### K

#### The affirmative advantages function as a form of spectacle to justify the fetishization of technology in the plan. This promotes increased production as an answer to social problems and disconnects individuals from the material realities of policy [both green and yellow]

David Harvey in 2003 ( Distinguished Professor of Anthropology and Geography at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York, The Fetish of Technology: Causes and Consequences, Macalester International Vol. 13)

The effective demand of consumers and, in these times in particular, consumer confidence expressed as a willingness to spend and go into debt, if necessary, constitute very important stabilizing forces in the growth dynamics of capital accumulation. **While the labor process produces the fantasy of the worker as an appendage of the machine** (as robot), **the consumption side induces the fantasy of the insatiable consumer totally hooked into the circulation of capital** and its endless output of products (the cyborg customer). In this, the fetish of technology, the lust for the new, the fashionable, the sophisticated, has its own role to playwithin populations at large. **The** production of this fetish is promoted directly through fantasy production, using advertising and other technologies of persuasion, in particular that aspect that reduces the consumer to a passive spectatorof spectacle. One does not have to accept all of Debord’s propositions in The Society of the Spectacle to recognize the cogency of his argument that media and cultural formsand icons, mediated through sophisticated technologies of representationand communication, capture, **manipulate, and promote consumer desires** and identities **in ways conducive to** endless **capital accumulation**. 12 **Insofar as everything** — **nature, social relations**, history, **geography**, culture, the news, **current events** — **gets reduced to** and commodified as **spectacle, so**, too, **does the consumer become a passive player** in history relative to the drive to accumulate capital and consolidate political-economic power in a few hands. And if that does not work, then technologies of surveillance and control are at hand to monitor and manipulate the behavior of populations that do not conform to social norms established within the frame of the consumer society and the society of the spectacle. **Media technologies of** fantasy and **spectacle** production **have been of singular importance** within the dynamics of capitalism, particularly **in recent times**. Oriented primarily toward social groups and regions blessed with substantial effective demand, **the bourgeoisie must increasingly enfold itself in its own fetishisms** and fantasies **as to how the world is constructed. The mentalités of the bourgeoisie cannot stand outside of its own fetish** and fantasy products. As a result, **the affluent classes** living in privileged territories, **such as the United States**, largely **fail to** register, let alone **react to**, **material threats and dangers in a socially and politically cogent way. The contradictions** embedded **in the** fantasy and the **fetish are rich with unintended consequences** and always **pose the danger of steering straight into the path of major material crises without knowing it** (or even, as in the case of global warming, being unable to steer out of a problem whose parameters are broadly known and widely accepted). Sadly, the most common response to being physically caught in the events of September 11 in New York was to say, “It was like being in a bad movie.”

#### The alternative is a challenge to the ontological framework of neoliberalism – by breaking away from this political ontology can we introduce alternative means in the political arena including justice and solidarity.

Oksala in 2011(Johanna, Senior Research Fellow in the Academy of Finland research project is Philosophy and Politics in Feminist Theory at the University of Helsinki, “Violence and Neoliberal Governmentality,” *Constellations Volume 18, No 3)*

**If we accept my analysis of the relationship between neoliberalism and political violence, however, irrational violence appears to become the only meaningful form that violent resistance against neoliberalism can take. The implication of the specific relationship between neoliberalism and political violence is**, **paradoxically, that there can be no cost-effective and, in this sense, rational practices of violence that could function as genuine resistance against it**. Burning cars in rich neighbourhoods instead of poor ones would mean adopting the very political ontology one is attempting to question and transform: **all human behavior should not be reduced to cost-effective means, to an end. If we want to oppose neoliberalism not just as an economic policy, but also as a socio-political matrix, we have to challenge the ontological framework that explains all human behavior through the economic analysis of its costs and effects.** Some forms of behavior, such as violence, must retain an irreducibly moral and political meaning. **The paradoxical relationship between neoliberalism and violent resistance does not obviously imply that the only meaningful form of protest against neoliberalism is irrational violence. On the contrary, it should constitute a strong reason not to engage in violence, but to seek other ways of resisting**. While we have to accept that practical forms of resistance against neoliberalism have to consider the efficaciousness of their strategies and even apply strictly economic, cost-benefit analysis to some of their actions, **economic rationality should not form the framework for assessing violence as a form of resistance. We should question neoliberalism’s exclusive stake to rationality and introduce alternative means and ends to the political arena: justice, compassion, creativity and solidarity,** for example. Many of the peaceful protests against neoliberal hegemony – demonstrations, public performances and the occupation of public spaces – provide good examples of this. I am thus not promoting mindless, irrational violence, but I contend that **the economic irrationality of violence does not amount to its meaninglessness, not unless we have lost all frameworks other than the neoliberal for understanding social reality**. **The expressive and disruptive forces of violence are a genuine and sometimes appealing alternative to people disenchanted with the all-encompassing framework of cost-benefit analysis and the systemic, “rational” forms of violence compatible with** it. I also disagree with ˇ Ziˇzek’s claim that advanced capitalism is worldless in the sense that it contains no worldview. **Not unlike Nazism and communism neoliberalism contains an explicit worldview: it holds metaphysical assumptions about what human beings and societies are essentially like by maintaining a belief that human beings are always rational beings driven by natural self-interest.** This is not a problem, a lamentable manifestation of the human condition, but something to be affirmed because it is ultimately the engine for economic growth. Neoliberalism also advances values and political ideals for the optimal organisation of human societies: the maximal material wellbeing of the population must be the undisputed goal of all societies and it is achieved only by continuous economic growth. **The importance of free competition and the privileging of market mechanisms is thus not based solely on their economic rationality. They are understood as the means for a good life** where good life is understood to include both maximal wealth and freedom. Free markets guarantee that people have maximal choice in cheap products and services and are thus not only maximally wealthy, but also free. The prevalent characteristic of neoliberalism is not just the conviction that free markets provide the optimal organising mechanism for capitalist economies. More fundamentally, **the conviction is that they provide the optimal organising mechanism for the entirety of human life and social interaction**: the necessary conditions for political freedom and a morality based on individual responsibility.33 **The free market is thus not just an economic, but also a moral and political force**. It does not function simply as the most efficient means for allocating resources: it is the optimum context for achieving human freedom and happiness. **Not unlike Nazism and communism neoliberalism maps a cognitive space for individuals with very clear objectives and the means of achieving them**. Some would express the objective by saying that it is quite simply wealth – whoever dies with the most toys wins. **Some would say that the ultimate objective of any form of liberalism is freedom. That ultimately amounts to the same things, however, because “money is. . .the greatest instrument of freedom ever invented by man**.”34 And the best means for achieving wealth is unlimited competition in the free market. As Foucault saw it, the art of government developed by the Ordoliberals in and around the 1930s had become the programme of most governments in capitalist countries by 1979 when he delivered his lectures. **Since then this political ontology has become even more expansive and deeply ingrained.** It has circumscribed our everyday life in the last 30 years to the extent that it has not just been the dominant economic theory, **it has been constitutive of our life-world and ultimately of ourselves.** Its triumph does not mean that we have become a standardised, mass society of consumption and spectacle, as some social critics have insisted. It rather means that we live in a society that is oriented towards the multiplicity and differentiation of enterprises. **We have become entrepreneurs of our lives, competing in the free market called society. We compete in an ever-expanding range of fields, and invest in ourselves by enhancing our abilities and appearance, by improving our strategies of life coaching and time management.** Our life has become an enterprise that we must lead to success.**Within this framework irrational violence does not appear morally wrong or politically compromised: it is simply a losing strategy, and this, paradoxically, remains its appeal and its significance.**

#### NEOLIBERALISM’S RELIANCE ON THE MARKET PERPETUATES SOCIAL CONTROL. THE MARKET IS DETERMINED TO BE A NEUTRAL, NATURAL SYSTEM OF LAW. THIS ALLOWS THE ELITES TO CONSTRUE SOCIAL DOMINATION AS NATURAL INFERIORITY, LEADING TO RACISM AND CLASSISM

MURPHY ET AL IN 2K4(JOHN, MANUEL CARO, JUNG MIN CHOI, PROF OF SOCIOLOGY @ UNIV OF MIAMI, ASSIS PROF OF SOCIOLOGY @ BARRY UNIV, ASSOC PROF OF SOCIOLOGY @ SDSU, GLOBALIZATION WITH A HUMAN FACE )

The point of this book is to say that the powerful classes have learned a lot about domination, and thus have concocted new ways to hide their control and exploitation of others. Manipulation, therefore, is neither crudely ideological nor undertaken openly through governmental or leg­islative mandates. As Hardt and Negri discuss, power is now portrayed as diffuse and revealed through means that are almost undetectable. Critics have maintained, nonetheless, that Hardt and Negri have ig­nored power, and that this omission is particularly problematic nowa­days.9 After all, the middle and lower classes seem to be under enormous economic pressure—their buying power has been eroding for at least 20 years. But what these critics have not grasped is how the market serves to reinforce empire. How does the market, simply put, deflect criticism from capitalist societies and foster political stability? Although Hardt and Negri do not deal directly with the market, their model of social control is operative at the marketplace. Most important, the illusion has been created successfully that the market is autonomous, and therefore this regulatory mechanism is neutral, beyond politics, and basically fair. And when the market is allowed to function without po­litical interference, any outcomes are thought to reflect reality, as opposed to some narrow social agenda. At the marketplace, talent and ambition come into play, rather than hidden schemes and trickery Consequently, poverty is thought to reflect ability or effort, and not the influence of class or racial biases. In fact, variables such as discrimination or exploitation are obscured at the market. The assumption is that racial bias, for example, would be economically disastrous—not hiring talented blacks would reduce profit—and would not be rational at the market­place. Accordingly, in the long run, the market is thought to be immune to considerations that are inconsistent with economic rationality. Yet by focusing on the market in this way, social analysis is severely truncated. Important factors that are operating outside of the marketplace, which relate to the preservation of power and social status, are overlooked and allowed to continue unchecked. The abuse of entire classes of persons, accordingly, is concealed behind the facade of neutrality and rationality. At the marketplace, social classes do not clash, but simply fulfill their respective destinies. Any disparities that may begin to exist in society have nothing to do with the economic philosophy that may be in place. If blacks or Hispanics begin to accumulate in the lower levels of society, there is nothing sinister about this outcome. These persons were simply unable to compete successfully at the marketplace and take advantage of their opportunities. Rather than neoliberal capitalism, the problem is unprepared or unmoti­vated individuals. The market, in this sense, provides a perfect shield against structural criticisms, and empire is maintained without any hint of social conflict or coercion. Ideology is thus no longer crude and clumsy. Privileges, corruption, or exploitation, instead are protected behind a facade of rationality and in­difference. In this respect, an entirely new era of social control has been entered. As persons strive to improve the rationality of the market, they conceal further the social causes of their poverty and other afflictions. In fact, minorities may even begin to blame themselves for the discrimination they have experienced, while workers return their hard-earned gains to their bosses as penance for the failures of the economic system. When this type of behavior becomes normative, social control has become complete. <p5-6>

### DA

#### No Iran sanctions now – but Obama’s PC is key and effective – would cause negotiations to be derailed – INSIDE SOURCES

Klapper 12/11 – Associated Press reporter (Bradley, “Congress to Hold off on Iran Sanctions for Now”, Associated Press, December 11, 2013, http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/wireStory/congress-hold-off-iran-sanctions-now-21182966) Possible House action this week against Iran could fall short of new penalties that might derail a short-term nuclear agreement and Senate steps seem further off, legislatives aides said Wednesday, as the Obama administration appealed for patience. In the House, the aides said Majority Leader Rep. Eric Cantor, R-Va., could introduce a nonbinding resolution as early as Thursday spelling out suggested terms for any final deal. The goal would be a vote before the House leaves on recess Friday. Senate aides reported that Majority Leader Harry Reid, D-Nev., was talking about possible votes in January. His intent, they said, was to ensure the issue does not interfere with passage of a defense bill before senators break next week for Christmas. As a result, Congress is not expected to approve new sanctions until January at the earliest, giving President Barack Obama at least a few more weeks before his diplomatic effort could face added complications. The aides spoke on condition of anonymity because they weren't authorized to publicly discuss the legislative maneuvering. The U.S. and other world powers reached an agreement with Iran last month that provides Iran with $7 billion in relief from U.S. economic penalties in exchange for a series of nuclear concessions. The administration also committed to no new nuclear-related penalties for six months, a promise that upset members of both parties in Congress. Secretary of State John Kerry and Treasury Secretary Jacob Lew met with much of the Senate in private Wednesday in a renewed effort to hold on any legislation that might scuttle the nuclear deal. Kerry told the House Foreign Affairs Committee on Tuesday that even if lawmakers suspended fresh penalties on condition that Iran didn't violate its commitments, those sanctions would be a sign of bad faith to America's negotiating partners and could provide Tehran with an excuse to walk away from negotiations. Obama and Kerry say a final deal next year is uncertain, but stress that diplomacy is far preferable to any military solution. Iran insists its nuclear program is solely designed for peaceful energy generation and medical research purposes. The U.S. and several other countries long have viewed the program as a covert attempt by Iran to develop nuclear weapons capability. Sens. Bob Menendez, D-N.J., and Mark Kirk, R-Ill., are close to completing a bill that would require that the administration certify every 30 days Iran's adherence to the interim pact, according to legislative aides. Without that certification, the legislation would reimpose all penalties and introduce new restrictions on Iran's engineering, mining and construction industries. The legislation also calls for a global boycott of Iranian oil by 2015 if Iran fails to live up to the interim agreement. Foreign companies and banks violating the bans would be barred from doing business in the United States. Menendez declined to comment on his plans, but said he would listen to Kerry's presentation. Sen. Lindsey Graham, R-S.C., said he would be open to allowing this year's defense bill to pass without including new sanctions, if he could get a guarantee that the topic would come up soon. "That will go a long way to shape my thinking," Graham said. Sen. John Cornyn, R-Texas, said the Senate needs to deal with the issue "sooner rather than later." Sen. Bob Corker, R-Tenn., is pushing his own bill. It doesn't seek to ramp up sanctions but looks to lock in those already in place until Iran completely halts all uranium enrichment activity — a demand U.S. officials long ago conceded. "My concern is that the administration in another, quote, trust-building measure, will alleviate some more sanctions for another baby step which really doesn't accomplish anything relative to dismantling the enrichment programs," Corker told reporters. Iranian Foreign Minister Mohammad Javad Zarif has said any new commercial restrictions against Iran could kill the diplomatic effort.

#### Climate issues divide the Congress – opposing expectations

Zeller, 2013

(Tom, 1-17-13, Huffington Post, “Obama On Climate Change Faces High Expectations, And High Hurdles, In Second Term,” [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/17/obama-climate- change\_n\_2472552.html?utm\_hp\_ref=the-road-forward](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/17/obama-climate-%20change_n_2472552.html?utm_hp_ref=the-road-forward), accessed 7-10-13, EB)

But even after a year of record-breaking heat, **Obama embarks on his second term against** the backdrop of **a Congress that remains** stubbornly **divided on questions of climate and conservation, leaving little hope these issues will be addressed through broad-based legislation,** which the administration has long said was the preferred route for such measures. **That will leave the president with a long list of demands and expectations from his environmental base and only the comparatively narrow corridors of his own regulatory authority through which to pursue any of it** -- should he choose to do so.

#### A deal stops Iran prolif and Israel strikes

Phillip Stephens 11/14/13, columnist for the Financial Times, “The four big truths that are shaping the Iran talks,” <http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/af170df6-4d1c-11e3-bf32-00144feabdc0.html#axzz2kkvx15JT>

The first of these is that Tehran’s acquisition of a bomb would be more than dangerous for the Middle East and for wider international security. It would most likely set off a nuclear arms race that would see Saudi Arabia, Turkey and Egypt signing up to the nuclear club. The nuclear non-proliferation treaty would be shattered. A future regional conflict could draw Israel into launching a pre-emptive nuclear strike. This is not a region obviously susceptible to cold war disciplines of deterrence.¶ The second ineluctable reality is that Iran has mastered the nuclear cycle. How far it is from building a bomb remains a subject of debate. Different intelligence agencies give different answers. These depend in part on what the spooks actually know and in part on what their political masters want others to hear. The progress of an Iranian warhead programme is one of the known unknowns that have often wreaked havoc in this part of the world.¶ Israel points to an imminent threat. European agencies are more relaxed, suggesting Tehran is still two years or so away from a weapon. Western diplomats broadly agree that Ayatollah Ali Khamenei has not taken a definitive decision to step over the line. What Iran has been seeking is what diplomats call a breakout capability – the capacity to dash to a bomb before the international community could effectively mobilise against it.¶ The third fact – and this one is hard for many to swallow – is that neither a negotiated settlement nor the air strikes long favoured by Benjamin Netanyahu, Israel’s prime minister, can offer the rest of the world a watertight insurance policy.¶ It should be possible to construct a deal that acts as a plausible restraint – and extends the timeframe for any breakout – but no amount of restrictions or intrusive monitoring can offer a certain guarantee against Tehran’s future intentions.¶ By the same token, bombing Iran’s nuclear sites could certainly delay the programme, perhaps for a couple of years. But, assuming that even the hawkish Mr Netanyahu is not proposing permanent war against Iran, air strikes would not end it.¶ You cannot bomb knowledge and technical expertise. To try would be to empower those in Tehran who say the regime will be safe only when, like North Korea, it has a weapon. So when Barack Obama says the US will never allow Iran to get the bomb he is indulging in, albeit understandable, wishful thinking.¶ The best the international community can hope for is that, in return for a relaxation of sanctions, Iran will make a judgment that it is better off sticking with a threshold capability. To put this another way, if Tehran does step back from the nuclear brink it will be because of its own calculation of the balance of advantage.¶ The fourth element in this dynamic is that Iran now has a leadership that, faced with the severe and growing pain inflicted by sanctions, is prepared to talk. There is nothing to say that Hassan Rouhani, the president, is any less hard-headed than previous Iranian leaders, but he does seem ready to weigh the options.¶ Seen from this vantage point – and in spite of the inconclusive outcome – Geneva can be counted a modest success. Iran and the US broke the habit of more than 30 years and sat down to talk to each other. Know your enemy is a first rule of diplomacy – and of intelligence. John Kerry has his detractors but, unlike his predecessor Hillary Clinton, the US secretary of state understands that serious diplomacy demands a willingness to take risks.¶ The Geneva talks illuminated the shape of an interim agreement. Iran will not surrender the right it asserts to uranium enrichment, but will lower the level of enrichment from 20 per cent to 3 or 4 per cent. It will suspend work on its heavy water reactor in Arak – a potential source of plutonium – negotiate about the disposal of some of its existing stocks of enriched uranium, and accept intrusive international inspections. A debate between the six powers about the strength and credibility of such pledges is inevitable, as is an argument with Tehran about the speed and scope of a run down of sanctions.

#### An Israeli strike fails, but triggers World War 3, collapses heg and the global economy [read yellow and green]

Rafael Reuveny 10, professor in the School of Public and Environmental Affairs at Indiana University, “Unilateral strike could trigger World War III, global depression,” Gazette Xtra, 8/7, <http://gazettextra.com/news/2010/aug/07/con-unilateral-strike-could-trigger-world-war-iii-/#sthash.ec4zqu8o.dpuf>

A unilateral Israeli strike on Iran’s nuclear facilities would likely have dire consequences, including a regional war, global economic collapse and a major power clash.¶ For an Israeli campaign to succeed, it must be quick and decisive. This requires an attack that would be so overwhelming that Iran would not dare to respond in full force.¶ Such an outcome is extremely unlikely since the locations of some of Iran’s nuclear facilities are not fully known and known facilities are buried deep underground.¶ All of these widely spread facilities are shielded by elaborate air defense systems constructed not only by the Iranians but also the Chinese and, likely, the Russians as well.¶ By now, Iran has also built redundant command and control systems and nuclear facilities, developed early warning systems, acquired ballistic and cruise missiles and upgraded and enlarged its armed forces.¶ Because Iran is well-prepared, a single, conventional Israeli strike—or even numerous strikes—could not destroy all of its capabilities, giving Iran time to respond.¶ Unlike Iraq, whose nuclear program Israel destroyed in 1981, Iran has a second-strike capability comprised of a coalition of Iranian, Syrian, Lebanese, Hezbollah, Hamas, and, perhaps, Turkish forces. Internal pressure might compel Jordan, Egypt and the Palestinian Authority to join the assault, turning a bad situation into a regional war.¶ During the 1973 Arab-Israeli War, at the apex of its power, Israel was saved from defeat by President Nixon’s shipment of weapons and planes. Today, Israel’s numerical inferiority is greater, and it faces more determined and better-equipped opponents. After years of futilely fighting Palestinian irregular armies, Israel has lost some of its perceived superiority—bolstering its enemies’ resolve.¶ Despite Israel’s touted defense systems, Iranian coalition missiles, armed forces, and terrorist attacks would likely wreak havoc on its enemy, leading to a prolonged tit-for-tat.¶ In the absence of massive U.S. assistance, Israel’s military resources may quickly dwindle, forcing it to use its alleged nuclear weapons, as it had reportedly almost done in 1973.¶ An Israeli nuclear attack would likely destroy most of Iran’s capabilities, but a crippled Iran and its coalition could still attack neighboring oil facilities, unleash global terrorism, plant mines in the Persian Gulf and impair maritime trade in the Mediterranean, Red Sea and Indian Ocean.¶ Middle Eastern oil shipments would likely slow to a trickle as production declines due to the war and insurance companies decide to drop their risky Middle Eastern clients. Iran and Venezuela would likely stop selling oil to the United States and Europe.¶ From there, things could deteriorate as they did in the 1930s. The world economy would head into a tailspin; international acrimony would rise; and Iraqi and Afghani citizens might fully turn on the United States, immediately requiring the deployment of more American troops.¶ Russia, China, Venezuela, and maybe Brazil and Turkey—all of which essentially support Iran—could be tempted to form an alliance and openly challenge the U.S. hegemony.¶ Russia and China might rearm their injured Iranian protege overnight, just as Nixon rearmed Israel, and threaten to intervene, just as the U.S.S.R. threatened to join Egypt and Syria in 1973. President Obama’s response would likely put U.S. forces on nuclear alert, replaying Nixon’s nightmarish scenario.¶ Iran may well feel duty-bound to respond to a unilateral attack by its Israeli archenemy, but it knows that it could not take on the United States head-to-head. In contrast, if the United States leads the attack, Iran’s response would likely be muted.¶ If Iran chooses to absorb an American-led strike, its allies would likely protest and send weapons but would probably not risk using force.¶ While no one has a crystal ball, leaders should be risk-averse when choosing war as a foreign policy tool. If attacking Iran is deemed necessary, Israel must wait for an American green light. A unilateral Israeli strike could ultimately spark World War III.

### CP

#### The United States federal government should extend and offer to Mexico to increase economic engagement toward Mexico in the context of renewable energy

#### If and only if Mexico demonstrates its ability to

#### +Allow Mexico’s civilian institutions to investigate and prosecute cases of human rights abuses;

#### +Enhance enforcement of prohibitions against torture and other mistreatment;

#### +Strengthen protection for human rights defenders;

#### and implements policies enforcing these standards.

**Current policies to stop human and drug trafficking won’t solve – Mexican government policies fail**

Graham, 2010 [Melissa Graham, Council on Hemispheric Affairs Research Associate, “MEXICO’S NEW WAR: SEX TRAFFICKING” 10-13-2010 <http://www.coha.org/mexico%E2%80%99s-new-war-sex-trafficking/>]

The recent conflict over immigration has become another factor in the growth of human trafficking rings, as their levels of strength increase exponentially. Since 11 September 2001, the issue of border security has generated an overzealous reaction on the U.S public’s part, galvanized by politicians hungry for an issue, to keep “others” out. As a result, the U.S.-Mexico border became almost impenetrable. However, heightened border security backfired on the U.S. government as it forced many Mexicans into the areas of illegal trafficking groups in hopes that they will give them a better chance of getting across the border. As the debate over immigration continues, stringent U.S. laws will surely play an important role in the growing reliance of Mexicans on illegal trafficking groups. Recent laws like Arizona’s SB 1070, which critics argue encompass racial profiling, are causing increasing harm to many victims of human trafficking. Amanda Kloer of change.org explains that the law will “up the chances that undocumented trafficking victims will end up detained or deported and documented traffickers walk free.” Kloer reasons that victimizing those who have been subjected to trafficking, via laws like SB 1070, is likely to keep many from coming forward to law enforcement officials out of fear that they will simply be deported back to Mexico. Any change in the classification of “illegal immigrants” has to take into account that not all of those criminalized by existing U.S. laws are there by choice. Unfortunately, Calderón’s attack on drug cartels has left few resources to combat human trafficking. Mexico has tried to address the issue through legal changes to combat trafficking as recently as 2007, when “federal legislation to prohibit all forms of drug trafficking”7 was passed. Nonetheless, according to the U.S. Department of State’s Trafficking of Persons Report 2010, “some local officials tolerate and are sometimes complicit in trafficking, impeding the implementation of anti-trafficking statutes.”8 This limits the law and at times makes it completely ineffective in combating the issue. Last year, according to the same government report, the federal government in Mexico investigated only 48 cases of human trafficking. Only one trafficking ring was apprehended and the leader still remains at large. Obviously, the laws are not doing nearly enough to stop what is happening by passing laws that, in reality, do very little. The problem with human and sex trafficking is that it has become a side business for many cartels to supplement their lost income in the “war on drugs.” Kloer again explains it best: “When a drug cartel traffics a pound of cocaine into the U.S., they can only sell it once. When they traffic a young woman into the U.S., they can sell her again and again.”9 Calderón has unwittingly allowed the cartels to become involved in other illicit business, such as human trafficking, and his administration has done little to address this issue. As human trafficking becomes a growing problem shared by Mexico and the U.S., it becomes the responsibility of both governments to properly address the issue. Due to both countries’ stance on immigration policy, the current violence taking over the country, and the insubordination of women’s status in Mexico, female trafficking has become the loophole in cartel’s moneymaking abilities and is an issue that can be stopped if given the right attention and awareness. Calderón, as well as other leaders in Latin America, must start attacking the cartels’ human trafficking activities to help combat the growth of this industry. The United States also has a responsibility to help those that become labeled as “victims” of human trafficking. In situations like this, the United States needs to assert their role as a guiding light in the Western hemisphere and aid victims who are not being helped by their own government.

#### Economic aid should be conditioned on Merida initiative—unique opportunity for enforcement

**HRW 9**-[Human Rights Watch, “Mexico: US Should Withhold Military Aid,” 7/13/2009, <http://www.hrw.org/news/2009/07/13/mexico-us-should-withhold-military-aid>, DKP]

(Washington, DC) - **The US State Department should not certify Mexico's compliance with the Merida Initiative**'s human rights requirements **so long as Mexican army abuses continue to be tried in military rather than civilian courts**, Human Rights Watch said in a letter to Secretary of State Hillary Clinton released today.¶ The US Congress mandated that 15 percent of funds to be provided to Mexico under the Merida Initiative, **a multi-year regional aid package** to help address the increasing violence and corruption of heavily armed drug cartels, **should be withheld until the secretary of state reports to Congress that the Mexican government has met four human rights conditions.** They include the requirement that military abuses be investigated and prosecuted by civilian rather than military authorities.¶ **"The Merida Initiative provides** the **Obama** administration **with an important opportunity to strengthen** US-Mexican drug enforcement and **human rights cooperation,"** Kenneth Roth, executive director of Human Rights Watch, said in the letter. "**To capitalize on this opportunity**, however, the **Obama** administration **should vigorously enforce the human rights requirements included in the aid package."**

#### Sex trafficking causes economic decline, geopolitical instability, disease spread, human rights violation and international conflict.

Bertone 99 (Andrea Marie, Professor of Government and Politics at George Washington University, “Sexual Trafficking in Women: International Political Economy and the Politics of Sex”, Gender Issues, Vol #18, #1, EBSCOhost)

What are the consequences of trafficking in women? There is no doubt that the consequences of trafficking are grave for the women and countries involved. Mr. Gramegna of the IOM identified a number of consequences including a threat to orderly, legal migration and a growth in clandestine immigration. These can have serious implications for national sovereignty and relations between states, as well as internal political and economic consequences. Socially, trafficking can feed popular fear of uncontrolled borders and xenophobic sentiments. Security is put at risk by the growth in criminality that trafficking in women involves. Powerful networks are controlling the trade as the activity becomes ever more lucrative. The gravity of the consequences for the individual cannot be overstated. These women face sexual abuse, with all the dangers of injury and severe health risks it entails. The women may be deprived of their documents and forced into a situation of severe dependence, comparable to being a hostage (or a slave). They are often subject to violence by traffickers and clients alike, deprived of basic human rights and forced to live in unendurable conditions. Some women die as a direct result of abuse and exploitation by traffickers. The mental and emotional consequences for the victims can be as severe as and longer lasting than physical scars. For many, it is difficult to talk about the ordeal and impossible to return to normal life. In some countries, a woman may be ostracized from the community if it becomes known she has worked as a prostitute. Few trafficked women receive any counseling or reha¬bilitation assistance (www.iom.ch/doc/trafficking). The lethal combination of poverty, powerlessness, and poor health is evident in the figures. Many prostitutes know little or nothing of AIDS, but even if they did they would be in no position to demand that their clients use condoms. The clients' fears of AIDS have had the apparent effect of sending them in search of younger and younger boys and girls. AIDS itself is very much a part of the international political economy of sex, demonstrating how permeable state borders and people's bodies are to certain kinds of international traffic. A different reading of AIDS as a threat to national security is made by Filipina feminist members of GABRIELA, who see American mili¬tary men and foreign sex tourists as infecting the Philippines body politic, and invading national sovereignty. The impact of a politics of unequal trade and debt, World Bank conditionality, restructuring, and the government's search for hard currency is linked with a feminist analysis of patriarchy and the eroticization of women's bodies (Enloe, 1990a, p. 38; Pettman, 1996a, pp. 200-202).

#### This is a decision rule – we must place values over survival, especially in the context of contemporary human slavery that takes the form of human trafficking.

Schmitz 2004 (Joseph E., Inspector General of the Department of Defense, “Implementing the Department of Defense “Zero Tolerance” Policy With Regard to Trafficking in Humans”, <http://www.dodig.mil/fo/JES_TIP_Testimony_092104.pdf>)

A more fundamental answer might be that to confront modern day human slavery forces us all to focus on “first things first,” that is, we need to focus on the principles that are worth fighting for, in order that we might better focus on “second things,” which include survival. “[T]he principle of ‘first and second things,’ as C. S. Lewis calls it . . . [is] that when second things are put first, not only first things but second things too are lost. More exactly, when there are greater goods, or ultimate ends and proximate ends, if we put lesser goods, like survival, before greater goods, like values to survive for, then we lose not only the greater goods, the values, but even the lesser goods that we’ve idolized . . . . [T]he society that believes in nothing worth surviving for beyond mere survival will not survive.”5 Our currently available legislative tools for suppressing human trafficking include, of course, the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 and its 2003 reauthorization, which together prescribe a model “zero tolerance” standard not only for all Americans but for our Western Alliance partners as well. There is another legislative tool for combating trafficking in persons, less known but equally potent for those of us serving in the Department of Defense, known as the “Exemplary Conduct” leadership standard.

### CP

#### The United States federal government should develop and deploy sunshades beyond the Earth’s mesosphere.

#### Solves warming

Victor et al 2009 – a Professor at Stanford Law School, Director of Stanford's Program on Energy and Sustainable Development, and an Adjunct Senior Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations. M. Granger Morgan is Head of Carnegie Mellon University's Department of Engineering and Public Policy and Director of the Climate Decision Making Center. Jay Apt is Professor of Engineering and Public Policy at Carnegie Mellon University. John Steinbruner is Professor of Public Policy and Director of the Center for International and Security Studies at the University of Maryland. Katharine Ricke is a doctoral student at Carnegie Mellon University (David G., March/April 2009 “The geoengineering option” http://iis-db.stanford.edu/pubs/22456/The\_Geoengineering\_Option.pdf)

Each year, the effects of climate change are coming into sharper focus. Barely a month goes by without some fresh bad news: ice sheets and glaciers are melting faster than expected, sea levels are rising more rapidly than ever in recorded history, plants are blooming earlier in the spring, water supplies and habitats are in danger, birds are being forced to find new migratory patterns. The odds that the global climate will reach a dangerous tipping point are increasing. Over the course of the twenty-first century, key ocean currents, such as the Gulf Stream, could shift radically, and thawing permafrost could release huge amounts of additional greenhouse gases into the atmosphere. Such scenarios, although still remote, would dramatically accelerate and compound the consequences of global warming. Scientists are taking these doomsday scenarios seriously because the steady accumulation of warming gases in the atmosphere is forcing change in the climate system at rates so rapid that the outcomes are extremely difficult to predict. Eliminating all the risks of climate change is impossible because carbon dioxide emissions, the chief human contribution to global warming, are unlike conventional air pollutants, which stay in the atmosphere for only hours or days. Once carbon dioxide enters the atmosphere, much of it remains for over a hundred years. Emissions from anywhere on the planet contribute to the global problem, and once headed in the wrong direction, the climate system is slow to respond to attempts at reversal. As with a bathtub that has a large faucet and a small drain, the only practical way to lower the level is by dramatically cutting the inflow. Holding global warming steady at its current rate would require a worldwide 60-80 percent cut in emissions, and it would still take decades for the atmospheric concentration of carbon dioxide to stabilize. Most human emissions of carbon dioxide come from burning fossil fuels, and most governments have been reluctant to force the radical changes necessary to reduce those emissions. Economic growth tends to trump vague and elusive global aspirations. The United States has yet to impose even a cap on its emissions, let alone a reduction. The European Union has adopted an emissions-trading scheme that, although promising in theory, has not yet had much real effect because carbon prices are still too low to cause any significant change in behavior. Even Norway, which in 1991 became one of the first nations to impose a stiff tax on emissions, has seen a net increase in its carbon dioxide emissions. Japan, too, has professed its commitment to taming global warming. Nevertheless, Tokyo is struggling to square the need for economic growth with continued dependence on an energy system powered mainly by conventional fossil fuels. And China's emissions recently surpassed those of the United States, thanks to coal-fueled industrialization and a staggering pace of economic growth. The global economic crisis is stanching emissions a bit, but it will not come close to shutting off the faucet. The world's slow progress in cutting carbon dioxide emissions and the looming danger that the climate could take a sudden turn for the worse require policymakers to take a closer look at emergency strategies for curbing the effects of global warming. These strategies, often called "geoengineering," envision deploying systems on a planetary scale, such as launching reflective particles into the atmosphere or positioning sunshades to cool the earth. These strategies could cool the planet, but they would not stop the buildup of carbon dioxide or lessen all its harmful impacts. For this reason, geoengineering has been widely shunned by those committed to reducing emissions. Serious research on geoengineering is still in its infancy, and it has not received the attention it deserves from politicians. The time has come to take it seriously. Geoengineering could provide a useful defense for the planet -- an emergency shield that could be deployed if surprisingly nasty climatic shifts put vital ecosystems and billions of people at risk. Actually raising the shield, however, would be a political choice. One nation's emergency can be another's opportunity, and it is unlikely that all countries will have similar assessments of how to balance the ills of unchecked climate change with the risk that geoengineering could do more harm than good. Governments should immediately begin to undertake serious research on geoengineering and help create international norms governing its use. THE RAINMAKERS Geoengineering is not a new idea. In 1965, when President Lyndon Johnson received the first-ever U.S. presidential briefing on the dangers of climate change, the only remedy prescribed to counter the effects of global warming was geoengineering. That advice reflected the scientific culture of the time, which imagined that engineering could fix almost any problem. By the late 1940s, both the United States and the Soviet Union had begun exploring strategies for modifying the weather to gain battlefield advantage. Many schemes focused on "seeding" clouds with substances that would coax them to drop more rain. Despite offering no clear advantage to the military, "weather makers" were routinely employed (rarely with much effect) to squeeze more rain from clouds for thirsty crops. Starting in 1962, U.S. government researchers for Project Stormfury tried to make tropical hurricanes less intense through cloud seeding, but with no clear success. Military experts also dreamed of using nuclear explosions and other interventions to create a more advantageous climate. These applications were frightening enough that in 1976 the United Nations adopted the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques to bar such projects. By the 1970s, after a string of failures, the idea of weather modification for war and farming had largely faded away. Today's proposals for geoengineering are more likely to have an impact because the interventions needed for global-scale geoengineering are much less subtle than those that sought to influence local weather patterns. The earth's climate is largely driven by the fine balance between the light energy with which the sun bathes the earth and the heat that the earth radiates back to space. On average, about 70 percent of the earth's incoming sunlight is absorbed by the atmosphere and the planet's surface; the remainder is reflected back into space. Increasing the reflectivity of the planet (known as the albedo) by about one percentage point could have an effect on the climate system large enough to offset the gross increase in warming that is likely over the next century as a result of a doubling of the amount of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. Making such tweaks is much more straightforward than causing rain or fog at a particular location in the ways that the weather makers of the late 1940s and 1950s dreamed of doing.

#### Now is key --- food crises are beginning --- only CO2 ensures strong plants that can provide for the increasing globe

**Idso et. al. 11**—Former Professor in the Departments of Geology, Geography, and Botany and Microbiology @ Arizona State and PhD from UMinnesota and former research physicist for the Department of Agriculture—AND Keith Idso, PhD in Botany—AND Craig, PhD in Geography (Sherwood, “Is There a Need for a More Sustainable Agriculture?” Vol. 14, Iss. 24, 15 June 2011, http://co2science.org/articles/V14/N24/EDIT.php)

In a paper that came to our attention a couple weeks ago, Gomiero et al. (2011) ask the question "Is there a need for a more sustainable agriculture?" This they do in the title of a paper recently published in Critical Reviews in Plant Sciences, where they write that "notwithstanding the great achievements of the 'Green Revolution,' the world will need 70 to 100% more food by 2050," concluding that "a new challenge lies ahead: how to feed nine billion with less land, water and energy, while at the same time preserving natural resources and soil fertility." Coincidentally, this is essentially the same question asked by one of us (Idso, 2011) in a major report published in the current week's issue of CO2 Science: "Estimates of Global Food Production in the Year 2050: Will We Produce Enough to Adequately Feed the World?" In their analysis of the question, Gomiero et al. state that "technical advances are important in order to meet the future needs," as does Idso. In addition, Gomiero et al. state that "addressing key socioeconomic issues, such as the inequality in the access to resources, population growth and access to education are also a priority if we want to properly deal with sustainability." Idso alludes to these same factors, particularly population growth; but he concentrates most heavily on a subject not touched upon by Gomiero et al. -- the aerial fertilization effect of the ongoing rise in the air's CO2 content. Idso first identifies the 45 key crops that account for 95% of world food production, after which he calculates the rates at which their productivities rose over the past 15 years in response to all technological innovations of that time period plus the concurrent increase in atmospheric CO2 concentration. Then, calculating the percentage increases in the productivities of these crops in response to a 300-ppm increase in the atmosphere's CO2 concentration from experimental data tabulated in the Plant Growth Database of CO2 Science, and knowing how much the atmosphere's CO2 content rose over the past 15 years, he determines what part of the past 15 years' productivity increases were due to the aerial fertilization effect of CO2 and what part was due to everything else, which remaining part he calls the techno-intel effect. Extending the linear regression representing this latter effect to the year 2050, and using the IPCC's best median estimate of what the atmosphere's CO2 concentration will be in that year, Idso then calculates the productivity increases of the 45 key crops due to the aerial fertilization effect of CO2 to that point in time, adding the results to those he obtained for the techno-intel effect. This he does for the world as a whole, six world regions, twenty sub-regions and the 25 countries with the greatest populations. And comparing these results with what has been learned from the many different analyses of the subject -- and making adjustments for each geographic entity's projected rate of population growth -- he determines which entities' projected crop productivity increases fall either below, within or above the 70-100% interval that is deemed necessary to insure food security in 2050, with productivity increases below 70% representing food insecurity, with those above 100% representing food security, and with anything in between the two percentages being a "maybe" in terms of food security. The results are rather chilling. And they should cause all those who are calling for mandatory reductions in anthropogenic CO2 emissions to seriously reconsider their views on the subject, while those who may not have thought at all about the topic should do so now; for the looming global food crisis is everybody's business, and all should have a say in what to do about it.

### Case

#### 1. Renewables won’t solve – they are inefficient, costly, unreliable, scarce, and cannot be stored

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

“Green” energy such as wind, solar and biomass presently constitute only 3.6% of fuel used to generate electricity in the U.S. But if another “I Have a Dream” speech were given at the base of the Lincoln Memorial, it would undoubtedly urge us on to a promised land where renewable energy completely replaced fossil fuels and nuclear power. How much will this particular dream cost? Energy expert Vaclav Smil calculates that achieving that goal in a decade — former Vice President Al Gore’s proposal — would incur building costs and write-downs on the order of $4 trillion. Taking a bit more time to reach this promised land would help reduce that price tag a bit, but simply building the requisite generators would cost $2.5 trillion alone. Let’s assume, however, that we could afford that. Have we ever seen such a “green economy”? Yes we have; in the 13th century. Renewable energy is quite literally the energy of yesterday. Few seem to realize that we abandoned “green” energy centuries ago for five very good reasons. First, green energy is diffuse, and it takes a tremendous amount of land and material to harness even a little bit of energy. Jesse Ausubel, director of the Program for the Human Environment and senior research associate at Rockefeller University, calculates, for instance, that the entire state of Connecticut (that is, if Connecticut were as windy as the southeastern Colorado plains) would need to be devoted to wind turbines to power the city of New York. Second, it is extremely costly. In 2016 President Obama’s own Energy Information Administration estimates that onshore wind (the least expensive of these green energies) will be 80% more expensive than combined cycle, gas-fired electricity. And that doesn’t account for the costs associated with the hundreds of billions of dollars’ worth of new transmission systems that would be necessary to get wind and solar energy — which is generally produced far from where consumers happen to live — to ratepayers. Third, it is unreliable. The wind doesn’t always blow and the sun doesn’t always shine when the energy is needed. We account for that today by having a lot of coal and natural gas generation on “standby” to fire-up when renewables can’t produce. Incidentally, the cost of maintaining this backup generation is likewise never fully accounted for in the cost estimates associated with green energy. But in a world where fossil fuels are a thing of the past, we would be forced — like the peasants of the Dark Age — to rely upon the vagaries of the weather. Fourth, it is scarce. While wind and sunlight are obviously not scarce, the real estate where those energies are reliably continuous and in economic proximity to ratepayers is scarce. Finally, once the electricity is produced by the sun or wind, it cannot be stored because battery technology is not currently up to the task. Hence, we must immediately “use it or lose it.” Fossil fuels are everything that green energy is not. Approximately 1,000 cubic feet of natural gas (which cost approximately $4.00) can generate the same amount of electricity as running an average rooftop solar system for 131 days. It is comparatively cheap. It is reliable; it will burn and produce energy whenever you want it. It is plentiful (we use only a tiny bit of oil in the electricity sector). And you can store fossil fuels until you need them. Proponents of green energy argue that if the government can put a man on the moon, it can certainly make green energy economically attractive. Well, notice that government was not trying to get a man to the moon profitably, which is more akin to the challenge here. Even before the Obama presidency began, about half the production costs of wind and solar energy were underwritten by the taxpayer to no commercial avail. There’s little reason to think that a more sustained, multi-decade commitment to subsidy would play out any differently. After all, the federal government once promised that nuclear energy was on the cusp of being “too cheap to meter.” That was in the 1950s. Sixty-one billion dollars of subsidies and impossible-to-price regulatory preferences later, it’s still the most expensive source of conventional energy on the grid. The fundamental question that green energy proponents must answer is this: if green energy is so inevitable and such a great investment, why do we need to subsidize it? If and when renewable energy makes economic sense, profit-hungry investors will build all that we need for us without government needing to lift a finger. But if it doesn’t make economic sense, all of the subsidies in the world won’t change that fact.

#### 2. Plan can’t solve – climate changes are inevitable even if we cut emissions to zero—multiple studies confirm

Gillett et al 10—director @ the Canadian Centre for Climate Modelling and Analysis

Nathan, “Ongoing climate change following a complete cessation of carbon dioxide emissions”. *Nature Geoscience*

Several recent studies have demonstrated that CO2-induced 17 global mean temperature change is irreversible on human 18 timescales 15. We find that not only is this climate change 19 irreversible, but that for some climate variables, such as Antarctic 20 temperature and North African rainfall, CO2-induced climate 21 changes are simulated to continue to worsen for many centuries 22 even after a complete cessation of emissions. Although it is 23 also well known that a large committed thermosteric sea level 24 rise is expected even after a cessation of emissions in 2100, 25 our finding of a strong delayed high-latitude Southern Ocean 26 warming at intermediate depths suggests that this effect may be 27 compounded by ice shelf collapse, grounding line retreat, and ensuing accelerated ice discharge in marine-based sectors of the 28 Antarctic ice sheet, precipitating a sea level rise of several metres. 29 Quantitative results presented here are subject to uncertainties 30 associated with the climate sensitivity, the rate of ocean heat 31 uptake and the rate of carbon uptake in CanESM1, but our 32 findings of Northern Hemisphere cooling, Southern Hemisphere 33 warming, a southward shift of the intertropical convergence zone, 34 and delayed and ongoing ocean warming at intermediate depths 35 following a cessation of emissions are likely to be robust. Geo- 36 engineering by stratospheric aerosol injection has been proposed 37 as a response measure in the event of a rapid melting of the 38 West Antarctic ice sheet24. Our results indicate that if such a 39 melting were driven by ocean warming at intermediate depths, as 40 is thought likely, a geoengineering response would be ineffective 41 for several centuries owing to the long delay associated with 42 subsurface ocean warming.

#### 3. Alt causes – Livestock key to warming- passing gas, meat production, and land changes contribute more than CO2

Christopher Matthews, “Livestock a major threat to environment”, Food and Agriculture organization of the United Nations (FAO), November 26 2006, http://www.fao.org/newsroom/en/news/2006/1000448/index.html. (ENDI Impact D)

According to a new report published by the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, the livestock sector generates more greenhouse gas emissions as measured in CO2 equivalent – 18 percent – than transport. It is also a major source of land and water degradation. Says Henning Steinfeld, Chief of FAO’s Livestock Information and Policy Branch and senior author of the report: “Livestock are one of the most significant contributors to today’s most serious environmental problems. Urgent action is required to remedy the situation.” With increased prosperity, people are consuming more meat and dairy products every year. Global meat production is projected to more than double from 229 million tonnes in 1999/2001 to 465 million tonnes in 2050, while milk output is set to climb from 580 to 1043 million tonnes. Long shadow The global livestock sector is growing faster than any other agricultural sub-sector. It provides livelihoods to about 1.3 billion people and contributes about 40 percent to global agricultural output. For many poor farmers in developing countries livestock are also a source of renewable energy for draft and an essential source of organic fertilizer for their crops. But such rapid growth exacts a steep environmental price, according to the FAO report, Livestock’s Long Shadow –Environmental Issues and Options. “The environmental costs per unit of livestock production must be cut by one half, just to avoid the level of damage worsening beyond its present level,” it warns. When emissions from land use and land use change are included, the livestock sector accounts for 9 percent of CO2 deriving from human-related activities, but produces a much larger share of even more harmful greenhouse gases. It generates 65 percent of human-related nitrous oxide, which has 296 times the Global Warming Potential (GWP) of CO2. Most of this comes from manure. And it accounts for respectively 37 percent of all human-induced methane (23 times as warming as CO2), which is largely produced by the digestive system of ruminants, and 64 percent of ammonia, which contributes significantly to acid rain.

#### 4. Even with China doing rigorous energy projects, solving warming is impossible – means that spillover is irrelevant

**BRADSHER 10** Keith Bradsher, 7/4/10, New York Times, "China Fears Consumer Impact on Global Warming ," http://www.nytimes.com/2010/07/05/business/global/05warm.html

Already, in the last three years, China has shut down more than a thousand older coal-fired power plants that used technology of the sort still common in the United States. China has also surpassed the rest of the world as the biggest investor in wind turbines and other clean energy technology. And it has dictated tough new energy standards for lighting and gas mileage for cars. But even as Beijing imposes the world’s most rigorous national energy campaign, the effort is being overwhelmed by the billionfold demands of Chinese consumers.  **Chinese and Western energy experts worry that China’s energy challenge could become the world’s problem — possibly dooming any international efforts to place meaningful limits on global warming.** If China cannot meet its own energy-efficiency targets, the chances of avoiding widespread environmental damage from rising temperatures “are very close to zero,” said Fatih Birol, the chief economist of the International Energy Agency in Paris. Aspiring to a more Western standard of living, in many cases with the government’s encouragement, China’s population, 1.3 billion strong, is clamoring for more and bigger cars, for electricity-dependent home appliances and for more creature comforts like air-conditioned shopping malls. As a result, China is actually becoming even less energy efficient. And because most of its energy is still produced by burning fossil fuels, China’s emission of carbon dioxide — a so-called greenhouse gas — is growing worse. This past winter and spring showed the largest six-month increase in tonnage ever by a single country.

#### 5. Latin America will never adopt renewables – companies don’t have incentives and fossil fuels are more economically and technically viable

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

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

#### 6. Long timeframe – even if Mexico adopts renewables, projects have to overcome many barriers

Lokey 11 (Elizabeth Lokey, Environmental Studies, University of Colorado, “Barriers to clean development mechanism renewable energy projects in Mexico”, Renewable Energy Vol. 34 Issue 3, 504-508, Science Direct | JJ)

Because of these barriers for CDM participation from the state-run generation company, privately-owned generation comprises the sector with the most potential for utilization of the CDM. The mere fact that private generation makes up only 17.73% of the country's portfolio limits the number of projects that can be developed [18]. A multitude of barriers to renewable energy development in Mexico for independent power producers (IPPs) have also caused this market to move slowly. For an IPP to begin generating electricity over .5 MW in Mexico, the company must not only apply for a generation permit, but also obtain land and/or water leases for the site of generation. Because there are few land deeds that show legal ownership of property, IPPs sometimes have to go through an arduous process of having the local inhabitants first apply for their land deed before the IPP can legally lease it. Some companies have had the experience of purchasing land from the legal owner and later finding that people are living illegally on the land but claim it as their own. Relocating these people has been problematic and time-consuming [19]. Siting a project that is near a surrounding community can also be a difficult process. COMEXHIDRO had to convince locals that the power plant they planned on building near farmers’ fields would not electrify crops and that the dam would not take any water away from the irrigation efforts. At the proposed Benito Juarez COMEXHIDRO site in Oaxaca, locals are barring the construction of the dam because they think preventing the project will provide them with the leveraging power to oust the current Governor of Oaxaca [19]. Fuerza Eólica contracted a person to act as a community liason in Baja California to handle the land leasing and community relations, only to find that he was working for another company and started a land bidding war that raised the price of the land for wind project development [20]. In general, project developers have found that locals, officials, and even ornithologists, who study the impact wind turbines could have on birds and bats, often demand illegal payouts in order to allow the project to be completed [20]. The next stage in the process for the IPP to begin operations is for it to negotiate a price for transmission and firming capacity with CFE. The transmission charge is what CFE charges the IPP to use the excess capacity on the lines and the firming charge is the amount charged to provide back-up energy for the investors in case what they use is more than what the renewable generator produces over a monthly period. The tariffs charged by CFE constitute between 15 and 30% of the price per kWh that the customer eventually pays to the IPP [19] and [20]. The next stage of the process requires the IPP to complete a Power Purchase Agreement (PPA) under one of the five schemes provided by the 1992 Electric Energy Public Service Law (Ley de Servicio Público de Energía Eléctrica). Most renewable generators opt for the self-supply scheme, which entails an agreement between project investors and the IPP. Investors must purchase at least one share of the project company and then sign a long-term PPA [21]. In most cases, the price offered by the IPP must be less than what investors currently pay CFE to be competitive. However, to some in energy-intensive sectors, a long-term, fixed electricity price is attractive as it acts as a hedge against upward fluctuations in hydrocarbon markets. Then, the IPP is allowed to feed the amount of electricity into the grid as their customers use. If more energy is produced than the investors can use, then CFE buys the electricity from the IPP at 85% of their avoided costs. If less electricity is produced than determined by the initial capacity calculation, then higher capacity charges can apply in the next contract between CFE and the IPP. An Environmental Impact Statement assessing the potential environmental ramifications of the project must be prepared, and usually costs several thousand dollars. Only after all of these hurdles have been overcome can the project begin to consider applying for CDM revenues and undergo the lengthy CDM process.

#### An ice age is coming and will cause extinction- only maintaining emissions can solve

Kenny 2

(Andrew, 7/14/02, The Sunday Mail, “The Ice Age Cometh”, <http://www.ourcivilisation.com/aginatur/iceage.htm>, accessed 7/12/13, JA)

A new ice age is due now, but you wont hear it from the green groups, who like to play on Western guilt about consumerism to make us believe in global warming.¶ THE Earth's climate is changing in a dramatic way, with immense danger for mankind and the natural systems that sustain it. This was the frightening message broadcast to us by environmentalists in the recent past. Here are some of their prophecies.¶ The facts have emerged, in recent years and months, from research into past ice ages. They imply that the threat of a new ice age must now stand alongside nuclear war as a likely source of wholesale death and misery for mankind. (Nigel Calder, former editor of New Scientist, in International Wildlife, July 1975)¶ The cooling has already killed thousands of people in poor nations... If it continues, and no strong measures are taken to deal with it, the cooling will cause world famine, world chaos, and probably world war, and this could all come about by the year 2000. (Lowe Ponte, The Cooling, 1976)¶ As recently as January 1994, the supreme authority on matters environmental, Time magazine, wrote:¶ The ice age cometh? Last week's big chill was a reminder that the Earth's climate can change at any time ... The last (ice age) ended 10,000 years ago; the next one — for there will be a next one — could start tens of thousands of years from now. Or tens of years. Or it may have already started.¶ The scare about global cooling was always the same: unprecedented low temperatures; the coldest weather recorded; unusual floods and storms; a rapid shift in the world's climate towards an icy apocalypse.¶ But now, the scare is about global warming. To convert from the first scare to the second, all you have to do is substitute "the coldest weather recorded" with "the warmest weather recorded". Replace the icicles hanging from oranges in California with melting glaciers on Mt Everest, and the shivering armadillos with sweltering polar bears. We were going to freeze but now we are going to fry.¶ Even the White House is making cautionary sounds about warming.¶ What facts have emerged to make this dramatic reversal? Well, none really. The most reliable measurements show no change whatsoever in global temperatures in the past 20 years. What has changed is the perception that global warming makes a better scare than the coming ice age.¶ A good environmental scare needs two ingredients. The first is impending catastrophe. The second is a suitable culprit to blame. In the second case, the ice age fails and global warming is gloriously successful. It is not the destruction itself of Sodom and Gomorrah that makes the story so appealing but the fact that they were destroyed because they were so sinful.¶ One of the real threats to mankind is the danger of collision with a large asteroid. It has happened in the past with catastrophic effect, and it will probably happen again. But there are no conferences, resolutions, gatherings, protests and newspaper headlines about asteroid impacts. The reason is that you cannot find anyone suitable to blame for them. If you could persuade people that President Bush or the oil companies were responsible for the asteroids, I guarantee there would be a billion-dollar campaign to "raise awareness" about the asteroid danger, with sonorous editorials in all the papers.¶ Global warming has the perfect culprit: naughty, industrialised, advanced, consuming, Western society, which has made itself very rich by burning a lot of fossil fuels (coal, oil and gas). This, so the scare goes, is releasing a lot of carbon dioxide, which is dangerously heating up the world.¶ THERE are two facts in the scare. First, it is true that carbon dioxide is a greenhouse gas one which traps heat on Earth. (Without it, the Earth would be 'too cold for' life.) Second, it is true that the concentration of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere is rising. The rest is guesswork.¶ The global warmers said the most accurate measure of climate change would be air temperatures. For the past 20 years or more, air temperatures have been measured with extreme accuracy. They show no warming whatsoever.¶ Surface temperatures are much less reliable since the recording stations are often encroached on by expanding cities, which warm the local environment. The curve most often used by the global warmers is one showing surface temperatures rising by about half a degree in the past 100 years. (The curve, incidentally, is a bad match against rising carbon dioxide but a good one against solar activity, which suggests the sun might be the reason for the warming.)¶ However, there are accurate methods of measuring sea temperatures going back much further. Past temperatures for the Atlantic Ocean have been found by looking at dead marine life. The isotope ratio of carbon-14 in their skeletons tells you when they lived. The ratio of other isotopes tells you the temperature then. Thus we are able to know temperatures in the Atlantic and northern Europe going back thousands of years. They make nonsense of the global warming scare.¶ The last ice age ended about 10,000 years ago. Temperatures rose to the "Holocene Maximum" of about 5000 years ago when it was about l.5°C higher than now, dropped in the time of Christ, and then rose to the "Medieval Climate Optimum" in the years 600 to 1100, when temperatures. were about 1°C higher than now. This was a golden age for northern European agriculture and led to the rise of Viking civilisation.¶ Greenland, now a frozen wasteland, was then a habitable Viking colony. There were vineyards in the south of England. Then temperatures dropped to "The Little Ice Age" in the 1600s, when the Thames froze over. And they have been rising slowly ever since, although they are still much lower than 1000 years ago.¶ We are now in a rather cool period.¶ What caused these ups and downs of temperature? We do not know. Temperature changes are a fact of nature, and we have no idea if the claimed 0.3C heating over the past 100 years is caused by man's activities or part of a natural cycle.¶ What we can say, though, is that if Europe heats up by 1°C it would do it a power of good. We can see this from records of 1000 years ago. Moreover, increased carbon dioxide makes plants grow more quickly, so improving crops and forests.¶ The Earth's climate is immensely complicated, far beyond our present powers of understanding and the calculating powers of modern computers. Changes in phase from ice to water to vapour; cloud formation; convection; ocean currents; winds; changes in the sun: the complicated shapes of the land masses; the ability of the oceans to absorb carbon dioxide — all of these and a thousand other factors operating with small differences over vast masses and distances make it practically impossible for us to make predictions about long-term climate patterns, and perhaps make such predictions inherently impossible. The computer models that the global warmers now use are ludicrously oversimplified, and it is no surprise they have made one wrong prediction after another.¶ If the global warming scare has little foundation in fact, the ice-age scare is only too solidly founded. For the past two million years, but not before, the northern hemisphere has gone through a regular cycle of ice ages: 90,000 years with ice: 10,000 years without. The last ice age ended 10,000 years ago. Our time is up. The next ice age is due.¶ We do not know what causes the ice ages. It is probably to do with the arrangement of northern land masses and the path of the Gulf Stream, but we do not know.¶ However, a new ice age, unlike global warming, would be a certain calamity.¶ It may be that increased levels of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere are actually warding off the ice age. In this case, we should give tax relief to coal power stations and factories for every tonne of carbon dioxide they release.

#### An ice age is coming and will cause extinction- need to keep up emissions to survive

Chapman, geophysicist and astronautical engineer, ‘8

(Phil, April 23th 2008, The Australian, “Sorry to ruin the fun, but an ice age cometh.” [http://www.theaustralian.news.com.au/story/0,25197,23583376-7583,00.html](http://www.theaustralian.news.com.au/story/0%2C25197%2C23583376-7583%2C00.html), accessed 7/12/2013, JA)

THE scariest photo I have seen on the internet is www.spaceweather.com, where you will find a real-time image of the sun from the Solar and Heliospheric Observatory, located in deep space at the equilibrium point between solar and terrestrial gravity.¶ What is scary about the picture is that there is only one tiny sunspot.¶ Disconcerting as it may be to true believers in global warming, the average temperature on Earth has remained steady or slowly declined during the past decade, despite the continued increase in the atmospheric concentration of carbon dioxide, and now the global temperature is falling precipitously.¶ All four agencies that track Earth's temperature (the Hadley Climate Research Unit in Britain, the NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies in New York, the Christy group at the University of Alabama, and Remote Sensing Systems Inc in California) report that it cooled by about 0.7C in 2007. This is the fastest temperature change in the instrumental record and it puts us back where we were in 1930. If the temperature does not soon recover, we will have to conclude that global warming is over.¶ There is also plenty of anecdotal evidence that 2007 was exceptionally cold. It snowed in Baghdad for the first time in centuries, the winter in China was simply terrible and the extent of Antarctic sea ice in the austral winter was the greatest on record since James Cook discovered the place in 1770.¶ It is generally not possible to draw conclusions about climatic trends from events in a single year, so I would normally dismiss this cold snap as transient, pending what happens in the next few years.¶ This is where SOHO comes in. The sunspot number follows a cycle of somewhat variable length, averaging 11 years. The most recent minimum was in March last year. The new cycle, No.24, was supposed to start soon after that, with a gradual build-up in sunspot numbers.¶ It didn't happen. The first sunspot appeared in January this year and lasted only two days. A tiny spot appeared last Monday but vanished within 24 hours. Another little spot appeared this Monday. Pray that there will be many more, and soon.¶ The reason this matters is that there is a close correlation between variations in the sunspot cycle and Earth's climate. The previous time a cycle was delayed like this was in the Dalton Minimum, an especially cold period that lasted several decades from 1790.¶ Northern winters became ferocious: in particular, the rout of Napoleon's Grand Army during the retreat from Moscow in 1812 was at least partly due to the lack of sunspots.¶ That the rapid temperature decline in 2007 coincided with the failure of cycle No.24 to begin on schedule is not proof of a causal connection but it is cause for concern.¶ It is time to put aside the global warming dogma, at least to begin contingency planning about what to do if we are moving into another little ice age, similar to the one that lasted from 1100 to 1850.¶ There is no doubt that the next little ice age would be much worse than the previous one and much more harmful than anything warming may do. There are many more people now and we have become dependent on a few temperate agricultural areas, especially in the US and Canada. Global warming would increase agricultural output, but global cooling will decrease it.¶ Millions will starve if we do nothing to prepare for it (such as planning changes in agriculture to compensate), and millions more will die from cold-related diseases.¶ There is also another possibility, remote but much more serious. The Greenland and Antarctic ice cores and other evidence show that for the past several million years, severe glaciation has almost always afflicted our planet.¶ The bleak truth is that, under normal conditions, most of North America and Europe are buried under about 1.5km of ice. This bitterly frigid climate is interrupted occasionally by brief warm interglacials, typically lasting less than 10,000 years.¶ The interglacial we have enjoyed throughout recorded human history, called the Holocene, began 11,000 years ago, so the ice is overdue. We also know that glaciation can occur quickly: the required decline in global temperature is about 12C and it can happen in 20 years.¶ The next descent into an ice age is inevitable but may not happen for another 1000 years. On the other hand, it must be noted that the cooling in 2007 was even faster than in typical glacial transitions. If it continued for 20 years, the temperature would be 14C cooler in 2027.¶ By then, most of the advanced nations would have ceased to exist, vanishing under the ice, and the rest of the world would be faced with a catastrophe beyond imagining.¶ Australia may escape total annihilation but would surely be overrun by millions of refugees. Once the glaciation starts, it will last 1000 centuries, an incomprehensible stretch of time.¶

#### The coming Ice Age outweighs any impacts of Warming

Singer, distinguished research professor at George Mason and Avery, director of the Center for Global Food Issues at the Hudson Institute, ‘7

(Fred, “Unstoppable Global Warming: Every 1,500 Years”, Page 13, JA)

The climate event that deserves real concern is the next Big Ice Age. That is inevitably approaching, though it may still be thousands of years away. When it comes, temperatures may plummet 15 degrees Celsius, with the high latitudes getting up to 40 degrees colder. Humanity and food production will be forced closer to the equator, as huge ice sheets expand in Canada. Scandinavia. Russia, and Argentina. Even Ohio and Indiana may gradually be encased in mile-thick ice, while California and the Great Plains could suffer century-long drought. Keeping warm will become the critical issue, both night and day. Getting enough food for eight or nine billion people from the relatively small amount of arable land left unfrozen will be a potentially desperate effort. The broad, fertile plains of Alberta and the Ukraine will become sub-Arctic wastes. Wildlife species will be extremely challenged, even though they've survived such cold before-because this time there will be more humans competing for the ice-free land. That's when human knowledge and high-tech farming will be truly needed. In contrast, none of the scary scenarios posited by today's global warming advocates took place during the Earth's past warm periods

#### 1. Reject their solvency evidence—lacks comprehensive data to assess potential for renewables

Wood et. al., 1ac author, 2012, fellow @ Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Department of International Affairs, Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México Senior Advisor, Mexico Institute Renewable Energy Initiative(Duncan Wood, July 2012, “Solar Energy Potential in Mexico’s Northern Border States”, [http://www.wilsoncenter.org/sites/default/files/Border\_Solar\_Romero\_0.pdf)//Holmes](http://www.wilsoncenter.org/sites/default/files/Border_Solar_Romero_0.pdf%29//Holmes)

Due to the difficulty in obtaining comprehensive data regarding the development of solar energy in Mexico, much of the information in this report was obtained from site visits, personal communication with state government officials, journal and newspaper articles. A total of thirty-three journals and newspapers were analyzed. Three of these have a national circulation, while the rest were local newspapers from Mexican Border States. When possible, the information found in newspapers was confirmed by a second or third publication. The proliferation of governmental and non-governmental organizations that promote and regulate the development of renewable energy in Mexico, combined with the lack of a single agency serving as an information clearinghouse, complicates comprehensive analysis of renewable resource development. Energy projects below 1 MWp (MW peak power) have no reporting or regulatory obligations. Such small, often unreported projects are the most common use of solar energy in Mexico. In fact, there are only two CRE- approved Photovoltaic (PV) projects, one 3.8 MWp in Aguascalientes and another in 30 MWp in Jalisco.

#### 2. Can’t solve – No transmission capacity

Wood 12 - PhD in Political Studies @ Queen’s, Professor @ ITAM in Mexico City

(Duncan, et al, Wilson Center, http://www.wilsoncenter.org/sites/default/files/Border\_Wind\_Energy\_Wood.pdf)//BB

For the state of Baja California, this ¶ problem is made even more acute because ¶ there is no interconnection between ¶ the state and the national grid, making ¶ export of electricity to private consumers ¶ in other states impossible at the present ¶ time. Mexico’s national grid is in fact three ¶ grids, with Baja California Norte and ¶ Baja California Sur each having their own ¶ independent system.¶ A further level of difficulty is found ¶ with cross-border transmission. A quick ¶ survey of the above map shows that there are ¶ only a limited number of interconnections¶ across the border. Furthermore, only 5 of ¶ these connections are bi-directional. In ¶ Baja California, the Miguel-Tijuana and the ¶ Imperial Valley-Rosarita interconnections ¶ (both 230kV AC) have a combined capacity ¶ of 800 MW, in Coahuila the Eagle PassPiedras Negras interconnection (138kV ¶ HVDC) has a capacity of only 38 MW, and in ¶ Tamaulipas the Laredo-Nuevo Laredo (138kV ¶ VFT) and McAllen-Reynosa (138kV HVDC) ¶ interconnections have a combined capacity of ¶ 250 MW. These interconnections are maxed ¶ out and therefore cannot be considered ¶ for future cross-border electricity trade. In ¶ addition to these lines operated by CFE, there ¶ are two privately owned transmission lines of ¶ 310 MW (owned by Intergen) and 1200 MW ¶ (owned by Sempra).¶ The problem of cross-border ¶ transmission has been identified in a number ¶ of previous reports on wind and renewable ¶ energy in Mexico,5¶ and in 2010 the two ¶ countries set up a task-force to address ¶ the issue.6¶ Although this group has met a ¶ number of times, there appears to be little ¶ momentum behind the initiative, with each ¶ side blaming the other for lack of progress.

#### 3. Structural alt causes to the aff means they can’t solve – 5 reasons

Wood et. al., 1ac author, 2012, fellow @ Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Department of International Affairs, Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México Senior Advisor, Mexico Institute Renewable Energy Initiative(Duncan Wood, July 2012, “Solar Energy Potential in Mexico’s Northern Border States”, [http://www.wilsoncenter.org/sites/default/files/Border\_Solar\_Romero\_0.pdf)//Holmes](http://www.wilsoncenter.org/sites/default/files/Border_Solar_Romero_0.pdf%29//Holmes)

Barriers to Solar Development in Mexico Institutional There are no specific targets for increased solar capacity by the government. Although there are significant subsidies for conventional energy, the tax incentives for investment in solar energy are not sufficient to promote market growth. In addition, environmental externalities are not considered in the economic analysis of energy projects. Financial In general knowledge, there is little understanding of the life cycle of a solar project. It is not clear how a project can be developed, for it does not follow any established local pattern of construction or investment. The development steps are taken according to the situations that the project is currently in; steps, that have specific financial parameters. From the beginning to the conclusion of a project, it is uncertain how much it will cost. Flow analyses are not exact, adding to this, that the number and capacity of government and private financing programs are very limited. There are no mechanisms for “soft” loans or feed in tariffs to promote the use of solar systems in Mexico despite their successful application in other nations. Technical According to several installers consulted within ANES; in autonomous off-the-grid PV systems, lack of maintenance has caused failures to the PV systems after just a few years of operation. There is a need to train technicians to install and maintain systems and provide greater customer satisfaction, furthering development of the market. Finally, low level legislation (operating procedures) is needed to have minimum standards of quality and performance of photovoltaic products and solar projects. An important barrier to the development of the solar industry in Mexico with regards to manufacturing solar panels is that solar panel manufacturers in Mexico currently have to source most of their inputs from abroad. According to the manufacturers, the Mexican industry does not have the sufficient know-how or technology to meet the specific quality requirements and characteristics used in solar panel manufacturing. Some of the unmet requirements include low panel efficiency outputs, low cover glass quality with low useful life expectancy, and inadequate design and dimensions of the panel frames. Social The lack of knowledge and information about PV Solar Energy in Mexico means that many rural consumers do not understand its potential benefits. With respect to energy consumption and costs, households rarely take a long- term perspective and consequently fail to identify the potential savings small- scale solar system would in some cases provide. Moreover, the rural community remembers the failures of the Solidaridad program, which was developed by the administration of former Mexican president Carlos Salinas de Gortari in the late 1980s. The program’s objective was poverty alleviation, and one of the proposals was to install PV Solar Panels in rural communities. The program failed, partially because the solar systems were using car batteries that died just after a few months and were rarely replaced. Still remembered by the rural population, this experience left many rural residents with the impression that PV and other solar solutions are useless and with a strong preference for a grid connection. Political Unfortunately, decision makers are often uninformed about solar energy as well. This has greater consequences because policymakers have made decisions and declarations that have restricted the development and growth of solar energy in the country and given it a negative public image. For instance, when the electric taxi fleet for Mexico City was first announced, the government stated that the energy for recharging the cars would come from solar panels installed in the recharging stations, clearly an overstatement since the stations have an area of only 100 m2. As a result of public policy blunders and a lack of effective educational campaigns, most of the population is not aware that, when properly applied, solar systems can generate substantial financial and energy savings.

#### 4. Renewables can’t solve warming – they don’t replace dirty energy

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

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

#### 5. Connectivity leads to grid vulnerability and instability – turns the case

Terry 12 - Master’s candidate at the University of Denver’s Josef Korbel School of International Studies

(Alison, “POLICY AND PRACTICE IN NORTH AMERICAN ENERGY SECURITY,” International Affairs Review, 20.3)//BB

As the North American energy networks continue to integrate, they will ¶ become more vulnerable to attacks on critical infrastructure. One example ¶ of failed infrastructure is the August 2003 electrical blackout. The ¶ disturbance centered in Ohio, which is a high-density area of power ¶ transmission lines.96 Due to the integrated electrical grids between the ¶ United States and Canada, the disruption affected eight US states in the ¶ Midwest, and Northeast, as well as parts of Ontario. While it was not ¶ considered a terrorist attack, the incident shows that increased connectivity ¶ also increases vulnerabilities. Just as the electrical grid has areas of highdensity, the major hubs of US oil pipeline and refinery infrastructure are ¶ located near major reserve areas in California, Texas, and Louisiana.97¶ The increased connectivity of the North American electrical grid ¶ necessitates continental defense strategies to protect critical infrastructure. ¶ One example of an attempt to minimize threats to such critical ¶ infrastructure is the Smart Border Declaration signed by Canada and the ¶ United States in December 2001. This document includes measures to ¶ encourage information sharing and prioritizes the security of energy ¶ infrastructure from terrorist threats. Integrated energy networks are more ¶ vulnerable to cyber attacks because terrorists or enemies can use them as ¶ opportunities to exploit pieces of hardware with far-reaching connectivity. ¶ Consequently, the three North American countries must weigh the ease of ¶ use gained by merging their networks with increased risks of physical and ¶ virtual attacks.