energy use is largely driven by economic growth.” Problems with energy developments are thus in large part problems of scale related to the level of economic throughput. And the scale of energy consumption remains coupled in capitalist economies with economic growth in spite of efficiency gains, as critical sociologists of energy have demonstrated (York 2010; York, et al. 2011). For this reason, energy debates, like other issues in environmental sociological theory, often center on the tension between economic growth and ecological change. There are striking differences in how this tension and the possibility of overcoming it are understood by various theoretical positions. The most influential approach to energy issues in the broader society and policy circles is mirrored in environmental sociology in the ecological modernization perspective. It is the most optimistic that the tension between economic growth and ecological change may be transcended (social justice is not integrated in their analysis.) Ecological modernizationists emphasize “the possibility, actuality and desirability of a green Capitalism” (Mol and Jänicke 2009, 23). They claim there is a “growing independence of ecological rationality vis-à-vis other (e.g. economic and political) rationalities” (22) in the governance of society and institutions. “The basic premise of ecological modernization theory is…[that there is a] centripetal movement of ecological interests, ideas and considerations in social practices and institutions of modern society” (Mol 2002, 93). The authors see “continued industrial [and technological] development as offering the best option for escaping from the ecological crises of the developed world” (Fisher and Freudenburg 2001, 702). This new breed of modernizers suggest “we have entered a new industrial revolution, one of radical restructuring of production, consumption, state practices and political discourses along ecological lines” (Sonnenfield 2009, 372). Ecological modernization began as “essentially a political program” (Mol and Jänicke 2009, 18) and remains geared toward influencing policy (Mol, Sonnenfield, and Spaargaren 2009, 11). That this perspective might be popular in a world where those in power suggest capitalism will solve the climate crisis it created is not surprising. Ecological modernization theorists themselves have represented the significance of their ideas via the extent to which they share the perspective of those in power, and by the taming of the environmental movement, which was forced into an establishment mold (Spaargaren and Mol 2009, 72–75). Though it integrates popular assumptions, the ecological modernization perspective actually is in conflict with over a hundred years of sociological and ecological analyses (starting with that of the classical theorists, like Marx and Weber, and early energy scholars developing the study thermodynamics). This insidious perspective also is in conflict with the founding principles of environmental sociology, based on the New Ecological Paradigm, which include “recognition of: (1) limits to growth, (2) nonanthropocentrism, (3) fragility of nature’s balance, (4) untenability of exemptionalism, and (5) ecological crisis” (Foster 2012). Therefore, Foster (2012) refers to the ecological modernization perspective as the new exemptionalism and the third stage of denialism hindering necessary and urgent scientific development and change: The third stage of denial has the look and feel of greater realism, but actually constitutes a more desperate and dangerous response. It admits that capitalism is the problem, but also contends that capitalism is the solution. This general approach emphasizes what is variously referred to as "sustainable capitalism," "natural capitalism," "climate capitalism," "green capitalism," etc. In this view we can continue down the same road of capital accumulation, mounting profits, and exponential economic growth -- while at the same time miraculously reducing our burdens on the planetary environment. It is business as usual, but with greater efficiency and greater accounting of environmental costs. (Foster 2011a) Ecological modernization is a way then to avoid any significant challenge to the status quo. Because of this it ignores the seriousness and scale of ecological degradation (York and Rosa 2003), but also the inequalities necessarily embedded in the social relations of capitalism. There is no real gender, race, class, or any kind of social justice analysis there, even if justice is mentioned in passing in their work (usually in response previous criticisms). Despite all of these problems, the penetration of the assumptions undergirding this perspective is clear in the sociology of energy and climate change. The conscious and unconscious adoption of the main tenets of the modernization framework stands out in the sociology articles published since the boom in climate change research starting in 2005. A key term search in Sociological Abstracts of the 1,734 peer-reviewed articles published since 2005 with “climate change” or “energy” in the title yields the following results: many more mention technology (424), technological change (96), alternative energy (110), or renewable energy (160) than mention energy conservation (120), economic growth (96), or capitalism (35). Shockingly, only 22 mention inequality and only 9 equality. The blinders imposed by perspectives such as ecological modernization in the sociological work on energy and climate change, and broader environmental sociological theory, means that environmental sociology today is therefore faced with a double challenge, emanating both from without and within: developing means to combat the planetary rift, and confronting the new exemptionalism, which threatens to overthrow environmental sociology as a critical tradition. With respect to the latter challenge, the problem is to be found not in the concept of ecological modernization itself**,** which is obviously useful in limited contexts, and reflects real-world processes, but rather the elevation of ecological modernization into an overall environmental theory resurrecting the basic postulates of human exemptionalism. (Foster 2012) This makes the theoretical perspective proposed in this thesis all the more important and urgent, for the sociology of energy and for environmental sociology as a whole. Because the sociology of energy is taking off, the climate crisis is only worsening, and new scholars are being trained en masse, it is a crucial moment in the theoretical development of what will now be sustained sociological attention to energy. As bad as things are, they are only expected to get worse. Energy increasingly will be forced onto the broader sociological agenda (Dunlap 2010; Webler and Tuler 2010). If energy justice is not at the heart of the sociology of energy that takes root, our formulations will necessarily impose blinders that make it impossible to understand, or propose meaningful changes to address, the interpenetrating depredations of social inequality and environmental destruction associated with the modern energy regime.

## 1NC

**Obama is pushing Congress to resolve the debt ceiling – political capital is key to success and solving a government shut down**

Pace 9/12 Julie, AP White House correspondent, Syria debate on hold, Obama refocuses on agenda, The Fresno Bee, 9/12/13, http://www.fresnobee.com/2013/09/12/3493538/obama-seeks-to-focus-on-domestic.html

With a military strike against Syria on hold, President Barack Obama tried Thursday to reignite momentum for his second-term domestic agenda. But his progress could hinge on the strength of his standing on Capitol Hill after what even allies acknowledge were missteps in the latest foreign crisis.¶ "It is still important to recognize that we have a lot of things left to do here in this government," Obama told his Cabinet, starting a sustained White House push to refocus the nation on matters at home as key benchmarks on the budget and health care rapidly approach.¶ "The American people are still interested in making sure that our kids are getting the kind of education they deserve, that we are putting people back to work," Obama said.¶ The White House plans to use next week's five-year anniversary of the 2008 financial collapse to warn Republicans that shutting down the government or failing to raise the debt limit could drag down the still-fragile economy. With Hispanic Heritage Month to begin Monday, Obama is also expected to press for a stalled immigration overhaul and urge minorities to sign up for health care exchanges beginning Oct. 1.¶ Among the events planned for next week is a White House ceremony highlighting Americans working on immigrant and citizenship issues. Administration officials will also promote overhaul efforts at naturalization ceremonies across the country. On Sept. 21, Obama will speak at the Congressional Black Caucus Gala, where he'll trumpet what the administration says are benefits of the president's health care law for African-Americans and other minorities.¶ Two major factors are driving Obama's push to get back on track with domestic issues after three weeks of Syria dominating the political debate. Polls show the economy, jobs and health care remain Americans' top concerns. And Obama has a limited window to make progress on those matters in a second term, when lame-duck status can quickly creep up on presidents, particularly if they start losing public support.¶ Obama already is grappling with some of the lowest approval ratings of his presidency. A Pew Research Center/USA Today poll out this week put his approval at 44 percent. That's down from 55 percent at the end of 2012.¶ Potential military intervention in Syria also is deeply unpopular with many Americans, with a Pew survey finding that 63 percent opposing the idea. And the president's publicly shifting positions on how to respond to a deadly chemical weapons attack in Syria also have confused many Americans and congressional lawmakers.¶ "In times of crisis, the more clarity the better," said Sen. Lindsey Graham, R-S.C., a strong supporter of U.S. intervention in Syria. "This has been confusing. For those who are inclined to support the president, it's been pretty hard to nail down what the purpose of a military strike is."¶ For a time, the Obama administration appeared to be barreling toward an imminent strike in retaliation for the Aug. 21 chemical weapons attack. But Obama made a sudden reversal and instead decided to seek congressional approval for military action.¶ Even after administration officials briefed hundreds of lawmakers on classified intelligence, there appeared to be limited backing for a use-of-force resolution on Capitol Hill. Rather than face defeat, Obama asked lawmakers this week to postpone any votes while the U.S. explores the viability of a deal to secure Syria's chemical weapons stockpiles.¶ That pause comes as a relief to Obama and many Democrats eager to return to issues more in line with the public's concerns. The most pressing matters are a Sept. 30 deadline to approve funding to keep the government open — the new fiscal year begins Oct. 1 — and the start of sign-ups for health care exchanges, a crucial element of the health care overhaul.¶ On Wednesday, a revolt by tea party conservatives forced House Republican leaders to delay a vote on a temporary spending bill written to head off a government shutdown. Several dozen staunch conservatives are seeking to couple the spending bill with a provision to derail implementation of the health care law.¶ The White House also may face a fight with Republicans over raising the nation's debt ceiling this fall. While Obama has insisted he won't negotiate over the debt limit, House Speaker John Boehner on Thursday said the GOP will insist on curbing spending.

**[Insert Link]**

**Failure collapses the economy – goes global and past events don’t disprove**

Davidson 9/10 Adam, co-founder of NPR’s “Planet Money,” Our Debt to Society, New York Times, 9/10/13, http://www.nytimes.com/2013/09/15/magazine/our-debt-to-society.html?pagewanted=all

If the debt ceiling isn’t lifted again this fall, some serious financial decisions will have to be made. Perhaps the government can skimp on its foreign aid or furlough all of NASA, but eventually the big-ticket items, like Social Security and Medicare, will have to be cut. At some point, the government won’t be able to pay interest on its bonds and will enter what’s known as sovereign default, the ultimate national financial disaster achieved by countries like Zimbabwe, Ecuador and Argentina (and now Greece). In the case of the United States, though, it won’t be an isolated national crisis. If the American government can’t stand behind the dollar, the world’s benchmark currency, then the global financial system will very likely enter a new era in which there is much less trade and much less economic growth. It would be, by most accounts, the largest self-imposed financial disaster in history.¶ Nearly everyone involved predicts that someone will blink before this disaster occurs. Yet a small number of House Republicans (one political analyst told me it’s no more than 20) appear willing to see what happens if the debt ceiling isn’t raised — at least for a bit. This could be used as leverage to force Democrats to drastically cut government spending and eliminate President Obama’s signature health-care-reform plan. In fact, Representative Tom Price, a Georgia Republican, told me that the whole problem could be avoided if the president agreed to drastically cut spending and lower taxes. Still, it is hard to put this act of game theory into historic context. Plenty of countries — and some cities, like Detroit — have defaulted on their financial obligations, but only because their governments ran out of money to pay their bills. No wealthy country has ever voluntarily decided — in the middle of an economic recovery, no less — to default. And there’s certainly no record of that happening to the country that controls the global reserve currency.¶ Like many, I assumed a self-imposed U.S. debt crisis might unfold like most involuntary ones. If the debt ceiling isn’t raised by X-Day, I figured, the world’s investors would begin to see America as an unstable investment and rush to sell their Treasury bonds. The U.S. government, desperate to hold on to investment, would then raise interest rates far higher, hurtling up rates on credit cards, student loans, mortgages and corporate borrowing — which would effectively put a clamp on all trade and spending. The U.S. economy would collapse far worse than anything we’ve seen in the past several years.¶ Instead, Robert Auwaerter, head of bond investing for Vanguard, the world’s largest mutual-fund company, told me that the collapse might be more insidious. “You know what happens when the market gets upset?” he said. “There’s a flight to quality. Investors buy Treasury bonds. It’s a bit perverse.” In other words, if the U.S. comes within shouting distance of a default (which Auwaerter is confident won’t happen), the world’s investors — absent a safer alternative, given the recent fates of the euro and the yen — might actually buy even more Treasury bonds. Indeed, interest rates would fall and the bond markets would soar.¶ While this possibility might not sound so bad, it’s really far more damaging than the apocalyptic one I imagined. Rather than resulting in a sudden crisis, failure to raise the debt ceiling would lead to a slow bleed. Scott Mather, head of the global portfolio at Pimco, the world’s largest private bond fund, explained that while governments and institutions might go on a U.S.-bond buying frenzy in the wake of a debt-ceiling panic, they would eventually recognize that the U.S. government was not going through an odd, temporary bit of insanity. They would eventually conclude that it had become permanently less reliable. Mather imagines institutional investors and governments turning to a basket of currencies, putting their savings in a mix of U.S., European, Canadian, Australian and Japanese bonds. Over the course of decades, the U.S. would lose its unique role in the global economy.¶ The U.S. benefits enormously from its status as global reserve currency and safe haven. Our interest and mortgage rates are lower; companies are able to borrow money to finance their new products more cheaply. As a result, there is much more economic activity and more wealth in America than there would be otherwise. If that status erodes, the U.S. economy’s peaks will be lower and recessions deeper; future generations will have fewer job opportunities and suffer more when the economy falters. And, Mather points out, no other country would benefit from America’s diminished status. When you make the base risk-free asset more risky, the entire global economy becomes riskier and costlier.

**Nuclear war**

Friedberg and Schoenfeld 8Aaron, Prof. Politics. And IR @ Princeton’s Woodrow Wilson School and Visiting Scholar @ Witherspoon Institute, and Gabriel, Senior Editor of Commentary and Wall Street Journal, “The Dangers of a Diminished America” <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB122455074012352571.html>

Then there are the dolorous consequences of a potential collapse of the world's financial architecture. For decades now, Americans have enjoyed the advantages of being at the center of that system. The worldwide use of the dollar, and the stability of our economy, among other things, made it easier for us to run huge budget deficits, as we counted on foreigners to pick up the tab by buying dollar-denominated assets as a safe haven. Will this be possible in the future? Meanwhile, traditional foreign-policy challenges are multiplying. The threat from al Qaeda and Islamic terrorist affiliates has not been extinguished. Iran and North Korea are continuing on their bellicose paths, while Pakistan and Afghanistan are progressing smartly down the road to chaos. Russia's new militancy and China's seemingly relentless rise also give cause for concern. If America now tries to pull back from the world stage, it will leave a dangerous power vacuum. The stabilizing effects of our presence in Asia, our continuing commitment to Europe, and our position as defender of last resort for Middle East energy sources and supply lines could all be placed at risk. In such a scenario there are shades of the 1930s, when global trade and finance ground nearly to a halt, the peaceful democracies failed to cooperate, and aggressive powers led by the remorseless fanatics who rose up on the crest of economic disaster exploited their divisions. Today we run the risk that rogue states may choose to become ever more reckless with their nuclear toys, just at our moment of maximum vulnerability. The aftershocks of the financial crisis will almost certainly rock our principal strategic competitors even harder than they will rock us. The dramatic free fall of the Russian stock market has demonstrated the fragility of a state whose economic performance hinges on high oil prices, now driven down by the global slowdown. China is perhaps even more fragile, its economic growth depending heavily on foreign investment and access to foreign markets. Both will now be constricted, inflicting economic pain and perhaps even sparking unrest in a country where political legitimacy rests on progress in the long march to prosperity. None of this is good news if the authoritarian leaders of these countries seek to divert attention from internal travails with external adventures.

## 1NC

**CP Text: The People’s Republic of China should [do the plan].**

**It solves – China is a better alternative than the US – solves the aff and avoids the disad.**

Ellis 6. [Evan, Associate with Booz Allen Hamilton, Inc., with an emphasis on Latin American security issues, PhD in Political Science, "The New Chinese Engagement with Latin America: Understanding its Dynamics and the Implications for the Region" Booz-Allen -- March 3 -- www6.miami.edu/hemispheric-policy/ellisthenewchineseengagementwithlatinamerica030306.pdf]

Aside from the intangible political dimension, China also represents a real alternative market for primary product exports, and to some degree, an alternative source of investment capital. China’s willingness to invest in the Bolivian hydrocarbon sector,82 for example, provides the new government of Evo Morales with another way of obtaining needed resources and technical expertise without having to make concessions to the 26 oil companies currently operating in the country. Chinese engagement with Bolivia thus gives Morales more latitude to proceed with the nationalization of that nation’s hydrocarbon sector. Similarly, the prospect of China as an alternative market for Latin American commodity exports has also introduced a new dimension to the question of trade integration with the United States, such as the Free Trade Area of the Americas.

**China solves Mexico energy investment – key model.**

Esenaro, 13 (Alberto, corporate lawyer in Mexico, expertise in high-profile corporate law with practice strong focus on foreign investment, energy, "MEXICO AND CHINA: AN EXPANDING ECONOMIC PARTNERSHIP" Before You Do Business -- May 1 -- beforeyoudobusiness.com/archives/787)//VP

While Mexico’s economy has been growing steadily since the implementation of NAFTA and various other free trade agreements with dozens of other countries, the general perception has been that the country’s main trading partners and investors have been the United States and Japan. However, Mexico’s partnership with manufacturing and economic powerhouse China has been gaining steam over the past few years and is showing positive signs of continued and expanding growth. Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto, on the evening before his visit to China, in a written interview with Xinhua, China’s top news service, spoke of his pledge to increase ties with China in a way that both countries can enjoy a win-win situation. China should and can be a “strategic partner” to the Latin American country, he said. Remarkable opportunities exist in many sectors, including infrastructure and trade. “Mexico can be a gateway for China to enter North America, the world’s richest market. It can so be a point of access to several countries in Central America and the Caribbean.” said Peña Nieto. This could very well be of high interest to Chinese companies such as Huawei and ZTE, two telecoms companies who have been effectively shut out of the American telecom market, a market Chinese telecoms have been wanting to crack for quite a long time. While their products may still not get into the U.S. market, both ZTE and Huawei could become involved in the potentially lucrative Mexican telecom sector, where reforms have recently been passed to allow foreign investment. President Peña Nieto continued, stressing the things that Chinese and Mexican people have in common such as an ancient culture and economic exchanges. After mentioning the above points of what Mexico can offer China, he spoke of what China can offer Mexico in return. “For Mexico, China represents an opportunity to increase its productive investment, and multiply and diversify its export capacity. China’s economic dynamism, the size of its market and its high demand for goods, turn China into an attractive market for Mexico.” he said. In order for an economic partnership to be long-lasting and beneficial for both sides, the Mexican head of state mentioned that friendship and cultural understanding are key. The expansion of China’s Confucius Institute in the Spanish-speaking country would be a very effective way for Mexicans to learn about China’s traditions and learn Mandarin, while Mexico can increase the awareness of Mexican culture in China by the means of Spanish-language courses and showing Chinese people “the opportunities that Mexico can offer them”. Most importantly however, the Mexican president stated how an economic partnership would be beneficial to both countries in the energy and infrastructure industries. China is a country that imports much of its energy, and Mexico has massive reserves of oil and gas; the country’s oil industry needs an overall upgrade, which Chinese companies could very well provide if reforms to Mexico’s energy sector go through. Furthermore, the president mentioned that when it comes to trains: “China is, without doubt, an excellent model on the issue” he said. “We have much to learn from its successful history in railway infrastructure.”

## 1NC

**China’s engagement in Latin America is high now and its zero sum- even if US engagement is happening now, China’s influence is overpowering now**

**Rosenthal, 9/11** – political consultant and writer who is currently interning at The Center for Security Policy in Washington DC (Terence, 2013, “China’s Pivot to Latin America”, Global Balita, http://globalbalita.com/2013/09/11/chinas-pivot-to-latin-america/)//VP

The quest for global naval power runs parallel to competition for control of markets in Latin America.. The two largest world economies, the United States, and China are vying for control of these markets. China has an enormous population of approximately 1.3 billion people but is only able to use a very small percentage of its land mass. Its’ consumer market is the wealthiest it has been in modern times. China desires access to key resources such as petroleum, coal, iron, uranium, as well as agricultural products. Latin America is in high global demand, with 500 million people, and a $3trillion market. In its quest to be Latin America’s foremost business partner, China has risen out of ambiguity to become one of the top three exporters, sometimes surpassing the United States in countries like Argentina, Peru, Venezuela, Chile, and Brazil. China has sought to be the prime lender in Latin America, loaning $110 billion dollars thus exceeding the World Bank’s contribution for the past two years. Some of China’s other most noteworthy loans include $28 billion to Venezuela, $10.2 billion to the Argentine debt swap, and 10 billion to Brazilian oil company, Petrobras. China wishes to benefit from developing infrastructure, ports, roads and rail systems in Latin America. In Nicaragua, China is planning the start of a canal bigger than the Panama Canal, facilitating passage to larger container ships than the Panama Canal is now able to handle. In Panama, China controls the leases at both ends of the Panama Canal and is in the process of widening the Canal in order to accommodate larger vessels. This constitutes excellent strategic positioning for China, giving them virtual control over two major passageways. Though a huge amount of the world’s trade transits the Panama Canal, the United States remains its biggest user. China’s economic relations in the Caribbean are also growing by leaps and bounds. Consider a $2.6 billion resort, among a gaggle of Chinese owned hotels and casinos being built by the Chinese in the Bahamas, 80 miles off the U.S. coast. Or Complant, a Chinese company, investing millions of dollars in Jamaica’s sugar industry. The Bahamas and Jamaica are great strategic places for the Chinese to invest due to their close proximity to the U.S., as well as in Cuba, with whom they already have solid military, diplomatic and commercial relations. In recent years, China has embarked on a well-planned pivot to Latin America, focusing on a multifaceted military approach. In terms of soft military power, the Chinese naval hospital, Peace Ark has sailed the Caribbean offering medical and military services, similar to America’s USNS Comfort, but, with the addition of military council. China conducts military exchange and arm sales with Colombia, Chile, Mexico, Peru, and Uruguay. In Argentina, the Chinese are providing technological assistance with aircraft and helicopters and in Brazil with civilian and military operations. In addition, specific attention is being paid to Venezuela as a launching pad for military and diplomatic influence in South America.

**Increased US-Mexico relations crowd out China**

**Fischer, 12** – Analyst for Capitol Media (Howard, “Fox Says US-Mexico Ties Deter China’s Influence”, September 14, http://azstarnet.com/news/local/border/fox-says-us-mexico-ties-deter-china-s-influence/article\_b8fd3834-acdc-5b33-b1fb-d983fdf8d2de.html)//VP

Former Mexican President Vicente Fox said the United States has to bolster ties with Mexico - including recognizing the benefits of migrant labor - or get used to the idea of China setting the international agenda on its own terms. "The threat is this so-called power shift from the West to the East," he told a press conference Thursday at an economic development event organized by the city of Peoria. "Those nations on the East are getting ready and prepared to lead," Fox explained, saying there are forecasts showing the Chinese economy will be larger than that of the United States within a dozen years. "And that means a very important question to all of us: Under what principles are those leading nations (going to) be exercising their leadership?" Fox said. His point: The U.S. would be better off dealing with Mexico and other Latin American countries than perhaps those with different worldviews. "We have our values in the West that we share," Fox said. "So we all on this continent, especially North America, must get ready to meet that challenge." That means bolstering the economies of the United States and Mexico, he said. If the West wants to keep its edge, Fox said, there needs to be a recognition that Mexicans in the United States, legally or not, contribute to the economy of both countries. And that, he said, will require resolving the issue of who can come to this country and under what circumstances. "It has to be based on humanism, on compassion, on love, on friendship, on neighborhood and on partnership that we have together," Fox said. "Otherwise, we will keep losing the jobs to the East." Fox, who served as president from 2000 to 2006, insisted he is not in favor of "open borders." "But I am in favor of the use of our talent, our wisdom, our intelligence," Fox said. And that requires finally filling the vacuum of what kind of laws on immigration are necessary. In his speech, Fox did not address Arizona's approval of SB 1070 two years ago in an effort to give state and local police more power to detain and arrest suspected illegal immigrants. But in response to a question afterward, he said Arizona and other states have waded into the fray with their own laws out of frustration with the lack of action in Washington. "At the very end, migration is a national issue," Fox said. With immigration reform stalled in Congress, "state governments and state legislatures have been forced to get involved." Fox said that what's needed now is for lawmakers in Washington to come up with at least a framework for reform. "We need to know what the playground is and what the rules of the game are," he said, calling on leaders to "put aside xenophobia, put aside all of our complaints that we might have, and sit down and discuss the differences." Fox said it also needs to be recognized that this is not just a one-way relationship, saying Mexico buys $250 billion of U.S. products every year, meaning "millions of jobs" to this country's economy.

**Lack of US influence in Mexico is key to China’s expansion in Latin America**

Shaiken et al ‘13[Harley. Prof in the Center for Latin American Studies at UC-Berkeley. And Enrique Peters – Center for Latin American Studies at the University of Miami. And Adrian Hearn – Centro de Estudios China-Mexixo at Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Mexico. China and the New Triangular Relationships in the Americas: China and the Future of US-Mexico Relations, 2013. Pg 88-9]

The dominant strategies of each of the parties and how these strategies evolve over time: Mexico’s regional and global position is being shaped by an increasing accent on diplomatic and trade diversification. The decline in US influence and the expected reforms in the Mexican energy sector may open more room for Mexico to adjust to a growth strategy less dependent on the United States. China’s rising role as a regional and global power and the new economic scenario marked by higher wages and growing concentration in industrial commodities and products are likely to affect the pace of change according to which China’s “going out” strategy will develop in the near future. If Mexico and China reorient their strategies, it is likely that there will be an adjustment in the triangle’s dynamic, which may result in a closer relationship between these two countries.

**Chinese influence controls every existential scenario for extinction**

**Zhang ’12** (Prof of Diplomacy and IR at the Geneva School of Diplomacy. “The Rise of China’s Political Softpower” 9/4/12 http://www.china.org.cn/opinion/2012-09/04/content\_26421330.htm)

As China plays an increasingly significant role in the world, its soft power must be attractive both domestically as well as internationally. The world faces many difficulties, including widespread poverty, international conflict, the clash of civilizations and environmental protection. Thus far, the Western model has not been able to decisively address these issues; the China model therefore brings hope that we can make progress in conquering these dilemmas. Poverty and development The Western-dominated global economic order has worsened poverty in developing countries. Per-capita consumption of resources in developed countries is 32 times as large as that in developing countries. Almost half of the population in the world still lives in poverty. Western countries nevertheless still are striving to consolidate their wealth using any and all necessary means. In contrast, China forged a new path of development for its citizens in spite of this unfair international order which enabled it to virtually eliminate extreme poverty at home. This extensive experience would indeed be helpful in the fight against global poverty. War and peace In the past few years, the American model of "exporting democracy'" has produced a more turbulent world, as the increased risk of terrorism threatens global security. In contrast, China insists that "harmony is most precious". It is more practical, the Chinese system argues, to strengthen international cooperation while addressing both the symptoms and root causes of terrorism. The clash of civilizations Conflict between Western countries and the Islamic world is intensifying. "In a world, which is diversified and where multiple civilizations coexist, the obligation of Western countries is to protect their own benefits yet promote benefits of other nations," wrote Harvard University professor Samuel P. Huntington in his seminal 1993 essay "The Clash of Civilizations?". China strives for "being harmonious yet remaining different", which means to respect other nations, and learn from each other. This philosophy is, in fact, wiser than that of Huntington, and it's also the reason why few religious conflicts have broken out in China. China's stance in regards to reconciling cultural conflicts, therefore, is more preferable than its "self-centered" Western counterargument. Environmental protection Poorer countries and their people are the most obvious victims of global warming, yet they are the least responsible for the emission of greenhouse gases. Although Europeans and Americans have a strong awareness of environmental protection, it is still hard to change their extravagant lifestyles. Chinese environmental protection standards are not yet ideal, but some effective environmental ideas can be extracted from the China model. Perfecting the China model The China model is still being perfected, but its unique influence in dealing with the above four issues grows as China becomes stronger. China's experiences in eliminating poverty, prioritizing modernization while maintaining traditional values, and creating core values for its citizens demonstrate our insight and sense of human consciousness. Indeed, the success of the China model has not only brought about China's rise, but also a new trend that can't be explained by Western theory. In essence, the rise of China is the rise of China's political soft power, which has significantly helped China deal with challenges, assist developing countries in reducing poverty, and manage global issues. As the China model improves, it will continue to surprise the world.

**Independently, Latin American relations mutually beneficial – key to China’s economy**

**Kunsheng, 12** - Assistant Foreign Minister of the People’s Republic of China (Zhang, “On Strengthening China’s Relations with Latin American and Caribbean Countries under New Situation”, China Institute of International Studies, 10-30-12, http://www.ciis.org.cn/english/2012-10/30/content\_5446364.htm)//KG

Second, the convergence of interests between the two sides is deepening with the sustained economic development of China and Latin America and the Caribbean. Since China and Latin America and the Caribbean are facing the tasks of developing economy and improving people’s livelihood, economic and trade cooperation is the most vibrant and promising field in developing relations between the two sides. With the increasingly strong complementarity of economy and trade between China and Latin America and the Caribbean, their pragmatic cooperation has entered a new stage. Particularly, in coping with the international financial crisis, China and Latin America and the Caribbean have adopted proper measures. In general, the economies of China and Latin America and the Caribbean have maintained stable and rapid growth, thus becoming important engines driving the recovery of the world economy. The two sides have grasped the opportunities and reached a great number of pragmatic cooperative projects. These projects are playing an active role in promoting common development and in bringing tangible benefits to the peoples of the two sides. We can see the effects in the following three aspects: The trade is continuing to grow rapidly. China has become the second largest trading partner of Latin American and Caribbean countries, while the Latin American and Caribbean region is also one of regions with fastest growth of exports to China. In 2000, the trade volume between the two sides exceeded US$ 10 billion, hitting US$ 12.6 billion; the volume exceeded US$ 100 billion in 2007; it surpassed US$ 200 billion in 2011, hitting a record high of US$ 241.5 billion. In the first half of 2012, the trade volume of the two sides hit US$ 124.8 billion, up 17.5%. It is expected that in the next five years, the trade volume between the two sides will exceed US$ 400 billion. The trade between the two sides is relatively balanced, with the trade structure getting more optimized. China’s exports to Latin America and the Caribbean are mostly mechanical and electrical products and high-tech products, while its imports from this region are mostly minerals for energy use and agricultural products. China hopes and is ready to import more high value-added products from Latin American and Caribbean countries. China has signed and implemented free trade agreements with Chile, Peru and Costa Rica, and reached an agreement with Colombia on a joint feasibility study in launching a bilateral free trade agreement. The two-way investment is vibrant. In recent years, expanding mutual investment has become the consensus of the governments and entrepreneurs of China and Latin America and the Caribbean. The Chinese government proactively encourages and supports competitive and reputable enterprises to invest in this region. As a result, Chinese enterprises are expanding the investment scale and widening the scope for investment in Latin America and the Caribbean. According to statistics released by China’s Ministry of Commerce, by December 2011, the non-financial direct investment by China in Latin America and the Caribbean totaled US$ 54 billion, involving the fields of energy, resources, agriculture, manufacturing and processing, etc. In the meantime, the investment in China by Latin American and Caribbean countries is also growing. By the end of 2011, the number of investment projects in China by Latin American and Caribbean countries totaled 27,875, with the cumulative actual investment amounting to US$ 153.3 billion, accounting for 13.1% of the global cumulative actual investment in China. The financial cooperation exhibits good momentum. The relevant financial institutions of China have stepped up efforts to provide financing support for the economic and trade cooperation between China and Latin America and the Caribbean, and supported key projects in infrastructure, energy, mining, agriculture and social development for Latin American and Caribbean countries. The People’s Bank of China, China’s central bank, signed a 70 billion yuan (or 38 billion pesos) bilateral currency swap agreement with the Central Bank of Argentina and a 190 billion yuan (or R$ 60 billion) bilateral currency swap agreement with the Central Bank of Brazil. The two sides also stepped up consultation and exchanges on macroeconomic situation and economic and financial policies, and supported commercial banks to establish bank branches in each other’s countries. In June 2012, when visiting Latin America, Premier Wen Jiabao declared that China will initiate a cooperation fund with the first tranche of US$ 5 billion between the two sides, and China will provide a special loan of US$ 10 billion to facilitate the cooperation in infrastructure development, creating favorable conditions for expanding the economic and trade cooperation between the two sides.

**China economic collapse causes WW3- hotspot for escalation**

**Plate, 03 -** Mr. Plate is a member of the Pacific Council on International Policy, the Century Association of New York and the Phi Beta Kappa Society(Tom Plate, “Why Not Invade China” Asia Pacific Media Networks, 6/30, http://asiamedia.ucla.edu/TomPlate2003/06302003.htm)//JS

But imagine a China disintegrating -- on its own, without neo-con or CIA prompting, much less outright military invasion -- because the economy (against all predictions) suddenly collapses. That would knock Asia into chaos. Refugees by the gazillions would head for Indonesia and other poorly border-patrolled places, which don't want them and can't handle them; some in Japan might lick their chops for World War II Redux and look to annex a slice of China. That would send small but successful Singapore and Malaysia -- once Japanese colonies -- into absolute nervous breakdowns. India might make a grab for Tibet, and while it does, Pakistan for Kashmir. Say hello to World War III Asia-style! That's why wise policy encourages Chinese stability, security and economic growth -- the very direction the White House now seems to prefer. If neo-cons like Kristol really care about Bush, they ought to relocate their common sense and get off his back. Bush has enough on his plate, trying to put Iraq back together. In the final analysis, neo-con insanity is more of a danger to the Bush presidency than China
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**E.** Empirically proven**—economic disruptions don’t collapse Mexico’s economy**

**AP, 8/20** [Forbes, “Mexican economy shrinks 10.3 percent in 2nd qtr”] < <http://www.forbes.com/feeds/ap/2009/08/20/business-lt-mexico-economy_6801218.html>>

MEXICO CITY -- Mexico's economy shrank 10.3 percent in the second quarter, the worst quarterly drop since comparable records began being kept in 1981, the government said Thursday. The contraction for April-June outstripped the previous worst quarterly performance - a 9.2 percent drop in the second quarter of 1995. But the current downturn has not been accompanied by the banking crisis, high inflation, spiraling interest rates and governmental liquidity problems that characterized 1995.

## Politics

**Timeframe – failure to raise the debt ceiling causes quick unraveling of the U.S. and global economy – collapse before November**

Sahadi 9/10 (Jeanne, “Debt ceiling 'X date' could hit Oct. 18”, <http://money.cnn.com/2013/09/10/news/economy/debt-ceiling-bills-coming-due/index.html>)//VP

A new analysis by a think tank shows that **Washington's drop-dead deadline for the debt ceiling could hit as soon as Oct. 18**.¶ Estimating exactly when the Treasury Department will be unable to pay all the bills coming due if Congress fails to raise the nation's legal borrowing limit is notoriously difficult.¶ That's why, in an analysis released Tuesday, the Bipartisan Policy Center put the "X date" between Oct. 18 and Nov. 5.¶ Treasury Secretary Jack Lew has warned that **by mid-October the agency will have only $50 billion in cash on top of incoming revenue.**¶That may sound like a lot. But, as the Bipartisan Policy Center details, **it won't last very long**.¶ If the "X" date turns out to be Oct. 18, Treasury would run about $106 billion short of the money it owes between then and Nov.15. That means it wouldn't be able to pay the equivalent of a third of all the bills due during that period.¶ Here's why: Treasury handles about 80 million payments a month. Those payments are not evenly spaced out so on some days more is owed than on others. And the revenue flowing into federal coffers is unpredictable and varies from day to day.¶ Payments include IRS refunds, Social Security and veterans benefits, Medicare reimbursements for doctors and hospitals, bond interest owed investors, payments to contractors and paychecks for federal workers and military personnel.¶ If Congress fails to act in time, Treasury will have to make difficult -- and legally questionable -- decisions about who should get paid and who should be stiffed. It may decide to pay some bills in full and on time and not others.¶ Or it may decide to delay all payments due on a given day until it has sufficient revenue on hand to pay in full. in a Treasury Inspector General's report that this might be the most plausible and least harmful approach.¶ But under that scenario, **delays would grow over time from a day or two to several weeks**. For example, the payments due to seniors, veterans and active duty military personnel on Nov. 1 wouldn't go out until Nov. 13.¶ In any case, the expectation is that the agency will try to prioritize payments to bond investors over everyone else, lest the financial markets go haywire. Politically, of course, that carries risk, said Steve Bell, the senior director of the Bipartisan Policy Center's economic policy project.¶ "There's a political danger you'll be accused of paying bondholders over Social Security recipients," Bell said.¶ On both Oct. 23 and Nov. 14, $12 billion in Social Security benefits come due, while another $25 billion comes due on Nov. 1, according to the analysis.¶ Meanwhile, on Oct. 24, Treasury will have to roll over $57 billion in outstanding debt and another $115 billion on Oct. 31. Normally that's not a problem, because U.S. Treasury auctions attract a lot of buyers willing to purchase bonds at low rates.¶ But if those rollover dates come after the "X" date, and **the perception is that the United States is defaulting on some of its obligations, Treasury could have trouble finding enough buyers or investors could demand higher interest rates**.¶ The debt ceiling is currently set at $16.7 trillion. That ceiling was reached on May 19, and ever since Treasury has been using a host of special measures to keep the country's borrowing at or below that ceiling. But those measures will be exhausted by mid-October, according to Treasury.¶ If lawmakers want to raise the ceiling enough to get past the 2014 midterm elections in November, the Bipartisan Policy Center estimates they will have to raise it by $1.1 trillion to $17.8 trillion. To top of page

**b.) TURNS CASE – debt default means the plan would be delayed or under-funded – fiat only means the plan passes**

Goldfarb 1-1 [Zachary A. Goldfarb 1-1-2013 Washington Post “‘Fiscal cliff’ deal does little to tame threats from debt ceiling, high unemployment rates” http://www.washingtonpost.com/business/fiscal-cliff/fiscal-cliff-deal-does-little-to-tame-threats-from-debt-ceiling-high-unemployment-rates/2013/01/01/8e4c14aa-5393-11e2-bf3e-76c0a789346f\_story.html]//VP

Leaving the fate of the debt ceiling up in the air will cause anxiety among businesses and individuals, potentially crimping hiring, investing and consumer spending.¶ In many ways, the threat of default in two months is a more serious risk than the Jan. 1 fiscal cliff deadline. If Congress does not increase the debt ceiling, the government will quickly run out of ways to pay the nation’s bills and make interest payments on the nation’s outstanding debt. Any failure by the government to meet its financial obligations could be seen as a default, shaking world financial markets, given the special role that U.S. government bonds play in the global economy.¶ And while a default would be all but certain to push the economy into recession, growth is likely to be slow — and job-market improvement slight — even without such a cataclysmic event. The unemployment rate, which stands at 7.7 percent, is not expected to fall below 7.4 percent by the end of this year, and not below 6 percent until at least 2016 or later.

**No Syria focus – every credible indicator points to debt ceiling focus for Obama’s PC**

Sink 9/12 – reporter for the Hill (Justin, “Obama signals shift back to economic focus”, The Hill, September 12th, 2013, http://thehill.com/blogs/on-the-money/economy/321793-obama-signals-shift-back-to-focus-on-the-economy)//VP

The White House is signaling it wants to shift back to the economy after two weeks in which the Syrian crisis has dominated President Obama’s schedule and workload.¶ Obama will be “focusing” on issues related to the economy in the coming weeks, White House press secretary Jay Carney said Wednesday at his daily briefing.¶ He said the president wants to push forward with economic policies that the White House believes will grow the middle class.¶ Obama himself in his prime-time address to the nation Tuesday on Syria said voters wanted him focused on the economy and not on Syria. Public support for a military intervention in Syria is low.¶ “I know Americans want all of us in Washington — especially me — to concentrate on the task of building our nation here at home: putting people back to work, educating our kids, growing our middle class,” Obama said.¶ The president had wanted to use the beginning of September to press forward on his economic policies ahead of fights with Congress on government spending and debt.

**Turn – thumpers divert the public’s attention- not Obama’s**

**Davis 5/22** (Julie Hirschfeld Davis; May 22, 2013; “Obama Probes Create Immigration Magic as Bill Advances”; Bloomberg; http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-05-23/obama-probes-create-immigration-magic-as-bill-advances.html)//KDUB

The trio of investigations causing headaches for President Barack Obama’s administration has also provided a honeymoon period for the marquee element of his domestic agenda: revising immigration laws. The congressional probes into various government agencies diverted attention at a critical time, allowing the Senate Judiciary Committee a respite from the spotlight as it reached critical compromises on the measure and approved it on a bipartisan 13-5 vote on May 21. The bill would allow the estimated 11 million immigrants living in the U.S. without authorization a chance at citizenship. “It’s like magic -- you distract the audience while the real trick is being done -- and I think right now, while Americans focus on President Obama’s unending difficulties, it’s good news for the Gang of Eight working on immigration,” said Republican strategist Alex Castellanos, referring to the four Republicans and four Democrats who crafted the bill.

**Shift to domestic issues now – Obama balancing**

Felsenthal 9/12

Mark, Reuters, Obama says is shifting to domestic priorities from Syria focus, 9/12/13, http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/09/12/us-usa-obama-syria-idUSBRE98B0RF20130912

President Barack Obama said on Thursday he is shifting his focus to domestic priorities from a tense period during which he sought congressional approval to use military force against Syria for its suspected use of chemical weapons.¶ "Even as we have been spending a lot of time on the Syria issue and making sure that international attention is focused on the horrible tragedy that occurred there, it is still important to recognize that we've got a lot more stuff to do here in this government," the president said before a meeting with his Cabinet at the White House.¶ The president said he hopes meetings between Secretary of State John Kerry and Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov will result in action to eliminate Syria's ability to use chemical weapons again.¶ Obama has asked Congress to authorize military strikes against Syria in response to what the United States says was a chemical weapons attack by the government that killed more than 1,400 people on August 21. The issue is on hold pending diplomatic efforts to disarm Syria of chemical weapons.¶ "I am hopeful that the discussions that Secretary Kerry had with Foreign Minister Lavrov as well as some of the other players in this can yield a concrete result," Obama said.¶ Secretary of State John Kerry and Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov were to hold talks on Syria in Geneva.¶ The president cited the budget, immigration, and implementation of his signature healthcare legislation as concerns he is turning to.¶ The administration faces daunting obstacles on all three fronts and a ticking clock on the budget in particular. Congressional Republicans have sought to eliminate funding for the health law, known as Obamacare, and want the president to agree to spending cuts in exchange for raising the nation's debt limit.¶ Lawmakers must pass legislation to continue funding for government operations by the end of the month or force a government shutdown. Failure to raise the nation's debt limit after a date expected in mid-October would trigger a debt default.

**Corn lobby supports sugar tariffs.**

**Vilner 07** (Dmitry, writer for the Independence Institute, “Corn-based Ethanol: The Last Straw”, Independence Institute, <http://www.i2i.org/main/article.php?article_id=1397>)

Today, ethanol subsidies are forcing up the operating costs of Colorado’s treasured microbreweries like Odell’s and New Belgium. The chasm between ethanol fact and fiction would be an amusing nuisance if it weren’t costing the American taxpayers billions of dollars every year and the economy untold billions in lost efficiency. That the corn ethanol lobby endeavors to exclude Brazilian sugar-cane ethanol from the market reveals that the lobby’s primary interest is not saving the environment or securing American energy, but corporate welfare.

**Corn ethanol has powerful lobby.**

**Mitseff, 08** [Micheal, staff writer for the lake city reporter, “Biofuel heavily subsidized by the government meaning taxpayers foot the bill”, 7/18 <http://www.lakecityreporter.com/articles/2008/07/15/news/doc487c1b7e2ff3f016695315.txt>]

“If the price isn’t going down, I don’t why they’re putting it (ethanol) in there,” Lake City resident Mark Hammonds said. “My truck don’t want to run on it at all, it sputters and everything else.” For the past few months, ethanol has been appearing at gas pumps throughout the county, but why? “Our dear Congress, or whoever is in charge, is responsible for the ethanol in our gasoline,” Scaff said. Scaff said his company spent more than $100,000 cleaning its holding tanks getting ready for the ethanol/gas mixture. “Had we not done it, then the ethanol would have clogged our tanks and pumps,” Scaff said. Bob Amin, part owner of One Stop Chevron just east of Marion Avenue on East Duval Street, said that he’s had no complaints about the ethanol/gasoline mixture. Scaff said he believes that corn ethanol is becoming more prevalent because of its well-organized and powerful lobby.

**Winners-win theory is wrong --- Obama’s first term proves**

**Calmes 11/13** (Jackie, International Herald Tribune, “Obama looks to budget talks as an opportunity to take control of agenda; News Analysis,” 11/13/2012, Factiva, CMR)

Whether Mr. Obama succeeds will reveal much about what kind of president he intends to be in his second term. Beyond the specifics of any accord, perhaps the bigger question hanging over the negotiations is whether Mr. Obama will go to his second inaugural in January with an achievement that starts to rewrite the unflattering leadership narrative that, fairly or not, came to define his first term for many people.¶ That story line, stoked by Republicans but shared by some Democrats, holds that Mr. Obama is too passive and deferential to Congress, a legislative naïf who does little to nurture personal relationships with potential allies — in short, not a particularly strong leader. Even as voters re-elected Mr. Obama, those who said in surveys afterward that strong leadership was the most important quality for a president overwhelmingly chose Mr. Romney.¶ George C. Edwards III, a **leading scholar of the presidency** at Texas A&M University who is currently teaching at Oxford University, dismissed such criticisms as shallow and generally wrong. Yet Mr. Edwards, whose book on Mr. Obama’s presidency is titled ‘‘Overreach,’’ said, ‘‘He didn’t understand the limits of what he could do.’’¶‘‘They thought they could continuously create opportunities and they would succeed, and then there would be more success and more success, and we’d build this advancing-tide theory of legislation,’’ Mr. Edwards said. ‘‘And that was **very naïve, very silly**. Well, they’ve learned a lot, I think.’’¶ ‘‘Effective leaders,’’ he added, **‘‘exploit opportunities rather than create them.’’**

**Political capital is finite**

**Gangale,** San Francisco State political science lecturer**, 5**

(Thomas, poli sci lecturer @ SF State, 1/23/5, “To Amend or Not to Amend”, http://pweb.jps.net/~gangale/opsa/ps2/ToAmendOrNotToAmend.htm) JPG

Abolishing the Electoral College is somewhat of a progressive issue in that it is based on the principle of "one person, one vote." However, more than anything it is a "large states vs. small states" issue, and that is why it is a perennial loser. The reality is that there are many more Idahos and Nebraskas than there are Californias and New Yorks, and since a small state has as many votes in the US Senate as a large state, any proposal to do away with the Electoral College cannot hope to win the required two-thirds majority. It is destined to defeat. Even worse, the issue pits progressive states large and small against each other, weakening progressive solidarity. **If you fight someone tooth-and-nail on one issue, it’s hard to muster any more than lukewarm support on another issue on which you agree. Political capital is like ammunition: use too much of it up in an unwise action, and you have to wait to be resupplied**. Meanwhile, **your forces may be** in disarray and **vulnerable** **to** a **counterstrike**. Abolishing the Electoral College isn’t the only constitutional amendment that’s being bandied about this year. There’s also talk of an amendment to ban gay marriage.

**1) Obama abandoned Summers to pursue debt negotiations – the plan would undermine his position**

Cassidy 9/16 John, The New Yorker, SUMMERS AND OBAMA ACCEPT THE INEVITABLE, 9/16/13, http://www.newyorker.com/online/blogs/johncassidy/2013/09/summers-and-obama-accept-the-inevitable.html

In recent weeks, numerous stories appeared that quoted White House and Treasury Department insiders saying how much the President respected Summers, who served as his senior economic advisor from the start of 2009 to the end of 2010, and how much he valued his advice. But we already knew that. The key question was never how much Obama admired Summers, but how much political capital he would be willing to invest in landing him at the Fed. If you looked at the issue in terms of cold political calculus, which is how Presidential aides look at most things, it was pretty clear which way the cost-benefit analysis would come out.¶ If Obama had been flying high, with a tight grip on Congress, it’s conceivable that he would have decided to nominate Summers and be damned. But he was hardly reaching a determination about the Fed job from a position of strength. His approval ratings are sagging, and he is about to enter another season of squabbling with Congressional Republicans over the budget, funding Obamacare, and the debt ceiling. In such circumstances, the last thing that the President needed was a bitter nomination fight in the Senate, especially one in which the liberal wing of his party, which is virtually united against a Summers nomination, was on the opposing side.

**1) GOP will cave because they can’t get Obamacare repealed**

Giroux 9/19

Greg, Bloomberg, Senate Budget Chief Sees Republican Yield on Debt Lifting, 9/19/13, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-09-19/senate-budget-chief-sees-republican-yield-on-debt-lifting.html

Republicans seeking to curb President Barack Obama’s health-care law probably will capitulate to demands from Democrats to enact a “clean” bill raising the nation’s debt ceiling, the Senate’s top Democratic budget writer said.¶ “I see no deals on the debt ceiling,” Senator Patty Murray of Washington state, who leads the Budget Committee, said in an interview on Bloomberg Television’s “Political Capital with Al Hunt” airing this weekend.¶ “The downside of not paying our bills is our credit-rating tanks,” Murray said. “That affects every family, every business, every community. It affects Main Street. It affects Wall Street.”¶ Murray said she also expects Republicans to relent on their demands for stripping spending from Obama’s health plan as part of action on a spending bill needed to keep the government running after Sept. 30.¶ Republicans led by House Speaker John Boehner of Ohio have clashed with Obama over the debt ceiling, with the lawmakers demanding changes to spending programs as a condition of raising the $16.7 trillion federal borrowing limit.¶ Republicans “will come together with some mishmash policy of everything in the bag they’ve ever promised” to anti-tax Tea Party activists, though “they haven’t been able to get the votes for anything yet,” said Murray, 62, fourth-ranking Democrat in the Senate’s leadership.¶ Federal Reserve¶ As Federal Reserve Chairman Ben S. Bernanke nears the end of his second term in January, Murray said there’s “a very good chance” that Obama will nominate Fed vice chairman Janet Yellen to succeed him.¶ Yellen is “very experienced” and “certainly understands that we need to create jobs, the kind of economic climate that brings stability to families in my home state and across the country,” Murray said.¶ Yellen also would be a “historic choice,” as the first woman to lead the U.S. central bank, Murray said.¶ Yellen became the front-runner to lead the Fed after Larry Summers withdrew from consideration Sept. 15 amid opposition from some Democratic senators. Murray was among the one-third of the 54-member Senate Democratic caucus who signed a July letter urging Obama to appoint Yellen as Bernanke’s successor.¶ The Senate will have to confirm Obama’s nominee.¶ Republicans led by Boehner have said they won’t negotiate with Obama over raising the debt ceiling. The House will act on a debt-ceiling measure that would also reduce the deficit, promote growth and delay Obama’s health-care law by one year, Boehner said at a press conference yesterday.¶ Reduce Deficit¶ “If you’re going to raise the debt ceiling, you should work to reduce the deficit and grow the economy at the same time,” Boehner said.¶ The House plans to vote today on the stopgap spending bill that would finance federal government operations through Dec. 15 while denying money for the president’s health-care overhaul. Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid has called that plan “dead on arrival.”¶ Obama would veto the bill because the legislation “advances a narrow ideological agenda that threatens our economy,” the president’s Office of Management and Budget said yesterday in a statement of administration policy.¶ The Democratic-run Senate won’t pass any bill curbing Obama’s top domestic policy achievement, Murray said.¶ ‘Helping Millions’¶ Republicans are demanding to repeal a health-care law “that is already in place, that’s been upheld by the Supreme Court and is helping millions of Americans,” she said.¶ Treasury Secretary Jacob J. Lew told Congress in a letter last month that lawmakers need to raise the borrowing limit by mid-October to remove the threat of a government default.¶ A government shutdown and a failure to raise the debt limit “could have very serious consequences for the financial markets and for the economy,” Bernanke said Sept. 18 as he announced that the Federal Open Market Committee wouldn’t reduce the $85 billion pace of its monthly securities buying.¶ Bernanke “sees what I see right now,” Murray said, that the economy “is starting to get stable again, but there’s a lot of uncertainty around it.”

**3) Negotiations don’t matter – GOP will capitulate to Obama and bipartisanship**

**ValueWalk 9/21** – (2013, “Sen. Patty Murray: GOP will ‘Capitulate on Debt Ceiling”, Value Walk, <http://www.valuewalk.com/2013/09/sen-patty-murray-gop-will-capitulate-debt-ceiling/>)//VP

On what will occur in the days to come within the Republican Party: “I am confident that they will come together with some mishmash policy of everything in the bag they’ve ever promised to the Tea Party, attach it to the debt ceiling, and try and send it over. Now, they haven’t been able to get the votes for anything yet but we’ll see. What will happen is that the Senate Democrats will say we are going to pass a clean debt ceiling. We have a responsibility as people who’ve been elected to govern to do the right thing. I see no deals on the debt ceiling. On whether Republicans will capitulate: “They did last time.”
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**Facilitate is not the same as increase**

**Merriam Webster** (Merriam Webster, "Facilitate.", 22 Sept. 2013. <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/facilitate>) MaxL

to make (something) easier : to help cause (something)

**Here’s more evidence – prefer intent to define.**

Words and Phrases, 5 (Cummulative Supplementary Pamphlet, v. 20a, p.295) cmr

Cal.App.2 Dist. 1991. Term “increase,” as used in statute giving the Energy Commission modification jurisdiction over any alteration, replacement, or improvement of equipment that results in “increase” of 50 megawatts or more in electric generating capacity of existing thermal power plant, refers to “net increase” in power plant’s total generating capacity; in deciding whether there has been the requisite 50-megawatt increase as a result of new units being incorporated into a plant, Energy Commission cannot ignore decreases in capacity caused by retirement or deactivation of other units at plant. West’s Ann.Cal.Pub.Res.Code § 25123.

## Trade

**Worst case it takes 100 years**

**Page 11**-Article Cites Study Conducted by the US National Science Foundation, Quotes Anreas Schmitner, Professor @ the College of Earth, Ocean, and Atmospheric Sciences [Lewis, The Register, Free Whitepaper-IBM System Networking RackSwitch G8264, “Global Warming Much Less Serious than Thought-New Science,” 11/25/2011, <http://www.theregister.co.uk/2011/11/25/runaway_warming_unlikely/>]

Climate scientists funded by the US government have announced new research in which they have established that the various doomsday global warming scenarios are in fact extremely unlikely to occur, and that the scenarios considered likeliest - and used for planning by the world's governments - are overly pessimistic. The new study improves upon previous results by including data from the remote past, rather than only examining records from recent times. "Many previous climate sensitivity studies have looked at the past only from 1850 through today, and not fully integrated paleoclimate data, especially on a global scale," says Andreas Schmittner, professor at the College of Earth, Ocean, and Atmospheric Sciences at Oregon State uni. "When you reconstruct sea and land surface temperatures from the peak of the last Ice Age 21,000 years ago – which is referred to as the Last Glacial Maximum – and compare it with climate model simulations of that period, you get a much different picture. "If these paleoclimatic constraints apply to the future, as predicted by our model, the results imply less probability of extreme climatic change than previously thought," Schmittner adds. The baseline assumption of climate science at the moment is that given a doubling of atmospheric CO2 compared to pre-industrial levels the most probable result is that the Earth would see a surface temperature rise average of 3°C - and that there would be a significant chance of much bigger, perhaps fatal rises. Schmittner and his colleagues' analysis says that the planet's climate simply can't be this sensitive to CO2 changes, however, or much more extreme events should have occurred at certain points in the past - and they did not. For instance, if the climate were sensitive enough that doubled CO2 could mean catastrophic warming, the low carbon levels seen 21,000 years ago should have resulted in an equally lifeless iceball planet. "Clearly, that didn't happen," Schmittner says. "Though the Earth then was covered by much more ice and snow than it is today, the ice sheets didn't extend beyond latitudes of about 40 degrees, and the tropics and subtropics were largely ice-free – except at high altitudes. These high-sensitivity models overestimate cooling." According to the new improved analysis, the most probable result as and when double CO2 occurs is actually a rise of just 2.3°C - only just above the 2°C limit which international climate efforts are seeking to stay within. Plainly there's no great need to fear a rise above 450 parts per million (ppm) CO2, as people currently do - in fact there's no likely prospect of getting near a 2°C temperature rise for a century or more at present rates of CO2 increase (rising about about 2 ppm/year at the moment from a level of 390-odd). And Schmittner and his colleagues' results show a much tighter grouping of possible futures, too, so the scope for way-out doomsday scenarios is hugely reduced. The Australian [quotes](http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/health-science/climate-forecasts-exaggerated-science-journal/story-e6frg8y6-1226205464958) Schmittner as saying: "Now these very large changes (predicted for the coming decades) can be ruled out, and we have some room to breathe and time to figure out solutions to the problem." The new study [is published](http://www.sciencemag.org/content/early/2011/11/22/science.1203513.abstract?sid=d47377ad-6df7-4f10-a1d7-ac371826abcf) in top-ranking boffinry journal Science. The research was funded by the US National Science Foundation. ®

**2. Both World Wars disprove**

**Tan, 99** (MAJ Tan Yan Yee attended the Royal Military College in Duntroon, Australia from 1987-1988. He graduated from the London School of Economics and Political Science with a B.Sc. (Econs) degree in 1992. An infantry officer by vocation, he attended the Singapore Command and Staff College in 1998 and is presently the S3 of 10 SIB, Journal of the Singapore Armed Forces, Jan-March)

Events leading up to the two World Wars amply illustrates the weaknesses of both theories. Prior to WWI, the European powers had reached unprecedented levels of trade, but this did not prevent the outbreak of war. Some liberals have sought to explain this by arguing that political leaders then did not understand how beneficial interdependence was, and how costly war would be. This is plausible, as it is likely that few statesmen or even military leaders then did not believe that the war would be over relatively quickly. However, it remains that greater interdependence failed disastrously to prevent the political crisis that led to WWI. Realists, on the other hand, fared no better. Although a high level of interdependence undoubtedly preceded WWI, such a situation had been prevailing for at least the best part of the previous 30 years, without causing any major conflict. If one were to be generous to the realist viewpoint, it can only be said that interdependence was a necessary but not sufficient condition for the War. Applying the liberal and realist arguments to WWII presents equally problematic outcomes. At first glance, the inter-war period seems to support liberalism over realism. In the 1920's, interdependence was high, and the world was largely peaceful. In the 1930's, as entrenched protectionism resulted in declining interdependence, international tension rose to the point that WWII erupted. Such a conclusion, however, would be wrong. Among the major protagonists during WWII, the Axis powers of Germany and Japan were the most dependent on other states for their raw materials and other vital goods; yet they were the ones that contributed most to the outbreak of war. It is fair to say that both states, especially Japan, resorted to war partly as a means of ensuring continued access to vital supplies. The period since the end of WWII has not helped to resolve this prolonged debate. International trade has enjoyed robust growth in the five decades since the end of WWII. The international economy is as integrated as it has ever been, with the economic situation in one country often affecting the outlook for other countries, as events in the recent financial turmoil has shown. International institutions and organisations have also become permanent features of the international society. In recent years, globalisation has further heightened the level of interdependence between states, so much so that the present trend towards ever-greater interdependence is probably irreversible. At the same time, the costs of war have also been proportionately rising with the development of increasingly sophisticated and destructive weapons and munitions. If the liberals are correct, then we should certainly see a reduced propensity for conflict among states. Yet the numerous conflicts over the last 50 years does not point to that conclusion. On the other hand, if the realists are correct, the world should certainly be close to a third world war by now. Yet it is hard to argue that there were more conflicts in recent years. In addition, none of these wars remotely approach the scale of the two World Wars fought in the earlier part of this century.

**3. Globalization increases the risk of bilateral war even though it lowers the risk of multilateral war**

**Martin, Mayer, and Thoenig, 08 (**Phillipe, University of Paris 1 Pantheon—Sorbonne, Paris School of Economics, and Centre for Economic Policy Research; Thierry MAYER, University of Paris 1 Pantheon—Sorbonne, Paris School of Economics, CEPII, and Centre for Economic Policy Research, Mathias THOENIG, University of Geneva and Paris School of Economics, The Review of Economic Studies 75)

The objective of this paper is to shed light on the following question: If trade promotes peace as suggested by the European example, why is it that globalization, interpreted as trade liberalization at the global level, has not lived up to its promise of decreasing the prevalence of violent interstate conflicts? We offer a theoretical and empirical answer to this question. On the theoretical side, we build a framework where escalation to military conflicts may occur because of the failure of negotiations in a bargaining game. The structure of this game is fairly general: (1) war is Pareto dominated by peace, (2) countries have private information, and (3) countries can choose any type of negotiation protocol. We then embed this game in a standard new trade theory model.We show that a pair of countries with more bilateral trade has a lower probability of bilateral war. However, multilateral trade openness has the opposite effect: Any pair of countries more open with the rest of the world decreases its degree of bilateral dependence and its cost of a bilateral conflict, and this results in a higher probability of bilateral war. A theoretical prediction of our model is that globalization of trade flows changes the nature of conflicts. It decreases the probability of global conflicts (maybe the most costly in terms of human welfare) but increases the probability of any bilateral conflict. The reason for the second result is that globalization decreases the bilateral dependence for any country pair, and this weakens the incentive to make concessions in order to avoid the escalation of a dispute into a bilateral military conflict. This is especially true for countries with a high probability of dispute with a local dimension such as disputes on borders, resources, and ethnic minorities.